

Cotham North RPS – Objections to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders CAE/NMT/P/851

Objection Number	Objector	Summary of Objection/Comment	Officers' Response
1	Roslyn Road	Has no objections to the proposed parking scheme, wants it implemented asap.	Comments noted.
2	Redland Grove	<p>There are many single family households on this road therefore less cars to accommodate as most houses have off-street parking. Prior to other areas having residents' parking, the streets were always quiet.</p> <p>Signposts and ticket machines will spoil the appearance of the area.</p> <p>They have no objection to commuters parking on the streets during the day.</p> <p>The parking scheme seems to be implemented with no consultation and is undemocratic.</p>	<p>Whilst parking may not be difficult on this particular street, many residents in the area are finding it difficult to park close to where they live. For the residents' parking scheme to be successful, individual streets cannot be left out of the scheme as they would face significant commuter parking problems.</p> <p>A design code is followed by our engineers to avoid unnecessary street furniture, whilst meeting the legal requirements of the scheme. Signs and machines will be sympathetically placed, with existing posts and walls used to display signs wherever possible.</p> <p>One of the strategic aims of the scheme is to reduce commuter traffic in the city and dependence on car use. This will reduce congestion, whilst improving air quality and road safety in the local area. The policy context for the scheme is set out in the Joint Local Transport Plan 2011-2026 and the Bristol Core Strategy 2026.</p> <p>Non-statutory consultation regarding the initial proposals took place in Spring 2013. Feedback from residents informed the final plans that are now proposed in the statutory consultation.</p>
3	Brighton Road	Wholeheartedly supports the proposals because of the disproportionate number of multi-occupancy homes and commuter parking. Worried about safety of young daughter and hopes the scheme will be implemented quickly.	Comments noted.

4	Fernbank Road	<p>Fully supports the scheme as it is very difficult to park and commuters often block the driveway.</p> <p>Would like the scheme to only operate Mon-Fri 9-5 so impact on family and friends is minimal and would like to know the timescale for implementation.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>It is proposed that the scheme will only operate on Monday to Friday between 9.00am and 5.00pm.</p>
5	Napier Road	<p>Does not want double yellow lines across driveway.</p> <p>There is not enough room for parking on both sides of the road at the north, where the shared use bays are located. Refuse trucks have to reverse to get to the end of the road and worried about access for emergency vehicles.</p>	<p>This request can be accommodated and is included in the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p> <p>This part of Napier Road is 6.1 metres wide, which is wide enough for parking on both sides. The scheme has been designed to allow parking where possible. Once the scheme begins, there should be a lot less cars trying to park in the area and there may not be a need for these spaces at the north end of Napier Road, in which case they could be removed as part of the six month review. The emergency services are consulted on the plans as part of the statutory consultation. Any recommendations from them about access will be taken on board as a modification to the plans.</p>
6	Zetland Road	<p>Objects to the scheme. Concerned that local schools and hospitals will not be able to attract talented staff because of the lack of parking and poor public transport.</p> <p>Worried that shoppers will not be able to access the independent shops and restaurants on Gloucester Road, which are important to the local communities in Bishopston and Redland.</p> <p>Worried there will be less parking availability for</p>	<p>The Council is also investing in measures designed to improve public transport and encourage walking and cycling. The residents' parking proposals are intended to encourage people to travel using more sustainable forms of transport.</p> <p>Gloucester Road is not in the scheme area and the existing parking arrangements on the road will remain. It is not intended that RPS will have a negative impact on local shops and businesses. The scheme has been designed so that pay & display facilities are located near shops and businesses. People will be able to park for 30 minutes free of charge or pay £1 per hour for longer stays. The scheme will make it easier for customers to find a parking space because commuter parking will be removed.</p> <p>The scheme has been designed to optimise parking spaces and make the</p>

		<p>residents.</p> <p>Worried about the cost of the scheme and the number of visitor permits. Once the scheme is in, these can go up at any time.</p>	<p>best use of the space available. Residents will find it easier to park when commuter parking has been removed.</p> <p>The scheme will be self-funding. The permit charges are designed to pay for the administration and enforcement of the scheme, which will benefit local residents by making it easier to park. Any changes to permit charges would require a statutory notice to be processed before any decision to implement could be made. There are no plans to do so. Every household will be entitled to 50 free visitor permits and 50 for £1 each. Visitors will only need to use a permit if visiting during the scheme hours of operation (Monday to Friday from 9.00am to 5.00pm). There will also be pay & display facilities which visitors can use.</p>
7	Greenway Road	<p>Welcomes the fact that residents with driveways may only apply for one permit but think the cost of this should be set at the price of the second or third permit.</p> <p>Thinks that residents with driveways should be permitted and required to park their second car directly in front of this access on the public highway so they do not have an unfair advantage and use up less space in the street.</p> <p>The council should not incentivise front gardens being changed into off-street parking as this is unattractive.</p>	<p>It is the Council's view that it is equitable that all households seeking to park one vehicle on the public highway pay the same price for their permit.</p> <p>Off-street parking will be protected with double yellow lines to maintain access. Residents may request that these double yellow lines are removed so they can park a car in front of the driveway. The Council accommodates this unless there are safety reasons why the double yellow lines need to remain. It is not appropriate for the Council to require someone to park across their driveway as this may not be possible for safety reasons and they may prefer that we protect their access.</p> <p>The Council does not encourage front gardens to be changed into off-street parking. The cost of doing this, including the requirement to meet sustainable drainage requirements, is likely to make this a very unattractive course of action merely to avoid a permit charge. Any conversion will have to gain the relevant consents and parts of this scheme are in a conservation area, requiring planning consent.</p>
8	Greenway Road	<p>All cars parked on the street should have a permit because it is not fair that a person with a drive can request not to have double yellow lines and can park in this space for free whereas a house without a</p>	<p>The Council accommodates requests to remove double yellow lines unless there are safety reasons that prevent this. It would not be appropriate for the Council to designate a permit holders' parking place across a driveway as this would enable any permit holder to park there and could potentially</p>

		drive does not get this free parking space.	prevent access to the highway from the off-street parking facility.
9	Edgecumbe Road	<p>Supports residents' parking schemes but not Cotham North in its current form.</p> <p>Proper thought has not been given to the impacts of reducing the Redland scheme by so much. The remaining Redland scheme should be joined with Cotham North so it gives more choice and flexibility in parking. The new joined zone should also be called Redland in the interest of preserving identity and history.</p> <p>Lives on the edge of CM, CN and RD schemes and feels that this will restrict ability to find somewhere to park near to house.</p> <p>The introduction of CN ahead of RD will place even further pressure on RD zone.</p> <p>Requests that RD and CN are merged now, feels this would involve no additional costs and would be more effective.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Redland scheme was reduced in size as a response to feedback received during the non-statutory consultation. Scheme boundaries have been carefully chosen using main roads and natural boundaries and it is the Council's view that the boundary of the proposed Cotham North RPS area is appropriate. Whilst scheme names are not designed to match ward boundaries, Cotham North is the northern part of Cotham ward so it is the Council's view that this is an appropriate name.</p> <p>The proposal is intended to make it easier for residents to find somewhere to park than it is now. We will monitor the scheme during its first six months of operation and if we can further improve parking opportunities for residents living on or close to scheme boundaries then we will do so as part of this process.</p> <p>The Council will shortly be proposing a separate scheme for Redland which is designed to resolve parking pressures in that area.</p> <p>It is the Council's view that the Cotham North scheme boundary is the most appropriate for the area, as set out above.</p>
10	Fernbank Road	Writing to object to the lack of provision of double yellow lines in Elliston Lane. Required for access of refuse trucks and emergency vehicles. Says the current plan proposes no restrictions at all. Suggests the whole lane is protected by double yellow lines.	Due to the nature of Elliston Lane with its width and amount of garages that require access, it has been decided to leave it unrestricted. It is thought that overly double yellow lining the area would be detrimental to its appearance and as the lane is 5.1 metres wide, it is unlikely that drivers would seek to park there. We will monitor the scheme once it is introduced and will consider installing double yellow lines if problems do occur.
11	Redland Grove	Wants to know when the scheme will be implemented and if they can still apply for the 50 free visitor permits even though they are not	If the scheme is approved, it is planned that it will be implemented in Spring 2014. This is subject to change and dependent on many factors such as contractor's schedules and the weather. Anyone who lives in the

		<p>applying for a permit as they have off-street parking.</p> <p>Wants to know why Redland Grove is the only road in the area to offer shared use parking. Would it not be fairer if the side with all the houses on was residents' only for them and their visitors?</p>	<p>scheme can apply for the visitor permits regardless of whether they are applying for a residents' permit or not.</p> <p>Residents can still use their permit to park in the shared use spaces for as long as they want. Shared use spaces also give more flexibility for visitors and trades people who can use the pay & display facilities. Many of the houses on Redland Grove have off-street parking.</p>
12	Fernbank Road	Wants double yellow lines removed from in front of their drive.	This request can be accommodated and is included in the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.
13	Clyde Road	<p>Wants to know if they have the double yellow line removed from their access would they be able to park their car in this space without getting a ticket.</p> <p>Would other people be able to park here without permission and what could be done if this happened?</p> <p>If the situation was not working could they request for the double yellow lines to be reinstalled?</p>	<p>If the double yellow lines are removed from an access, then this space is left unrestricted. This enables the resident to park across the driveway without a permit.</p> <p>As the space is unrestricted, any vehicle could park there. An obstruction is only caused if the resident is prevented from exiting their driveway to access the highway, not if the resident is prevented from accessing their driveway. The Police are the responsible authority in the case of obstruction. However, they may not be able to prioritise the incident over other more pressing matters.</p> <p>The scheme will be reviewed after the first six months so a request to have double yellow lines installed could be made at that stage.</p>
14	Elgin Park	In favour of the scheme so friends can visit during the week and workmen find a place to park during the week. A timetable would be useful.	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Further information on implementation timing will be available on our website if a decision is made to proceed.</p>
15	Edgecumbe Road	<p>Believes Cotham North and Redland schemes should be merged into a single scheme. The dividing line dissects the wider Redland community.</p> <p>The proposed Redland scheme is now relatively small, and so what would the negative impacts be of joining the schemes apart from a delay in</p>	<p>The proposed scheme boundary for Cotham North was chosen to reflect a logically enforceable area of an appropriate size and nature and it is the Council's view that this remains the case.</p> <p>The proposed CN scheme is a coherent area in its own right. A scheme area that is too large would encourage inter-area trips which would compromise the scheme's intentions. All boundaries will be carefully</p>

		implementation? There are many longer term benefits of treating Redland as a single, logical entity.	considered in an on-going sense and changes could be made in future if necessary.
16	Westfield Park	<p>Objects to any residents' parking scheme as this will further the decline of Whiteladies Road.</p> <p>Pedestrian pathways and traffic islands in Whiteladies Road also need to be looked at as they are very dangerous and 'near misses' are common.</p>	<p>It is not intended that RPS will have a negative impact on local shops and businesses. The scheme has been designed so that pay & display facilities are located near shops and businesses. People will be able to park free for 30 minutes or for £1 per hour. The scheme is intended to make it easier for customers to park and better for business by creating higher turnover of parking spaces.</p> <p>This issue is not related to the residents' parking scheme proposal but will be considered separately by a road safety engineer.</p>
17	Westfield Park	Identical to objection 16.	See response to objection 16.
18	Imperial Road	<p>Hugely in favour of the introduction of the RPS.</p> <p>Says there are not enough permit holders' places on Imperial Road and suggests that some pay & display should be changed to permit holders' only. The residents in the side alley need to be considered as residents of Imperial Road.</p> <p>Domino's Pizza delivery vehicles often park on Imperial Road all through the night as they operate until 5am. They are part of the Cotham South scheme and they should not be permitted to park in Cotham North with their permits.</p> <p>It seems excessive that permits are valid in two cars.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Council has carefully considered this issue following the response to the non-statutory consultation. It is a matter of striking a balance between providing for the competing needs of residents, local shops and businesses. All residents of Imperial Road are included in the scheme. The scheme is flexible and the six months review will offer an opportunity to amend the balance of parking provision if necessary.</p> <p>As the business is not located in Cotham North, its business permits will not be valid in the permit holders' bays in Cotham North.</p> <p>Two registration numbers can be applied to one permit. However, only one vehicle can use the permit in the area at any one time. This is to offer greater flexibility to households with multiple vehicles.</p>

		<p>It needs to be made clear that it is illegal to sell visitor permits.</p> <p>Imperial Road does not have a 'no-exit' sign and drivers go the wrong way exiting onto Whiteladies Road. One of the 'one-way' signs at the entry from Whiteladies Road has never been lit, despite the bulb being present.</p>	<p>It is stated in the scheme handbook and on the visitor scratch cards that they must not be transferred between households. Misuse of them is something that the council will monitor and appropriate action will be taken where necessary.</p> <p>This is a maintenance issue that is not connected to these proposals. It has been passed to the maintenance team to deal with.</p>
19	Edgecumbe Road	<p>Supports the combination of Cotham North and Redland schemes. There is no natural geographical break point between these two and people who live in the area support the shops on Chandos, Lower Redland and Whiteladies Roads.</p> <p>People living adjacent to Redland Road will no longer be able to park just a few yards from their home in the Redland scheme. Says there seems to be no logical reason for this and what is historically one community should be preserved.</p> <p>Hopes that the interests of traders on Gloucester Road will be protected with longer than 15 minutes free parking.</p> <p>Hopes that the scheme will be flexible in allowing spaces in between houses and in front of drives that</p>	<p>Scheme boundaries have been carefully chosen using main roads and natural boundaries and it is the Council's view that the boundary of the proposed Cotham North RPS area is appropriate. The Council will shortly be proposing a separate scheme for Redland which is designed to resolve parking pressures in that area.</p> <p>Main roads have generally been used as natural boundaries between schemes. The proposed scheme boundary for Cotham North RPS was chosen to reflect a logically enforceable area of an appropriate size and nature. The major road between Cotham North and Redland is Redland Road and it is the Council's view that this is an appropriate boundary. The scheme has been designed to enable people to park on or behind the side of the road that they live on. People from across the whole area will still be able to support the shops by using the free 30 minutes parking, the £1 per hour pay & display facilities or by using more sustainable means of transport such as walking or cycling.</p> <p>Gloucester Road is not in this scheme so the current parking restrictions will remain there. However, it is proposed that the pay & display facilities in the Cotham North scheme will have a 30 minutes free option available to users. This was done to support local shops and businesses.</p> <p>The scheme has been designed to make the best use of the space available, which is why larger bays are not broken up into individual</p>

		are smaller than the standard lengths.	parking spaces. There is a minimum bay size because a larger vehicle may overhang the space and cause an obstruction.
20	Bramford Terrace, Westfield Park	Has the opinion that the end stretch of Westfield Park adjoining Ashgrove Road is too narrow to allow parking on both sides. Vehicles are constantly parked on the pavement causing a hazard to pedestrians, pushchairs and people with disabilities.	This stretch of Westfield Park only has parking on one side of the road but the scheme has been designed to maximise opportunities for residents' to park. The emergency services are consulted on the plans as part of the statutory consultation. Any recommendations from them about access will be taken on board as a modification to the plans.
21	Burlington Road	Property backs onto Lower Redland Road and has recently had an access installed here. Our plans do not show this new access and parking is currently proposed across. The resident would like double yellow lines to protect this access.	The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.
22	Luccombe Hill	Does not want double yellow lines in front of their garage. Is pretty sure that all of the garage owners in that line do not want them.	The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme. The owners of each garage will have to request not to have double yellow lines to protect their access.
23	Edgecumbe Road	<p>Does not live in the scheme but is directly impacted by the proposals as lives on the boundary between the Cotham North and Cotham schemes.</p> <p>Feels strongly that there is a need for the Cotham North and Redland schemes to be merged. The situation for residents in Redland will only become worse as their options of places to park will become more limited.</p> <p>Objects to the Cotham North scheme being introduced before the Redland scheme because of the knock-on effect that this will have and the pressure of displaced cars.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Scheme boundaries have been carefully chosen using main roads and natural boundaries and it is the Council's view that the boundary of the proposed Cotham North RPS area is appropriate.</p> <p>The Council will shortly be proposing a separate scheme for Redland which is designed to resolve parking pressures in that area.</p>
24	Chandos Road	<p>In favour of the scheme as have seen the parking problem get worse over the years.</p> <p>Objects to the fact that there is no provision for any</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Loading and unloading is permitted on double yellow lines in the scheme</p>

		<p>loading bays. Essential for their business that lorries can pick up and drop off large sheets of glass. There are other traders that have regular deliveries and collections, therefore a loading bay at each end of the street would be most suitable.</p> <p>Also want permit holders' or pay & display spaces at this end of the street. Suggests that there is enough space for parking bays or a loading bay near the entrance of Compton Lodge. Unsure whether there is sufficient pay & display for customers on the street.</p> <p>Thinks that it is illogical to have a car club bay outside their shop when this could be a valuable trader's permit space, of which there is not enough provision for. Could be located at top end of Collingwood Road or Hampton Road.</p> <p>Thinks there is a need for some permit holders' or shared use bays at Hampton Road end of street.</p>	<p>area. There are lengths of double yellow lines throughout Chandos Road which can be used for this purpose. This can be monitored and amended as part of the six months review of the scheme if necessary.</p> <p>Due to the anticipated overall reduction in commuter parking we do not expect that customers will find it hard to park close to the shops. The introduction of a maximum stay will increase turnover of space and make it easier for customers to park.</p> <p>The car club bay is needed to provide an alternative to people owning a vehicle that they may not need to use very often. They are more successful in terms of viability if they are located in locations with relatively high footfall. It is the Council's view that this is the most appropriate location for a car club bay in the area.</p> <p>The scheme will be monitored after its introduction and, if necessary, there will be an opportunity to revisit the layout as part of the planned six month review post implementation.</p>
25	Ashgrove Road	Does not want double yellow lines across driveway as this will allow them to park across it, meaning there is more parking in bays for other residents.	The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.
26	Luccombe Hill	Does not want double yellow lines across their garage so they can continue to use the space in front. It is their belief that none of the garage owners on the road want double yellow lines.	The request can be accommodated and is included on the list of minor amendments to the scheme. The owners of each garage will have to request not to have double yellow lines to protect their access.
27	Greenway Road	Does not want double yellow lines across their driveway leaving an unregulated space where they can park their second car as this will leave more space for other residents to park in the road.	The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.

28	Leyton Villas	<p>Parking pressure has increased on Leyton Villas since the double yellow lines were added around the junction with Hampton Road. Worried about pressure in the future with new builds.</p> <p>Objects to the extending of double yellow lines at the blind end of Leyton Villas as this will unnecessarily reduce the number of available parking places.</p>	<p>The double yellow lines were installed for safety reasons around the junction at the Friends Meeting House.</p> <p>The extension of the double yellow lines is considered to be necessary for road safety purposes. It is anticipated that the scheme proposal will make it easier to find a parking space than it is now, so it is important that the scheme design optimises parking by removing unsafe parking from the area.</p>
29	Luccombe Hill	Does not want double yellow lines across driveway. This will increase parking spaces for other residents of the road.	The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.
30	Denny Isle Drive, Severn Beach	<p>Works on Whiteladies Road and has to drive because public transport does not run at the right times. Trains are often delayed and getting two buses is expensive and would take a lot of time. This is going to affect their career.</p> <p>Disappointed by the proposed parking restrictions as there is always free parking during the day and the area is surrounded by businesses. Residents should accept that this is a business area and move somewhere else is parking if an issue for them.</p> <p>Parking has already been minimised by the new road layout, this is bad for the shops and customers cannot park.</p>	<p>Whiteladies Road and Severn Beach are connected by both bus and rail. Public transport improvements have taken place in recent years and further improvements are planned for future years, as set out in the Joint Local Transport Plan 2011-2026.</p> <p>One of the strategic aims of the scheme is to reduce commuter traffic in the city and dependence on car use. This will reduce congestion, whilst improving air quality and road safety in the local area. The policy context for the scheme is set out in the Joint Local Transport Plan 2011-2026 and the Bristol Core Strategy 2026. The scheme is also intended to improve quality of life for local residents. For this to be the case there needs to be some spare parking capacity so that residents do not have to drive around searching for a space.</p> <p>The recent investment in Whiteladies Road was carried out as part of the Greater Bristol Bus Network scheme to improve public transport in the area. People from across the whole area will still be able to support the shops by using the free 30 minutes parking, the £1 per hour pay & display facilities or by using more sustainable means of transport such as walking</p>

			or cycling.
31	Luccombe Hill	Objects to the proposal to have double yellow lines in front of their garage. Does not want double yellow lines across garage and due to its orientation; the bays in front need to be far enough away to allow clear access.	The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.
32	Collingwood Road	Does not want double yellow lines across driveway. Has a dropped kerb and planning permission for this.	The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.
33	Napier Road	<p>Does not want double yellow lines across their driveway.</p> <p>Single yellow lines should be used as this would not affect implementation or the TRO and would reduce the visual impact slightly in a conservation area.</p> <p>The north end of Napier Road is too narrow for parking bays on both sides. This will cause obstruction and larger vehicles will not be able to pass.</p> <p>Wants confirmation that this is a genuine consultation and their comments will be considered seriously.</p>	<p>The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p> <p>Single yellow lines are not used in the scheme as we want to make it clear to people where they can and cannot park. The scheme has been designed to provide parking unless this is unsafe or would cause an obstruction, in which case double yellow lines are proposed.</p> <p>Once the scheme begins, there will be less cars trying to park in the area and there may not be a need for these spaces at the north end of Napier Road, in which case they could be removed as part of the six month review.</p> <p>The scheme proposals have been advertised in accordance with the statutory process and all objections received are being carefully considered before a decision is made on how to proceed.</p>
34	Lower Redland Road	<p>The lack of pay & display parking from 15 to 45 Lower Redland Road will cause severe hardship to their business and put it at risk of closure.</p> <p>Cannot afford to buy permits especially in light of business rate increase and rise in utility bills.</p> <p>Suggests that only one loading bay is required on Lower Redland Road so more space can be given to</p>	<p>The Council has carefully considered this issue following the response to the non-statutory consultation. There are lots of opportunities for shoppers to park on Whiteladies Road, which is only a short walk away. It is a matter of striking a balance between providing for the competing needs of residents, local shops and businesses. The scheme is flexible and the six month review will offer a chance for spaces to change use, if it proves they are not needed for residents.</p> <p>Permit prices are a policy matter and are set in relation to the value that</p>

		<p>parking. The area outside 15 to 45 and outside Sheep Drove, Salvation Army and Wild Oats should all be amended to pay & display only. Feels that there is adequate permit holders' parking elsewhere in the scheme to accommodate this.</p>	<p>they bring as well as incorporating the administration, enforcement and implementation costs. The scheme is intended to improve quality of life for residents and encourage businesses to use more sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>Two loading bays have been proposed in this road due to the amount of shops in the area that require constant loading facilities. One is located on the western end of Lower Redland Road to serve the adjacent shops on Whiteladies Road and the other is for the use of the shops along Lower Redland Road. Again, this situation will be monitored and could be changed in the six month review.</p>
35	Redland Grove	<p>Supports the scheme.</p> <p>The plans on the website are at too small a scale and there is no zoom function.</p> <p>The plans show a space between 25 and 26 Redland Grove, this is too small for a space and obstructs vision when trying to get off the driveway. It should be double yellow lines.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>There is a zoom function available on the website. The plans were also available at City Hall and Cheltenham Road Library, as set out in the press notice and site notices.</p> <p>The space between 25 and 26 is 4.9 metres, which can accommodate a car. Larger vehicles will not be able to fit into the space but this will be clear to the driver. There will be less people trying to find a parking space than there are now, so drivers of larger vehicles will be able to find another parking space. The scheme aims to provide as many parking opportunities for residents as possible but the situation here will be monitored and can be amended in the six months review should problems arise.</p>
36	University of Bristol Lecturer	<p>Many staff at the university travel long distances to get to work before 9am. The scheme will badly affect their parking situation as the university does not provide enough spaces for its staff. The scheme has not taken into account its effect on the wider community.</p>	<p>The scheme is designed to prioritise parking in the wider residential area for use by local residents, businesses and their visitors. It is also intended to encourage people to travel to work using more sustainable modes of transport. The university is well connected by bus and rail routes. The council is committed to helping employers in developing work place travel plans.</p>
37	Lower Redland Mews	<p>Objects to the proposed parking bay across the dropped kerb access between number 10 and 12 Chapel Green Lane. The entrance is used to access</p>	<p>The proposals show that the access is protected by double yellow lines. There will not be a parking bay across it.</p>

		six car ports behind the Napier House flats and access to 4 garages. 3 behind 12, 14 and 1six Chapel Green Lane and one for the Lofthouse.	
38	Stanley Road	<p>There are no loading bays on Chandos Road, there are however two loading bays at the west end of Lower Redland Road where there are no shops.</p> <p>Says there is not enough pay & display on Chandos Road. Suggests putting more in or putting some shared use bays on the side roads leading onto it.</p> <p>Comments that the TRO webpage is not very clear when telling people how to comment or object. Instead of saying 'Notices of Proposals' it should say 'Notices of Intent' as there are no notices of proposals.</p>	<p>You are permitted to load and unload on double yellow lines. There are lengths of double yellow lines throughout Chandos Road and it is considered that maximising spaces for customers to park would be a priority for the shops and businesses. The loading bays on Lower Redland Road could also serve the shops on this road and the shops on Whiteladies Road.</p> <p>The Council has carefully considered this issue following the response to the non-statutory consultation. It is a matter of striking a balance between providing for the competing needs of residents, local shops and businesses. The scheme will be monitored during its first six months and the balance of parking provision can be amended as part of the review of the scheme.</p> <p>The information on the website includes the site notice, which clearly sets out the procedure for submitting objections. At the time of advertisement a decision is still to be made on how to proceed, hence 'proposal' is correct, rather than 'intent', which would imply that the scheme will definitely go ahead.</p>
39	Chertsey Road	<p>Says that people in other schemes having been waiting 8 months for their permits.</p> <p>Would find it offensive and against rights if they were not allowed the amount of permits they need for their household. Many houses in the area are split up into multiple flats. The residents of these flats all require a car for work or family life.</p> <p>By allowing businesses to purchase permits there is</p>	<p>The permits team aim to send permits out within four weeks of receiving a complete application. Waiting times should not exceed this unless the applicant has submitted an incomplete application.</p> <p>All households are eligible to apply for three permits if they do not have off-street parking and one permit if they do. Each permit will be able to carry two registration numbers and it is anticipated that most households will be able to manage their parking requirements in this way, particularly as the scheme will only operate from 9am to 5pm Monday to Friday.</p> <p>Businesses will only be allowed to apply for a limited number of business</p>

		<p>going to be no change in the parking situation.</p> <p>Has not heard anything positive from people living in existing RPS area.</p> <p>This is just a way for the council to make money.</p>	<p>and customer permits. The business permits are only to be used for vehicles which are essential to operation. The aim is to encourage commuters to use more sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>We undertake an annual review of existing scheme areas and the results have been consistently positive. In the six months review of the existing Cotham scheme, 77% of respondents thought it had a positive impact on the area.</p> <p>The scheme is designed to be self-funding rather than to make money. Permit costs have been kept to a minimum. The normal cost of one permit is £48, which is less than £1 per week.</p>
40	Elm Lane	<p>Is a keen cyclist and advocate of sustainable transport, applauds many of the recent traffic improvements.</p> <p>Does not think the statement of reasons justifies the implementation of the TRO on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Elm Lane does not currently experience any issues regarding danger to pedestrians or traffic. It forms part of Route 4 of the National Cycle Network as it is a quiet, safer alternative to Whiteladies Road. The proposed RPS will make no changes to road/pavement conditions so therefore will not reduce danger. It will increase danger because deliveries will be restricted to before 9am. 2. Says that if the council has evidence that there is such a level of damage to the road 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>It is the Council's view that the scheme is in the best interests of the city. The Statement of Reasons relates to the proposals for the area as a whole and not solely to Elm Lane. Parking pressures and the problems that they cause vary throughout the area but it is not appropriate to remove any individual road from the scheme because that would cause parking pressure on the road to increase significantly.</p> <p>The scheme will formalise parking throughout the scheme area, which will mean there are less cars circling the area looking for somewhere to park which will make it safer for cyclists and pedestrians using this route. Deliveries can still be made on double yellow lines at any time.</p> <p>This is not included in the Statement of Reasons as being the Council's reason for proposing the scheme.</p>

		<p>and buildings along Elm Lane, then they should be addressed through other road management controls.</p> <p>3. The character of the road should be preserved for walking and horse riding. The street furniture associated with RPS will detract from existing character and will lead to physical obstacles for pedestrians. This goes against Saved Local Plan policy B15.</p> <p>4. Elm Lane is not in the Air Quality Management Area, therefore the councils Statement of Reason is flawed. People will still need to drive around searching for a space unless it is proposed to give each resident a dedicated space.</p> <p>Believes that these proposals are a money making scheme for the council.</p>	<p>The signs and pay & display machines required to make the scheme enforceable will be implemented as sympathetically as possible and will not be placed in locations where they cause an obstruction to pedestrians. As the new signs are introduced, we will review existing street furniture and remove anything that is no longer needed. Overall, the scheme will benefit pedestrians by reducing traffic volumes and improving road safety in the area.</p> <p>Improving air quality is one of the over-arching goals of the city outlined in the Bristol Core Strategy 2026 and the Joint Local Transport Plan 3 2011-2026 and it is everyone's responsibility to take a role in making a greener and healthier city. There will be fewer cars in the area and people will spend less time searching for a space, which should result in a reduction in emissions.</p> <p>See response 5 to objection 39.</p>
41	Clyde Mews	<p>The plans designate Clyde Mews and its car park as a public road. The road is public but the car park spaces are each owned by the houses in Clyde Mews, has the Land Registry deeds to prove this.</p> <p>The design of the road and the properties that lead onto it means that it is usually just residents that park in front of their own garages; therefore there is no benefit in designating the road as permit holders' places.</p>	<p>Comments are noted and changes can be accommodated and are included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p> <p>Clyde Lane has been designated as a permit parking area, which will enable residents to park there and will prevent non-residents from doing this. The only other alternative would be to leave the street unrestricted. This has been considered but we have decided not to propose that as it is likely that people without permits would park there.</p>

		<p>A dropped kerb has been missed from the plan on the lower part of Clyde Lane, behind the Coach House.</p> <p>The existing waiting restrictions are not marked correctly on the plan, specifically the double yellow lines between Elliston Road and the Coach House.</p>	<p>The plans will be amended to reflect this and it is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p> <p>Existing waiting restrictions are not part of the proposal that is being consulted on and as such they are not included on the proposal plan. All existing restrictions will be superseded by the new scheme, including any amendments, if a decision is made to proceed.</p>
42	Hampton Road	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Opposed to the scheme in principle saying that regulation brings expense, inconvenience and opportunities for confrontation. Parking restriction does not foster community harmony and polarise opinion. Improvements in public transport are a better way to reduce commuter's reliance on cars. 2. The proposals are likely to cause hardship for working people who are already suffering from rising living costs. 3. Students and their cars are the main cause of congestion. It should be the responsibility of the universities to ban students having cars. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The scheme is designed to make parking easier for residents. We have found in our other schemes that because it is much easier for people to park and less competition for space, there is less frustration and confrontation in the streets. Public transport improvements have taken place in recent years and further improvements are planned for future years, as set out in the Joint Local Transport Plan 2011-2026. 2. The scheme is intended to encourage people to travel to work using more sustainable modes of transport. There are long stay car park options in and around the city centre, available to those people where car travel is their only option. There are weekly and annual tickets available which can reduce the cost of this. 3. Both universities in the city operate policies to strongly discourage them from bringing cars to the city; however, this is something the council is unable to enforce without a permit scheme in place. If the proposals are introduced, students living in halls of residence will not be able to apply for permits. Students in shared houses will only be able to apply for up to three permits per household. Experience in our existing schemes is that student parking became less of a problem once the schemes were introduced.

		<p>4. Opposes to three-hour maximum stay. There are no park-and-ride facilities coming from the main routes in the north of the city and so it is not unreasonable for commuters to be able to park on the streets leading to the city centre during the week.</p> <p>5. The maximum of three permits per household should be reduced to two.</p> <p>6. Auburn Road should be designated a Permit Parking Area to not lose informal parking arrangements that have been developed over time along with Woodfield Road. Or the street should be designated 'access only, except bicycles' as this would totally get rid of any commuters coming down the street.</p> <p>7. Does not want double yellow lines across garage access and opposes permit holders' bays adjacent to pedestrian access to house at rear of property unless they can be assured that it will not block this entrance.</p>	<p>4. See response to point two above.</p> <p>5. Not all households will need to apply for three permits and those with off-street parking are only allowed to apply for one. However, some households may need three permits to meet their parking needs and experience in our existing schemes is that these can be accommodated within the scheme.</p> <p>6. Permit Parking Areas are not generally suitable for through-roads, they are generally only used in cul-de-sacs or networks of small roads with one entry and exit point as advised by the Department for Transport.</p> <p>7. The plans have been amended and have been included in the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p>
43	Clyde Road	Does not want double yellow lines across their driveway which is on Napier Road.	The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.
44	Manor Park	Relieved that street is currently not in the scheme, but concerned that the surrounding schemes will have an adverse effect.	If this proposal goes ahead, the effect on nearby streets will be monitored following its introduction.

		Points out that most dwellings in the central north Bristol area were built during the infancy of the car so most do not have off-street parking. Most of the cars on the streets belong to residents. It is unrealistic to expect residents to give up their cars.	Households without off-street parking will be able to apply for 3 residents' permits. Each permit will be able to carry two vehicle registration numbers on it. It is anticipated that most households will be able to manage their parking in this way. Numerous objections have been received from commuters who park in the area which shows this activity does occur.
45	Grove Park	<p>Very much in support of proposed RPS.</p> <p>Concerned that all the spaces on Grove Road are pay & display. The nearest permit holders' spaces are on Elm Lane and they have three young children. Understands that the area has lots of shops in it but Grove Road also has some residential dwellings so requests that some spaces are made permit holders' only.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>It is a matter of balancing the competing needs of residents and local shops and businesses. The pay & display only parking spaces have been provided to create turnover of space for the shops. The scheme will be monitored after its introduction and, if necessary, there will be an opportunity to revisit the layout as part of the planned six month review.</p>
46	Fernbank Road	Opposes the scheme on the grounds that they are proposed because some residents are disabled and need to park. The majority of residents are not disabled. Local residents need local businesses to flourish and it is not fair to make it more expensive for residents to park.	The scheme has been proposed for a number of reasons, including making it easier for disabled people to park in the area. The scheme is proposed to reduce commuter traffic and to make it easier for residents to park close to where they live. Another aim is to provide turnover of spaces close to local businesses, which will make it much easier for their customers to park nearby. Pay & display facilities have been located near shops and businesses. They provide free parking for up to 30 minutes or a relatively low cost option of £1 an hour for longer stays.
47	Chandos Road	<p>Recently moved to the area to be closer to school and have off-street parking. This has reduced their carbon footprint as they no longer need to drive the children to school. Generally in favour of the RPS.</p> <p>Houses in the area are generally large, 4+ bedrooms with professionals often sharing. Suggests that households are allowed four permits.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>For the scheme to work there needs to be a limit to the number of permits per household. Where larger houses have been divided into separate flats, each flat will be able to apply for permits. Each permit can carry two registration numbers on it so it is anticipated that most households will be able to manage their parking requirements in this way.</p>

		<p>The size of the drive should be taken into account when allocating permits e.g. a one car driveway household should be allowed three permits, a two car driveway should be allowed two permits.</p> <p>The permit cost should have an element of vehicle emissions to it, but should be delayed to take into account people changing vehicles e.g. a constant price to start with then variable prices after 3 years of the scheme being in place.</p>	<p>This would require every off-street parking facility to be assessed and a judgement made about how many vehicles can be accommodated on that facility (which may not be possible in all cases due to variation in vehicle size). This would increase the costs of the scheme and is unlikely to achieve a more equitable outcome than the existing proposal.</p> <p>Vehicle emission bands do form part of the tariff structure. The permits will have a vehicle registration on them and to apply for a permit the vehicle registration documents and proof of address will have to be provided. When a vehicle is changed then the permit will need to be changed too, so the price will always be correct for the vehicles on the permit.</p>
48	Redland High School for Girls	<p>Could the permit holders' bays be extended on Grove Park so it joins to the no stopping area outside of the school gate? Currently teachers park there, and will be able to with the use of business permits.</p> <p>Concerned that if Cotham North is implemented before the Redland scheme it will mean many cars are displaced and park in Redland, therefore making it dangerous for the girls walking to school.</p>	<p>The double yellow lines have been installed for safety and the mandatory school keep clear markings are a prescribed length. The scheme will reduce the number of vehicles parking in the area, so business permit holders should find it much easier to find a parking space than they do now.</p> <p>Separate proposals for Redland will be subject to statutory consultation shortly.</p>
49	Redland Road	<p>The draft proposals showed double yellow lines protecting theirs and other flats off-street parking and worried that the new plans do not reflect this and show a parking bay in front of the off-street parking?</p>	<p>The latest proposals show that the dropped kerb and access are protected by double yellow lines.</p>
50	Redland Grove	<p>Does not want double yellow lines across access to off-street parking.</p>	<p>The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p>
51	Auburn Road	<p>Does not want double yellow lines in front of garage.</p> <p>Is planning to have a driveway installed, so there cannot be a parking space. This needs to be added to the plans and does not want double yellow lines in</p>	<p>The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p> <p>There will be an opportunity to make this change in the six months review of the scheme.</p>

		front of the new driveway.	
52	Greenway Road	Does not want double yellow lines across driveway.	The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.
53	Hartington Park	<p>The plans show parking places in the zig-zags of zebra crossings. One on the corner of Lower Redland Road with Elgin Park and outside the Friends Meeting House on Hampton Road.</p> <p>Several bus stops have also been marked with parking places in them.</p> <p>Wants to know why there is a loading bay outside 126 Redland Road when there is no shop there. There is already a loading bay outside the shop on the corner of Redland Road and Lower Redland Road. Only one loading bay is needed here.</p>	<p>The Traffic Regulation Order includes all underlying restrictions so that if a pedestrian crossing or bus stop is ever removed or relocated, these restrictions can then be installed.</p> <p>See above response.</p> <p>The loading bay is going to be removed and replaced with permit holders' bays.</p>
54	Apsley Road	<p>Objects to the proposals because the scheme will operate from 9am to 5pm, when many residents will have commuted out of the area and the spaces left are a resource which should be available to commuters coming into the area.</p> <p>Spaces in the street are always filled after 9pm so often has to park elsewhere and will not be able to do this once the scheme comes in.</p> <p>Thinks scheme is reasonably priced but thinks this will go up once the scheme is in place.</p>	<p>One of the aims of the scheme is to encourage commuters to travel to work using more sustainable modes of transport where possible. This will help those residents that do need to park between 9.00am and 5.00pm to find a parking space more easily than they do now.</p> <p>Experience in our existing scheme areas is that it is easier to find a parking space outside the operating hours of the scheme than it was before the scheme was introduced. The scheme will be monitored after its introduction and the operating hours could be amended if there are problems parking in the evenings.</p> <p>See paragraph 4 of the response to objection six.</p>
55	Collingwood Road	Supports the principles of the scheme providing there are enough spaces for residents.	Comments noted. The Council anticipates that there will be enough parking for residents.

		<p>Two hour parking restrictions were implemented on Chandos Road in 2012 which worked well until the Cotham scheme began and the area became saturated with commuters.</p> <p>Concerned that the shared use bays are located at the eastern end of Chandos Road and pay & display bays are located in the central and western end of the road. The shared use spaces are likely to be taken up with residents and the shops at this end of the road are generally retail outlets that need a high footfall and turnover of spaces, while the shops located with the pay & display do not need this facility so much.</p> <p>Suggests that the pay & display is located between Cowper Road and Lansdown Road as per the consultation and regulations introduced in 2012 and the area on the north side of Chandos Road between Cowper Road and Collingwood Road be designated as permit holders' parking.</p> <p>Does not want double yellow lines across the dropped kerb to the garage entrance of 31 Collingwood Road which is located on Chandos Road.</p>	<p>When the Cotham North scheme begins to operate, this should address the problem of commuter parking.</p> <p>There are many shops in the western end that will benefit from the turnover of space that the pay & display will provide. The shared use bays offer flexibility and can be used by shoppers and as overspill for residents and their visitors. The scheme will be monitored during its first six months and changes to the design can be made as part of this review if problems do occur.</p> <p>See above response.</p> <p>We have assessed this request and unfortunately the double yellow lines cannot be removed as the road is too narrow to accommodate a vehicle parked in this space.</p>
56	Ashgrove Road	<p>Strongly against having the scheme introduced as it is costly for residents and there is not a parking problem.</p> <p>Thinks there should be a space between 18 and 19 Ashgrove Road.</p>	<p>Costs to residents have been kept to a minimum and are designed to pay for the implementation, administration and enforcement of the scheme. The cost for one permit is usually £48 but could be cheaper, depending on the emissions of your car. Previous consultation has shown that there are parking problems in this area and objections have been received from commuters which show that commuters do park in the area.</p>

			<p>The space between 18 and 19 Ashgrove Road is 4.8 metres after the double yellow lines have been omitted from in front of number 19, which the Council does not consider to be large enough for a bay, without restricting access to driveways. By removing commuter parking, it is anticipated that there will be spare capacity in the area so people will be able to find somewhere to park without an extra space being provided here.</p>
57	Edgecumbe Road	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lives just outside the proposed scheme and believe the plans will have a detrimental effect on the environment of their street as already feeling the effects of the Cotham scheme. The introduction of the Cotham North scheme will place even further pressure on the gap before the implementation of Redland. 2. Urges the Council to publish plans for Cotham North and Redland at the same time and thinks it is difficult to make an informed decision without seeing both sets of plans. 3. Often park on Redland Road but this will no longer be an option to them as this is in a different scheme. Feels they should be able to park within 250 metres of their home. 4. Concerned that the plans have changed significantly since the non-statutory consultations and there has been no other opportunity to comment. 5. Since the Redland scheme is now so small, it 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Separate proposals have been developed for Redland RPS and will be subject to statutory consultation shortly. 2. The plans for the Redland scheme were made available to the public from late May to August 2013. 3. See response 1 to this objection. 4. The proposals were finalised following non-statutory consultation in summer 2013. This is the statutory consultation period which provides the opportunity to object to the proposals. Minor changes and improvements have been made as a result of the comments received.

		should be merged with Cotham North so not to break up the heart of the Redland area.	5. Scheme boundaries have been carefully chosen using main roads and natural boundaries and it is the Council's view that the boundary of the proposed Cotham North RPS area is appropriate.
58	Redland Road	<p>Strongly objects to the scheme because there is no problem with parking or traffic congestion in this area, although understands the need to develop a greener city.</p> <p>The area is not in central Bristol and the scheme will be an unnecessary expense to residents.</p>	<p>Previous consultation has shown that there are parking problems in this area and objections have been received from commuters which show that commuters do park in the area.</p> <p>The scheme will be self-funding. The permit charges are designed to pay for the administration and enforcement of the scheme, which will benefit local residents by making it much easier to park than it is now.</p>
59	Bristol Children's Hospital	<p>Supporter of the parking scheme but feels it causes an unnecessary division across the Redland and Cotham community.</p> <p>Has been convincing people that a parking scheme would be beneficial but cannot support a separate Redland and Cotham scheme. They are one community and are small enough to be merged into one scheme.</p>	<p>The proposed scheme boundary was chosen to reflect a logically enforceable area of an appropriate size and nature.</p> <p>See response to objection 9.</p>
60	Grove Park	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Notes that parking bays are proposed over bus stops and crossings on Hampton Road. Says that even if the crossing were to be removed, the underlying parking bays would still not be possible because clear sight lines would be needed from Redland Park into Hampton Road/Elgin Park. 2. More pay & display bays are needed to serve the visitors of the Friends Meeting House, perhaps some shared use bays could be installed in Leyton Villas. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See response 1 to objection 53. 2. Leyton Villas is a small residential cul-de-sac with no turning circle at the end so it has been decided that it is not appropriate to locate pay & display facilities here. Shared use bays are located all along Hampton Road which is just a short walk from the Friends Meeting House. The Friends Meeting House is also served by

		<p>3. No proposals have been made for Elliston Lane.</p> <p>4. Visibility exiting Grove Park into Redland Road is currently a problem. Car parking bays to south east of junction with Grove Park on south side of Redland Road should start further back from the junction to give better sight lines.</p> <p>5. The shared use bays on the north side of Redland Grove from the junction with Redland Road are too close to allow buses to pass each other. The start of the parking bays need to be further from the junction to allow junction to run freely.</p> <p>6. Concerned that no passing places have been allowed for on the narrow roads south of Chandos Road, thinks this is a missed opportunity to ease traffic congestion.</p> <p>7. Wants to know if a bay is closed off in the future for passing places or locating shared recycling/refuse bins, will a new TRO be needed or is it easier to change from a parking bay than double yellow lines?</p>	<p>public transport networks.</p> <p>3. See response to objection 10.</p> <p>4. It is the Council's view that the proposed parking bays allow for safe visibility. This situation will be monitored after implementation and assessed in the six month review of the scheme.</p> <p>5. The area has been surveyed and we are of the opinion that the parking here will still allow the road to run freely. However, the situation here will be monitored and can be changed in the six month post implementation review.</p> <p>6. The scheme has been designed to maximise opportunities for residents' to park. Once the scheme begins, there will be fewer cars trying to park in the area, which will mean natural passing places will occur. The situation will be monitored and looked at in the six months review of the scheme.</p> <p>7. A new TRO would be required. The scheme will be reviewed after the first six months of operation and on an annual basis thereafter. Adjustments of this nature can be made at that time.</p>
61	Edgecumbe Road	The existing Cotham scheme has put pressure on Cotham North and Redland, therefore supportive of the schemes.	Comments noted.

		<p>States that the scheme offers a sensible mix between permit holders' only and pay & display spaces.</p> <p>Seems logical that Redland Road offers the proposed pay & display mix and is the boundary between the two schemes.</p> <p>Recognises the logic in the Cotham North and Redland schemes being separate but it is essential that they are implemented soon after each other to minimise displacement parking.</p> <p>It is imperative that steps are taken to address commuter parking and the Mayor's commitment to review the schemes and make further changes.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Separate proposals for Redland RPS will be subject to statutory advertisement shortly. If the decision is made to proceed with both schemes then they can be implemented within a similar timeframe to minimise potential problems caused by displaced parking.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>
62	Burlington Road/ Whiteladies Road	<p>Strongly objects to the scheme as it would put the business at a serious disadvantage. Whiteladies/Blackboy is a mixed use location and the businesses here add to the overall vitality of the area.</p> <p>The business involves regular project meetings that can last for up to a day with people attending from outside the area.</p> <p>The reason for the problem is houses being turned into HMOs and the new school in the area, despite their green travel plan.</p>	<p>The scheme is designed not to have a negative impact on local businesses. The scheme intends for people to think more responsibly about their travel arrangements and to encourage more sustainable modes of transport. Pay & display parking will be free for up to 30 minutes costs £1 an hour for longer stays, which will increase turnover of space for businesses.</p> <p>Whiteladies Road is well connected by public transport and there are long stay parking facilities, such as the West End car park nearby. Businesses are also entitled to apply for business and customer permits.</p> <p>Households will be limited to one permit each if they have off-street parking or three permits if they do not. The Council anticipates there will be enough room to accommodate these cars once less commuters are parking in the area. This is something that will be monitored. Travel plans cannot be enforced, but it is hoped that if the proposed scheme goes ahead this will provide greater incentive for people to follow the travel</p>

			plans which are already in place.
63	Whiteladies Road	Same as objection 62.	See response to objection 62.
64	Woodstock Road	<p>Wants to know if Woodstock Road is in the scheme as has seen notices on lampposts in Clarendon Road.</p> <p>Against the proposals and is surprised they are still going ahead with so little support.</p> <p>This is a conservation area and ugly street furniture will spoil the road.</p>	<p>Woodstock Road is in the Redland scheme, statutory consultation on these proposals will take place soon. The Cotham North scheme begins on Redland Road. Notices were placed on Clarendon Road to inform people in surrounding areas of the proposals.</p> <p>See response 3 to objection 2 which sets out the policy context for the scheme. There have been many expressions of support for the scheme, some included in this report, whilst others were received during the non-statutory consultation.</p> <p>See response 2 to objection 2.</p>
65	Greenway Road	<p>Objects to having double yellow lines across driveway.</p> <p>Notes that all driveways in the scheme have been protected by double yellow lines but they haven't in other areas of Bristol. Thinks that this part of the proposal is unnecessary as people do not park in front of driveways anyway.</p>	<p>The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p> <p>All accesses are protected by double yellow lines to facilitate access and prevent problems being caused by obstructive parking. Residents can ask not to have double yellow lines and we will meet these requests unless double yellow lines are needed for safety reasons.</p>
66	Imperial Road	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Thinks that the proposals are an unfair tax on residents. 2. The proposal states that one of the reasons for the scheme is to reduce traffic entering the central area during peak periods. Cotham North is nowhere near the central area so fails to see how the scheme fits in with the transport policy. 3. The people driving into the city and causing congestion should pay, not the residents. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See response 5 to objection 39. 2. The Council considers Whiteladies Road and its surrounding residential areas as central. Whiteladies Road is one of the main links from the north area into the city centre as well as being a busy, vibrant shopping quarter itself. 3. These proposals are intended to encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport and to remove commuter parking

		<p>Permits should be free to residents with pay & display charged at a price that will deter non-residents from parking in the area. This will encourage commuters to use public transport rather than the car.</p> <p>4. Wants to know why the schemes are proposed either side of Whiteladies Road and into Clifton. Is this because property values are higher so these people are being targeted?</p> <p>5. The Council states that it “believes the scheme will deliver significant benefits to the local area”. More investigation needs to be done to show the actual effects not what the Council believes.</p> <p>6. Concerned what effect the scheme will have on property prices with no free parking in the vicinity.</p> <p>7. Disagrees that the scheme will have benefits to people with limited mobility/disabled people as these are best served by disabled bays.</p> <p>8. Disagrees that the scheme will make access easier for deliveries and emergency vehicles as junctions have already been protected by double yellow lines and deliveries are</p>	<p>from the area. This will bring benefits to residents and the local community. Pay & display charges are set at a reasonable rate to allow use of the facility for legitimate visitors to the area.</p> <p>4. These proposals have been developed to address the significant commuter parking problems in the area. The Council’s Cabinet have decided that the same permit pricing structure will be part of the proposal for any RPS area. This pricing structure is a policy matter and is not determined by the nature of the area.</p> <p>5. The reviews of our existing schemes in Kingsdown and Cotham have demonstrated that the schemes have brought benefits to the area. In addition, we are aware that many people in this area experience difficulty parking, so it is our considered view that the proposals will benefit the area.</p> <p>6. It is unlikely that the scheme will have a negative effect on property values; in fact, people may be more attracted to the area because it will be easier for them and their visitors to park near their home.</p> <p>7. The scheme will benefit disabled people and people with limited mobility because it will make existing advisory disabled bays statutory, meaning that they can be enforced. Disabled people or people with limited mobility that do not have a disabled bay will find it much easier to park near to their home than it is now.</p> <p>8. Additional loading bays are proposed as part of the scheme. Less cars parked on narrow residential streets will make emergency access easier.</p>
--	--	--	---

		already served by loading bays.	
67	Greenway Road	<p>Strongly in favour of the scheme.</p> <p>Does not want double yellow lines across driveway.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The plans have been amended and have been included in the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p>
68	Ashgrove Road	<p>Understands the need for some restrictions on corners, but not everything that is being imposed. Explains that it seems like hatred towards the motor vehicle when many are greener than the public transport alternatives and they soon will be zero pollution emitters.</p> <p>The double yellow lines outside 4 Ashgrove Road are in excess of the actual gateway opening.</p> <p>There is room to park small family cars between 10 & 11, 11&12, 12 & 13, 17 & 18 and 18 & 19.</p> <p>Look forward to proper consultation.</p>	<p>Although the scheme is about air quality and pollution, it is also about traffic congestion and reducing the amount of cars on our roads, making it easier and quicker to move around the city. It will be a long time before all cars are completely zero pollution emitters. The permit prices reflect vehicle emissions with a permit for a band A vehicle being available free of charge to encourage the use of more sustainable vehicles.</p> <p>The double yellow lines were put in to protect the access in this location.</p> <p>Marking bays on the road that are too small to fit most cars can encourage larger vehicles to park there as they may think that the space is big enough, which could cause access problems to people using their driveways.</p> <p>Non-statutory consultation took place during the Spring and Summer 2013. The proposals were finalised following this and are now subject to the statutory advertisement process, which provides the final opportunity to object to the proposals.</p>
69	Greenway Road	<p>Is the owner of 12a Greenway Road. There is a driveway leading to the entrance and one adjacent which provides access to the pair of garages.</p> <p>Objects to the proposal to put double yellow lines in front of this access and requests that they are removed.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p>

		Asks why houses with no off-street parking are allowed to purchase three permits while those with off-street parking are only allowed to purchase one permit, thinks this is unfair.	Many off-street parking facilities can accommodate more than one car. Limiting permit availability will encourage people to use their off-street spaces rather than keeping them empty. Permits can hold two registration numbers as well so it is anticipated that most households will be able to manage their parking needs in this way.
70	Aerospace	<p>Objects to the scheme as there is never a problem parking at any time of the day on Redland Road.</p> <p>The scheme hours will penalise them as a cyclist because if they drove to work they would not need to buy a permit.</p> <p>It appears to be a money making scheme with no benefits to residents or businesses.</p>	<p>See response 1 to objection 2.</p> <p>The scheme will be reviewed during its first six months of operation. The operating hours could be amended at that stage if there were a need to do so. Car club bays are also provided in the scheme area, which can be a useful alternative for people that do not use their car regularly.</p> <p>See response 5 to objection 39 and response 1 to objection 16.</p>
71	Luccombe Hill	Requests not to have double yellow lines across entrance to internal garage.	We have assessed the situation and unfortunately this request cannot be met because the garage is too close to the junction with Lower Redland Road and it would not be safe to have a car parked in that location.
72	Leyton Villas	<p>The extension of double yellow lines on the left side of Leyton Villas, next to Quaker Hall is not needed and will cause parking problems. The length that was recently put in is more than adequate for short term disabled parking and turning.</p> <p>There is no need to extend the double yellow line at the end of Leyton Villas; the current set up is adequate.</p> <p>Suggests the Leyton Villas and other surrounding roads have parking restrictions from 8am-7pm as parking problems often occur between 5pm-7pm and before 9am.</p> <p>Pay & display parking is located on the zig zags of a</p>	<p>We have assessed the situation here and it is the Council's view that extra double yellow lines are required to ensure the safety of users of Quaker Hall. However, the situation will be monitored and assessed as part of the six months review of the scheme.</p> <p>The double yellow lines at the end of Leyton Villas are to ensure that there is enough room for road users to manoeuvre on this narrow road.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the reduction in vehicles parked in the area during the day will lead to a reduction in the number of vehicles parked in the area at other times. The hours of operation will be monitored and looked at in the six months review of the scheme.</p> <p>See response 1 to objection 53.</p>

		zebra crossing on the plans and this is very dangerous.	
73	Redland Park	Do not want double yellow lines installed across driveway because it will change the aesthetics of their environment.	The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.
74	Webbs Heath	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objects to the proposal because people have to drive to Whiteladies Road and park for work, this will just push the problem further out. 2. It currently works because the residents leave in the morning for work, when the commuters come and park there then leave before the residents get home. 3. Agrees with the need to reduce congestion but thinks other measures need to be taken to do this. What's going on with the new railway or tram system? 4. Could the old railway line from Mangotsfield not be converted for a new transport system with a separate track for walkers and another track for cyclists? 5. To get to work would take over 1 hour 30 minutes where it currently takes 35 minutes by car. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One of the strategic aims of the scheme is to reduce commuter traffic in the city and dependence on car use. This will reduce congestion, whilst improving air quality and road safety in the local area. The policy context for the scheme is set out in the Joint Local Transport Plan 2011-2026 and the Bristol Core Strategy 2026. 2. One of the aims of the scheme is to improve the quality of life for local residents, particularly those who need to use their car during the day and currently find it very difficult to park when they return home. 3. The Council is also investing in measures designed to improve public transport and encourage walking and cycling. The residents' parking proposals are intended to encourage people to travel using more sustainable forms of transport. MetroBus is a £200 million investment in a new express, high quality public transport network with faster and more reliable journey times. The first MetroBus services are expected to start operating in 2016. 4. This suggestion could not form part of these proposals but has been passed to the relevant team for consideration. 5. See response 1 and 3 to this objection.

		<p>6. The problem of parents driving children to school needs to be tackled when they could walk or go on a school bus.</p> <p>7. More people would go on their bikes if they felt safer with more separated bike lanes.</p> <p>8. Drives an eco-friendly car, shouldn't this be incentivised/encouraged?</p> <p>9. The park and ride for the East of Bristol would help as there is often congestion around St George, Fishponds and Cheltenham Road.</p>	<p>6. The Council is working with schools to produce School Travel Plans.</p> <p>7. The Council is investing in measures to improve cycling within the city which includes plans to develop segregated cycle lanes.</p> <p>8. Residents with low emission vehicles are incentivised by being entitled to either a free or discounted permit.</p> <p>9. This suggestion could not form part of these proposals but has been passed to the relevant team for consideration.</p>
75	Elmgrove Road	<p>Wants to know why there are no loading bays on Chandos Road when they exist in all other shopping areas. Suggests there should be two, one on the south side between Lansdown and Cowper Roads and one on the north side opposite Collingwood and Cowper Roads.</p> <p>The double sided parking for permit holders' only in the five streets opening south from Chandos Road offer more than what will be required for residents and their visitors. These roads should offer some shared use parking to allow for more flexibility for shoppers.</p> <p>These same five roads should offer at least one passing place near the centre.</p>	<p>See response 2 to objection 24.</p> <p>This is a very densely populated area, so the proposals have optimised parking for residents. However, the situation here will be monitored once the scheme has been introduced and if it appears that all of the spaces are not needed then there will be the opportunity for them to be changed in the six months post-implementation review.</p> <p>The scheme has been designed to maximise opportunities for residents' to park. Once the scheme begins, there will be fewer cars trying to park in the area, so natural passing places should occur. This is something we have found in our other schemes but the situation on these roads will be monitored as part of the six months review of the scheme.</p>

		<p>Broadly supports the scheme but regrets that it doesn't cover the area to the north of Zetland Road to Cranbrook and Kersteman Roads.</p> <p>Supports the 30 minutes free parking offered in pay & display spaces, wants to know if this is going to be extended to the Cotham scheme?</p>	<p>Comments noted. Separate proposals for this area will be subject to statutory consultation shortly as part of the Redland RPS proposals.</p> <p>Comments noted. The 30 minutes free parking option will be proposed for the Cotham RPS area as part of the review of the scheme.</p>
76	Manor Park	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerned how the scheme is going to affect Manor Park as this is just outside the proposal area. 2. Referring to the scheme as Cotham North suggests and ignorance to local geography and is confusing as the area is in Redland. 3. Understands that legislation requires that the majority of residents have to support RPS before it can go ahead. 4. In existing schemes each household was sent a questionnaire to have their say, this 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Manor Park was originally in the northern area of the proposed Redland RPS. However, the Redland scheme was reduced significantly following informal engagement and Manor Park is no longer included in these proposals. The situation in neighbouring roads will be monitored and assessed once the scheme has been introduced. 2. The Redland scheme was reduced in size as a response to feedback received during the non-statutory consultation. Scheme boundaries have been carefully chosen using main roads and natural boundaries and it is the Council's view that the boundary of the proposed Cotham North RPS area is appropriate. Whilst scheme names are not designed to match ward boundaries, Cotham North is the northern part of Cotham ward so it is the Council's view that this is an appropriate name. 3. The proposals have been advertised in accordance with the statutory requirements. The statement of reasons sets out why the Council is proposing the scheme. There is no requirement to obtain majority support in order to proceed. 4. See response to point 3 above and point 5 below.

		<p>did not happen in Cotham North, this represents a democratic deficit.</p> <p>5. The consultation process has been totally inadequate. The informal consultation had no public meetings or proper channels for engagement.</p> <p>6. There is no robust evidence base to support the proposal. No analysis of commuter travel patterns or the scale of commuter parking have been published.</p>	<p>5. The Cabinet gave approval for proposals to be taken forward to statutory consultation on 27th June 2013. The initial plans were made available online and in local libraries to enable people to comment on them before the final proposals were developed. The non-statutory consultation process involved every address in the neighbourhood being sent a postcard with details of how to comment on the plans.</p> <p>6. The statement of reasons sets out why the Council is proposing the scheme. There is evidence in the 2011 census which shows how people travel in and out of the city to work. Many commuters have also written in response to these proposals which shows that they are using the area for parking and we have received many responses from local residents who are experiencing difficulty in finding somewhere to park.</p>
77	Leyton Villas	<p>Agrees with objection 72.</p> <p>The parking pressure in Leyton Villas is caused by commuters and users of the Friends Meeting House.</p> <p>Concerned about spaces located on the zig zags of the zebra crossing outside the Clyde Arms Pub.</p>	<p>See responses to objection 72.</p> <p>The parking scheme is designed to reduce this pressure and encourage people to use more sustainable modes of transport. There are permit holders' only bays in Leyton Villas but pay & display facilities on Hampton Road to serve the Friends Meeting House.</p> <p>See response 1 to objection 53.</p>
78	Whiteladies Road	<p>Wants to why such a small amount of shared use parking bays have been allocated to all of the roads running off Whiteladies Road? These areas would be more suited to pay & display to allow people to</p>	<p>The Council has carefully considered this issue. The side roads off Whiteladies Road are very densely populated and the scheme design is intended to strike a balance between providing for the needs of residents, local shops and businesses. Visitors to shops on Whiteladies Road can use</p>

		<p>continue shopping on Whiteladies Road.</p> <p>Are the schemes enforced Monday to Friday or Monday to Saturday? There is a discrepancy between Cotham North and Clifton East schemes.</p>	<p>the parking spaces on Whiteladies Road, which have a maximum stay period of one hour, or use the shared use parking on the side streets for longer stays. The scheme is flexible and the six month review will offer a chance for spaces to change use, if it proves necessary.</p> <p>The operating hours of Residents' Parking Schemes can vary between areas and between different streets in the same area. There will be a sign at each parking place that displays the parking restrictions that apply to that parking place. Cotham North is proposed to operate on Monday to Friday between 9.00am and 5.00pm. The Clifton East proposals cannot be considered as part of this report. They are currently being drawn up following non-statutory consultation.</p>
79	Luccombe Hill	Requests not to have double yellow lines in front of their garage.	The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.
80	Elgin Park	Does not want double yellow lines across driveway.	The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.
81	Leyton Villas	<p>Agrees with objection 72.</p> <p>Also agrees with objection 77.</p> <p>Concerned that the new building works on Hampton Road which include new dwellings and a physiotherapy clinic are being erected with very little parking provision, which will only add to the pressure.</p>	<p>See comments to objection 72.</p> <p>See comments to objection 77.</p> <p>If the scheme is introduced, it is anticipated that there will be a lot less cars trying to park in the area leaving spare capacity. The new clinic will also be served by the shared use parking spaces on Hampton Road.</p>
82	Stepney Walk	<p>Children at Bristol Steiner School at the top of Redland Hill, need free parking in the area for pick-ups and drops-offs.</p> <p>Worried there is less parking proposed than there currently is.</p>	<p>There are shared use bays located on Redland Hill and Grove Road. Shared use bays offer a free 30 minutes option which is suitable for pick-ups and drop-offs.</p> <p>Parking has been optimised to provide as many spaces as possible, whilst removing unsafe parking and maintaining access. It is anticipated that there will be a lot less cars parking in the area once the scheme is introduced.</p>

83	No address	<p>Positive about the reduction in pay & display spaces and charges aligned to vehicle emissions.</p> <p>This consultation is parallel to the initial Clifton East consultation; therefore does not give opportunity for people to comment on both schemes at the same time. Consideration needs to be given to consistency.</p> <p>Feedback on the existing, but new restrictions in Cotham North haven't been listened too. Consideration needs to be paid to reducing the amount of double yellow lines where they are not needed.</p> <p>No business case can be made for the large amount of pay & display on Whiteladies Road; this will have a negative impact on footfall and should be removed.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The schemes are separate proposals so need to be subject to separate statutory consultation procedures. Statutory consultation on the Clifton East proposals will take place in due course, which will provide the final opportunity to object to those proposals. If both schemes are implemented, they will be reviewed after six months and on an annual basis thereafter and if there are issues relating to the boundary between the two areas, these can be addressed at that time.</p> <p>When designing the RPS, the streets were surveyed and the existing parking restrictions were reviewed. Parking has been optimised to provide as many spaces as possible, whilst removing unsafe parking and maintaining access. Residents with off-street parking can request to have their double yellow lines removed from their access. Other double yellow are considered to be necessary for safety reasons.</p> <p>This cannot be considered as part of these proposals. Statutory consultation on the Clifton East proposals will take place in due course, which will provide the opportunity to object to those proposals. Clifton East RPS proposals are still in the early stages of design consultation.</p>
84	Greenway Road	Do not want double yellow lines in front of their driveway.	The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.
85	Luccombe Hill	Does not want double yellow lines across garage access.	The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.
86	Lower Redland Road	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objects to scheme as it directly affects business. 2. There is no provision for pay & display between shop numbers 15 to 45, this will out business at risk of closure. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is not intended that the proposed scheme will have a negative effect on business. It will make it easier to find a parking space in the area and will improve turnover of space. 2. Businesses can apply for business and customer permits and park in the permit holders' bays. There are shared use bays on Lower Redland Road and parking spaces on Whiteladies Road.

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Faced with an increasing cost base and increases in national minimum wage, cannot afford to buy business and customer permits. 4. Suggests only one loading bay is required on Lower Redland Road. 5. There should be pay & display outside of Sheep Drove, Salvation Army, Lashings and Wild Oats. 6. The space outside 15 to 45 Lower Redland Road should be pay & display. These changes will only make the businesses here more viable. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Businesses in receipt of small business rate relief can buy business and customer permits at a discounted rate. 4. The scheme will be monitored during the first six months of operation and if these loading facilities are not required by businesses then the design can be changed as part of that process. 5. See response to point 2 of this objection. 6. See response to point 2 of this objection.
87	Lower Redland Road	Identical to objection 86 above.	See response to objection 86.
88	Lower Redland Road	Identical to objection 86 above.	See response to objection 86.
89	Lower Redland Road	Identical to objection 86 above.	See response to objection 86.
90	Alexandra Park	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has a business employing six-8 people, most walk or cycle to work but others live to far away and have to drive. Nowhere for these people to park, no car parks or bus routes to this area from where they live. 2. Scheme only allows for operational vehicles. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One of the overarching goals of the scheme is to significantly reduce commuter traffic. The area is served by buses and trains and there are long-stay car parking facilities on Whiteladies Road. 2. The scheme is intended to encourage people to travel to work

		<p>3. Statement of intent says parking opportunities will be increased for businesses but this is not the case if there is nowhere for them to park.</p> <p>4. The plan is impractical; the narrow 'finger' to 11a Alexandra Park is shown to have parking on both sides when there is not enough room. The only way to park cars on both sides of the road is if some park on the pavement.</p> <p>5. Lives on Carnavon Road and is affected by displacement from Cotham scheme, and this will get worse when Cotham North scheme begins.</p> <p>6. The pay & display spaces always seem to be 90% unoccupied, so how can the scheme be self-financing, as required by law? Finances of the scheme need to be impartially examined.</p>	<p>using more sustainable modes of transport where possible. Business permits are intended for vehicles necessary for operational use.</p> <p>3. Visitors/customers to shops and businesses will find it much easier to find a space to park nearby. Operational vehicles necessary for business will also have increased opportunities to park.</p> <p>4. The scheme has been designed to maximise opportunities for residents to park. Once the scheme begins, there should be a lot less pressure on parking in the area. The scheme will be reviewed during its first six months of operation and adjustments can be made as part of this process if these spaces are not required.</p> <p>5. Carnavon Road is in the proposed Redland scheme area. Proposals for this area will be advertised shortly.</p> <p>6. The cost of permits and the revenue from the pay & display machines covers the cost to implement, administer and enforce the schemes. The Council's budget is open, transparent and democratic.</p>
91	The Boundaries	<p>1. Objects as lives in Somerset and commutes to Clifton on a daily basis.</p> <p>2. Supports ideas of making Bristol a greener</p>	<p>1. One of the strategic aims of the scheme is to reduce commuter traffic in the city and dependence on car use. This will reduce congestion, whilst improving air quality and road safety in the local area. The policy context for the scheme is set out in the Joint Local Transport Plan 2011-2026 and the Bristol Core Strategy 2026.</p> <p>2. The Council is also investing in measures designed to improve</p>

		<p>city but there is no transport infrastructure to support it.</p> <p>3. Prepared to use park and ride at Avonmouth but the route does not include Clifton area.</p> <p>4. Trains are not regular from Temple Meads to Clifton Down.</p> <p>5. Needs to use car to access meetings across the South West during the working day.</p>	<p>public transport and encourage walking and cycling. The residents' parking proposals are intended to encourage people to travel using more sustainable forms of transport.</p> <p>3. The Clifton area is well served by high-frequency buses from the city centre.</p> <p>4. The Severn Beach Line rail service connects the two stations. The 8 and 9 bus service provides a high frequency bus connection between the two if the rail service does not run at a convenient time.</p> <p>5. There are long stay parking facilities, such as the West End car park nearby. There are annual and weekly ticket options available which reduce the daily cost.</p>
92	Clyde Road	Does not want double yellow lines across driveway.	The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.
93	Woolcot Street	Is a blue badge holder, but sees there are no disabled bays in the street. Can usually park on the street, not sure how many spaces will be lost on the street as part of the scheme since most spaces are taken up by people who live on the street. Seeking clarification for if they find it difficult to park here in the future.	Blue badge holders can apply for a statutory disabled bay to be installed outside their home. They can also park in the shared use and pay & display parking spaces free of charge or apply for a residents' permit.
94	Clyde Park	<p>Supports proposal.</p> <p>Need to ensure that sufficient length of double yellow lines across driveways to ensure access.</p> <p>Supports extended double yellow lines around the top and bottom of Clyde Park which will make the vision</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Double yellow lines will be long enough to provide good sight lines and maintain access to off-street parking.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>
95	Chandos Road	Does not want double yellow lines in front of their	Double yellow lines are not proposed in front of this garage. See response

		garage.	5 to objection 128.
96	Greenway Road	Needs to be more enforcement of parking violations on pavements, yellow lines, corners, across driveways etc. which cause inconvenience to pedestrians rather than CEOs booking motorists for overstaying.	The scheme will reduce the number of cars trying to park in the area, which should resolve some of these issues. It has been designed to protect accesses and junctions with double yellow lines to enable enforcement by the Council. The scheme will be regularly enforced and the CEOs will be enforcing double yellow lines as well as checking whether vehicles have valid permits and pay & display tickets.
97	Clyde Road	Does not want double yellow lines in front of garage. Residents' parking only needs to be in place for an hour a day or maybe twice a day to deter commuters parking like they do in London.	The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme. This idea has been considered but has not been proposed because Bristol is very different to London. Those schemes are commonly found close to local rail stations, where it would be much more difficult for commuters to return to their car during the working day. A scheme only operational for two hours a day is more open to abuse, Bristol is a small city and commuters could move their cars during the day to avoid parking charges. It is also more expensive to enforce. It is the Council's view that for the scheme to be successful and really achieve its goals of reducing congestion and improving air quality, then longer hours of operation are necessary. This is supported by the outcome of the reviews of our existing schemes.
98	Clyde Park	Does not want double yellow lines across driveway.	The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.
99	Whiteladies Road	Believes there is insufficient provision of shared use spaces on the roads adjacent to Whiteladies Road. Whiteladies Road offers lots of shops and businesses which aren't just local but destination shops.	It is a matter of striking a balance between providing for the competing needs of residents, local shops and businesses. Cotham North is a densely populated area and shared use spaces have been located on nearly all of the roads adjacent to Whiteladies Road. The proposed pay & display parking on Whiteladies Road will offer much more flexibility for shoppers. There is a 30 minutes free option and then it is £1 per hour after that with a maximum stay of 3 hours. There are also long stay parking facilities at Clifton Down and the area is well served by

		<p>Feels that the scheme discriminates against working mothers, public transport is not adequate for dropping children to school in different areas and then getting to work on time.</p> <p>Will not be viable for staff that live in Thornbury to continue at their job due to indirect public transport.</p>	<p>bus and rail.</p> <p>One of the strategic aims of the scheme is to reduce commuter traffic in the city and dependence on car use. This will reduce congestion, whilst improving air quality and road safety in the local area. Whiteladies Road is accessible by public transport and for those who need to drive there are long stay parking facilities nearby.</p> <p>The scheme aims to encourage people to travel to work using more sustainable modes of transport where possible. There are high-frequency bus services which run between the city centre and Whiteladies Road. If staff need to commute by car, long-stay parking facilities are available at Clifton Down.</p>
100	Redland Road	<p>Objects to scheme as currently proposed as the roads of Redland Road and Redland Hill which are not in the scheme are used for commuter parking for those working on Whiteladies Road.</p> <p>The scheme will simply push more cars into this area. The extension will not impact on shops on Coldharbour Road if it extends perpendicular to it.</p> <p>The other option would be not to impose the scheme at all.</p>	<p>Scheme boundaries have been carefully chosen using main roads and natural boundaries and it is the Council's view that the boundary of the proposed Cotham North RPS area is appropriate.</p> <p>Separate proposals for Redland will be subject to statutory consultation shortly.</p> <p>It is the Council's view that these proposals are required as set out in the statement of reasons for the scheme.</p>

101	Chandos Road	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objects to the proposals because they have concerns about how the council is going to fairly allocate permits when there are so many houses in multiple occupation (HMOs). 2. Also concerned about how the pay & display parking is going to affect the business of independent traders on Chandos Road. 3. Wants to know if the revenue from the scheme will go towards improving public transport or the policing and management of the scheme. 4. Will the roads be congested further by tow trucks enforcing the scheme? 5. Not sure if Chandos Road is full of commuters, wants to know if a survey has been done? 6. Feels houses with off-street parking are being penalised with only being allowed to purchase one permit. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Each household that has a separate address for council tax purposes will be eligible for up to three permits, or one permit if they have off-street parking. Each permit can hold two registration numbers and it is anticipated that each household will be able to manage their parking in this way. 2. The pay & display facilities will be free for 30 minutes option or £1 per hour for up to three hours. This will provide better turnover of space than limited waiting arrangements, which will make it easier for people visiting the shops to find somewhere to park. 3. The scheme is designed to be self-funding, which means that the revenue will be used to implement, administer and enforce the scheme. 4. Tow trucks are generally only used as a last resort if a car is parked blocking access or in a bus lane at an inappropriate time. Sometimes it is essential they are used so not to hold up traffic at peak times and to improve the efficiency of public transport. However, Cotham North RPS will generally be patrolled using Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) and penalty charge notices. 5. Many people have written in acknowledging the commuter parking as well as commuters themselves. For the overall scheme to be successful, individual streets cannot be left unrestricted as they would then be targeted by commuters. 6. Households with off-street parking can apply to have their double yellow lines removed protecting their access, usually meaning they can park a third car in this space. If they could apply for more than one permit, they would effectively be able to park four cars, taking
-----	--------------	---	--

		<p>7. Requires two cars in the household as both people work at places not served by public transport. Elderly relatives need to visit during the day, so they will have to park on the driveway.</p> <p>8. There could be a problem during the holidays, will the scheme apply on bank holidays?</p>	<p>up more valuable space on the street. Some off-street parking facilities can accommodate more than one vehicle. It is considered to be equitable that all households with off-street parking can apply for one permit (which can carry two registration numbers) to park in a bay.</p> <p>7. Each permit can hold two registration numbers and the household is also entitled to a total of 100 visitor permits. The scheme will only operate Monday-Friday 9am-5pm, so permits will not be needed in the evenings and on weekends.</p> <p>8. The scheme does not apply on bank holidays.</p>
102	Elgin Park	1. A one car household, who barely use the car	1. Comments noted.

		<p>during the week and don't use it to drive around Bristol. Uses the car to get out of the city and visit family and friends at weekends.</p> <p>2. Both walk to their places of work and always have done, even though it would be easier to drive.</p> <p>3. Feels as if they are being punished for living within walking distance from work by having to pay to park outside their house.</p> <p>4. Parking is not an issue on Elgin Park, always manage to park outside home and will now have to pay to do this.</p> <p>5. Says since the other parking restrictions were introduced on Whiteladies Road shops have been closing down and this is going to get worse as it becomes less convenient for people to use businesses.</p> <p>6. The notices in the area have small writing making it harder to object. It would be more democratic if the scheme were to be voted in, instead of having to object if you see the</p>	<p>2. Comments noted.</p> <p>3. The intention is to encourage people to use more sustainable modes of transport. Car club bays are provided in the scheme area, which can be a useful alternative for people that do not use their car regularly.</p> <p>4. Whilst parking may not be difficult on this particular street, many residents in the area are finding it difficult to park close to where they live. For the residents' parking scheme to be successful, individual streets cannot be left out of the scheme as they would face significant commuter parking problems.</p> <p>5. It is not intended that RPS will have a negative impact on local shops and businesses. The scheme has been designed so that pay & display facilities are located near shops and businesses. People will be able to park free for 30 minutes or £1 per hour. The scheme should make it easier for customers to park because commuter parking will be removed. In other schemes, local traders have praised the scheme for creating higher turnover in space.</p> <p>6. The Cabinet gave approval to develop proposals for statutory advertisement on 27th June 2013. These proposals have now been advertised in accordance with the legal statutory advertisement process. This requires a notice to be displayed in the local press</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>notices.</p>	<p>advertising the proposals and for the documents to be available in City Hall and a local library for inspection. In addition to this, we displayed site notices on lamp columns in the scheme area, sent a postcard to every property in the scheme area informing residents that the statutory process was imminent and made the proposals available online.</p>
103	Elgin Park	Same as objection 102.	See response to objection 102.
104	Clyde Road	<p>Objects to the scheme on the basis that it is unfair to residents with driveways.</p> <p>Is a family of 5 who have three vehicles. Can only park one on the driveway so the other two are parked on the road. Self-employed and part-time hours mean one car will have to be out of the scheme during the hours of operation.</p> <p>Should be allowed to apply for two permits, as the driveway only removes one space from the roadside.</p> <p>Understands that it is possible for residents to elect not to have double yellow lines protecting their access meaning they could park additional vehicles in front of it. This means other people could park here and it would require additional vehicle manoeuvres whenever the driveway vehicle is blocked in, which is undesirable when considering road safety.</p>	<p>Households with off-street parking can apply to have their double yellow lines removed protecting their access, usually meaning they can park a third car in this space. If they could apply for more than one permit, they would effectively be able to park four cars, taking up more valuable space on the street. Some off-street parking facilities can accommodate more than one vehicle. It is considered to be equitable that all households with off-street parking can apply for one permit (which can carry two registration numbers) to park in a bay.</p> <p>Each permit can hold two registration numbers and the household is also entitled to 100 visitor permits. The scheme will only operate Monday-Friday 9am-5pm, so permits will not be needed in the evenings and on weekends. Each permit can hold two registration numbers meaning it could be swapped between your cars at different times.</p> <p>See response above.</p> <p>See response above. The police are the enforcement authority if someone else has blocked your driveway.</p>

105	Clyde Road	<p>To stop commuter parking, residents' parking is only needed for a short period in the morning and possibly a short period in the afternoon. Suggests different times in different areas for the short periods to allow for flexibility. This would mean parking for the local shops is protected.</p> <p>Disagrees with the one permit allocation for households with off-street parking as many of the houses in the area are large and have several adults living in them all travelling to different places of work or study.</p>	<p>See response 2 to objection 97.</p> <p>For the scheme to be successful there has to be a limit to the number of permits per household. Each permit can carry two registration numbers on it so it is anticipated that most households will be able to manage their parking requirements in this way, particularly as the scheme is only proposed to operate from Mon-Fri, 9am-5pm.</p>
106	University of Bristol	<p>Objects to the RPS proposals on the grounds that a significant minority of their staff will lose access to parking space on-street.</p> <p>Whilst the majority of staff and students do not depend on the private car, there are groups of people that do need a car and it will damage the University's position as a major employer if this parking capability is removed without consultation and with no ready alternatives available.</p> <p>Requests to know what viable alternatives the city is going to offer people who currently park on the residential streets.</p> <p>Requests that consideration is given to expanding on-street cycle parking locations on or adjacent to the highway, including the conversion of car parking spaces where appropriate.</p> <p>Requests clarification as to whether their property at</p>	<p>One of the aims of the scheme is to encourage people to travel to work using more sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>Bristol University's buildings are relatively centrally located and are close to many local bus services and local rail. There are also high-frequent bus links between Temple Meads railway station and the University buildings. The initial proposals for this area were made publicly available in spring 2013 to enable people to comment before they were finalised. The final proposal has been subject to statutory consultation.</p> <p>There are viable public transport options as set out above. In addition, long-stay car parking is available at Trenchard Street and West End MSCP and at a number of other city centre locations.</p> <p>There has been significant investment in recent years, including funding to expand the number of cycle parking facilities. We do consider replacing car parking spaces with cycle parking where appropriate. This is something that can be considered as part of the six months review of the Cotham north RPS.</p> <p>If the property is a business as defined in the proposal then it will be able</p>

		121 Redland Road will be able to obtain either residents or business permits.	to apply for business permits; if it is defined as a residential property then it will be able to apply for residents' permits. Confirmation of permit entitlement cannot be provided until an application showing current documentation has been received.
107	Collingwood Road	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objects to the changes on Chandos Road between Cowper, Collingwood Road and Hampton Road because of the consequences it has for the available parking spaces for residents in the area and road safety. Three quarters of the road will be double yellow lines, meaning it will permanently be unavailable for residents and the other quarter will be pay & display Monday to Friday 9am until 5pm meaning it won't be available for residents either. 2. The main parking problem in this area is due to the number of households. There has been increased pressure since the introduction of surrounding schemes. 3. Parking is difficult to obtain in the evenings and weekends. 4. The no waiting zones on Chandos Road have not helped with road safety as cars now speed along the road, making it more difficult to cross. 5. The pay & display area of Chandos Road is inconsistent with proposals further down 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parking has been optimised to provide as many spaces as possible, whilst removing unsafe parking and maintaining access. It is anticipated that there will be fewer cars parking in the area overall. 2. The Council believes that there will be sufficient capacity to enable residents eligible for permits to park. If the scheme comes into operation, there should be an overall reduction of cars parking in the area, making it easier for residents to find a space. 3. It is anticipated that there will be an overall reduction in vehicles trying to park in the area meaning there will be more spaces for residents to park. 4. It is felt that the double yellow lines are needed to improve road safety, access for larger vehicles and visibility on Chandos Road, as well as leaving passing places and places to load and unload. This location will also be included in the separate plans for a citywide 20mph limit. 5. The scheme offers a range of parking places for the different users of the area. The pay & display only spaces will create turnover in

		<p>the road where there are shared use bays.</p> <p>6. Suggests that the stretch on Chandos Road between Hampton Road and Brighton Road be made permit holders' bays. And the pay & display bays on Chandos Road becoming shared use bays.</p>	<p>space for shops and businesses whilst the shared use bays also enable permit holders (including people with business and customer permits) to park.</p> <p>6. See response 2 to objection 38.</p>
108	Greenway Road	<p>1. Objects to the scheme because does not think parking needs to be restricted unless it impedes free progress of road users or causes danger to other road users.</p> <p>2. Thinks there should be more enforcement of parking violations including parking on pavements, yellow lines, corners, across driveways and outside of schools. These offenses are ignored by CEO's booking people for over staying in marked bays.</p> <p>3. The proposed restrictions will drive more businesses out of the area. Not all businesses operate in normal public transport hours and many need parking for their staff.</p> <p>4. Does not want double yellow lines across driveway.</p> <p>5. Driveway is made of stable bricks and stone flag pavement which is important to the</p>	<p>1. See response 3 to objection 2.</p> <p>2. The scheme will reduce the number of cars trying to park in the area, which should resolve some of these issues. It has been designed to protect accesses and junctions with double yellow lines to enable enforcement by the Council. The scheme will be regularly enforced and the CEOs will be enforcing double yellow lines as well as checking whether vehicles have valid permits and pay & display tickets.</p> <p>3. See response to objection 16. The proposed scheme's hours of operation are Mon-Fri, 9am-5pm.</p> <p>4. The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p> <p>5. The visual impact of the scheme is designed to be as minimal as possible, respecting the character of the area. <i>See response 2 to</i></p>

		<p>character and amenity of Redland village.</p> <p>6. Wants to know why the area has become Cotham North when it is known as Redland by the people.</p> <p>7. Most car owners in the city walk or cycle most places and do not use their cars for short journeys during rush hour around the city.</p> <p>8. Supports actions by the council to widen pavements, improve wheelchair access and extend cycle ways.</p> <p>9. Anti-social parking should be eradicated and residents should be free to park on the streets.</p>	<p><i>objection 2.</i></p> <p>6. See response to objection 9.</p> <p>7. Many residents in the area covered by the proposals are finding it difficult to park during the day due to commuter parking.</p> <p>8. The Council continues to invest in cycling & walking schemes. The RPS should make parking easier for wheelchair users and other blue badge holders.</p> <p>9. See response 2 to this objection.</p>
109	Greenway Road	<p>A family that owns one car and cycles the commute to work daily does not think it is fair to have to pay to park on the street when not even guaranteed a space in the same road.</p> <p>The proximity to Whiteladies Road allows shoppers and workers to park for free bringing much needed custom and vitality to the area. Businesses will be forced to move away leaving empty shops.</p> <p>Will now consider converting front garden into parking space.</p> <p>Does not feel that introducing a parking scheme this far from town is productive or warranted.</p>	<p>It is anticipated that there will be an overall reduction in the number of cars needing to park in the area meaning that residents will find it much easier to park closer to their home.</p> <p>The pay & display facilities will offer a free 30 minutes option or is priced at a reasonable £1 per hour. In our other schemes we have found that shop keepers and businesses prefer the pay & display as it creates a turnover in space and customers usually find it easier to park closer to the shops. Businesses can also apply for business and customer permits. See response 3 to objection 7.</p> <p>See response 3 to objection 2.</p>

110	No address	<p>The expansion of the residents' parking scheme will not provide any solution to the traffic issues which are impacting every major city within the UK including Bristol.</p> <p>Wants to know where the traffic plan is for Bristol and who is accountable for the chaos they have to suffer each day when commuting in and out of the city to work.</p> <p>The park and ride gives no solution as buses get caught up in the other commuter traffic.</p>	<p>See response 3 to objection 2. The policy context for the scheme is set out in the Joint Local Transport Plan 2011-2026 and the Bristol Core Strategy 2026.</p> <p>One of the over-arching goals of the scheme is to reduce commuter traffic to make it easier to move around the city. Commerce is vital to the city, but so is reducing congestion and protecting the air quality and environment. Driving into the city and parking in residential streets or shopping areas causes congestion, blocks spaces needed for shoppers, and costs the city's economy a great deal every year.</p> <p>Park & Ride services offer a frequent, fast service into the city centre. They are supported by the network of bus lanes in the city which reduce journey times and increase reliability. Removing unnecessary commuter trips from the network will help bus reliability and journey times.</p>
111	Davis Street, Avonmouth	<p>Objects to this and to any future proposed RPS on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objects as there is one reason why people own a motor vehicle; to transport people or property in a timely and efficient manner. Motorists already pay heavily for using the roads in fuel duty, VAT and road tax. Parking spaces are fundamentally a part of this network. The road outside someone's property does not belong to them so they cannot expect to park there. 2. Whilst everyone might like a dedicated parking space outside their homes, this is not possible unless there is special justification such as disability. People should be able to park outside anyone's house if 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See response 3 to objection 2. The scheme is also aimed at making it easier for residents and visitors to the local area to find somewhere to park. The payment of vehicle excise duty, fuel duty and other costs associated with motoring do not entitle the motorist to park on the highway. The Council considers it appropriate and necessary to prioritise parking in this area for residents, local businesses and visitors to the area. 2. The scheme does not provide dedicated parking spaces outside people's houses. Parking is prioritised for permit holders but individual spaces are not provided.

		<p>they want to.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Many households in London are carless. However, London has better public transport. Although buses are scheduled for every 15 minutes, they often leave you waiting for over an hour. Reliable and efficient public transport needs to come first. 4. Commuters need to be able to get in and out of the city and the scheme will put pressure on employers to relocate out of town for ease of access and parking. 5. Residents may have friends, relatives or tradesmen who need to come and visit them. Nurses and doctors may need to visit. 6. This will result in a black market for visitor's permits. 7. If the council are sure on improving air quality then should encourage electric cars with a congestion charge and adapt its own fleet. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Significant public transport improvements have taken place in recent years and further improvements are planned for future years, as set out in the Joint Local Transport Plan 2011-2026. See also response 3 to objection 110. It is anticipated that bus reliability will improve once obstructive parking and unnecessary commuter traffic is removed from the area. 4. One of the aims of the scheme is to reduce commuter traffic and congestion in the city centre which costs the economy lots of money every year. The scheme is designed to encourage people to use more sustainable modes of transport to get to work but there are also long stay car parks in the city centre. 5. Every household is eligible for free visitors' permits and has the option to purchase more. There are traders' permits and medical permits' available as well as pay & display facilities in every area. All visitors will only need to use permits during the scheme hours of operation. 6. Visitor's permits have a reference number which identifies them to the household and other permit types will have a vehicle registration on them meaning they cannot be transferred between cars, so there are systems in place to minimise abuse and this is something that will be monitored post implementation and appropriate action will be taken. 7. The Council's own fleet is constantly under review. Many of the cars we use are dual fuel, low emission vehicles and some are electric. We also encourage our staff to use sustainable modes of transport and have a fleet of electric bikes. Low emission vehicles
--	--	---	---

		<p>8. Website claims how it is popular with residents, but it is a negative sum game where there are winners and losers, it depends who you ask.</p>	<p>are subject to free or reduced cost residents' permits.</p> <p>8. In the reviews of our existing scheme, we ask everyone in the area to provide feedback on the scheme. The outcomes of these reviews have clearly demonstrated that the schemes provide real benefits to the local area.</p>
112	Fairview Drive	<p>1. Strongly opposed to the residents' parking scheme as it could be devastating for their business.</p> <p>2. Employs 35 people, another 4 businesses at the premises with an additional 12 employees.</p> <p>3. Has received no guidance on how to plan for the future.</p> <p>4. Took a long term lease on the premises back in 2011 which was otherwise vacant and only could be used as a business premises under council restrictions. The ample on – street parking, which causes no detriment to residents, was a key attraction.</p> <p>5. Due to the number of professionally qualified and skilled employees required to work at the business, it is not possible for them to live locally, therefore making public transport impractical. Ten key members of staff live outside of the city, with a distance to work of 10-40 miles.</p> <p>6. Operate a customer facing business where</p>	<p>1. The scheme has been designed to make it easier for residents and people using businesses to find a parking space and to provide better turnover of space.</p> <p>2. The main aims of the scheme are to reduce commuter traffic and improve air quality by encouraging people to use more sustainable modes on transport. The area is well served by bus and train links.</p> <p>3. The Council can offer guidance on travel planning and options for businesses.</p> <p>4. The scheme is also aimed at improving life for residents by making it easier for them to park near their homes, as many residents are experiencing difficulty parking during the day.</p> <p>5. One of the aims of the scheme is to encourage people to travel to work using more sustainable modes of transport where possible. The area is well connected by public transport links and there are park and ride facilities in the city, as well as long-stay parking in central car parks.</p>

		<p>consultants have to go out and visit clients across the area, meaning they need their cars on site. Public transport and cycling is impractical for this.</p> <p>7. Many elderly clients need to visit the office from outside of Bristol so public transport is not an option.</p> <p>8. Many working parents at the organisation who will not be able to work their contracted hours and maintain childcare requirements with significantly increased travel times.</p> <p>9. Bristol's public transport network is inadequate and expensive. This is a tax that will particularly affect lower paid staff.</p> <p>10. Without the provision of sufficient permits, staff will be forced to leave making recruitment difficult.</p> <p>11. Believes that Old Chapel is the largest employer of professional offices in the area which help support the shops and cafes on Chandos Road.</p> <p>12. Requests the opportunity to meet with</p>	<p>6. A business can apply for business permits which can hold two registration numbers, meaning it can be shared between cars. Pay & display parking is free for 30 minutes or £1 an hour for up to three hours, which should be suitable if the consultants are not based at the office all day. Customer permits are also available for businesses and there are long stay car parks in the area if people need to use their vehicles.</p> <p>7. The scheme should make it easier for your customers to park closer to your business because the commuter parking will be removed. People will be able to park for 30 minutes free of charge or pay £1 per hour for longer stays. The business can also apply for customer permits which it could provide to visiting clients.</p> <p>8. See response 5 and six to this objection and response to objection 110.</p> <p>9. See response 5 to this objection.</p> <p>10. See response 5 and 6 to this objection.</p> <p>11. See response 1 to this objection.</p> <p>12. See response 3 to this objection.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>someone regarding permit allocation.</p> <p>13. Wants to be reassured that the allocation of business permits will be made per registered company not premises.</p>	<p>13. The allocation of business and customer permits is per registered company that pay business rates, not necessarily per premises.</p>
113	Fernbank Road	<p>1. Says the proposal will pollute the Victorian suburb with signs and machines that just raise revenue.</p> <p>2. Says that planning decisions in the past have led to an antidemocratic, totalitarian antifamily approach to parking.</p> <p>3. Says the Council has already defaced Kingsdown and made it into a city centre parking lot with lines, signs and parking machines.</p> <p>4. Thinks that the Council should build car parks for the hospital and its employees. Cannot expect sick patients to arrive by public transport and make staff days longer.</p> <p>5. Believes that the motor vehicle is here to stay and we should focus on providing more car parks rather than cycle schemes.</p> <p>6. The scheme favours smaller households and flat dwellers and will cause fragmentation</p>	<p>1. A design code is followed by our engineers to minimise street furniture whilst meeting the legal requirements of the scheme. Signs and machines will be sympathetically placed, with existing posts and walls used to display signs wherever possible.</p> <p>2. The proposals aim to make it easier for local residents and visitors to the area to park as the commuter parking will be removed.</p> <p>3. See response 1 to this objection.</p> <p>4. The hospital has its own car parks for staff and the city centre is also served by long-stay car parks.</p> <p>5. A residents' parking scheme is aimed at reducing congestion and at making it easier for residents to park in the area. The overarching themes are about making a healthier, greener city for the future as set out in the in the Joint Local Transport Plan 2011-2026 and the Bristol Core Strategy 2026. Cycling plays a key role in helping us achieve our goals and low emission vehicles are also encouraged as part of the scheme.</p> <p>6. See response 2 to objection 39.</p>

		<p>for family life.</p> <p>7. Does not want double yellow lines in front of their driveway.</p>	<p>7. The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p>
114	Hampton Park	<p>1. Objects at the proposal to extend parking restrictions in Hampton Park for the second time.</p> <p>2. Dismayed to find a letter pinned to a lamppost, thinks this was done deliberately to circumvent feedback from residents. Each resident should have been contacted individually.</p> <p>3. The scheme is going to push out commuters and consumers which are vital to the economic activity in the area.</p> <p>4. The proposals are effectively devaluing property.</p> <p>5. Upset about having to pay another tax for the option of having a car or not.</p> <p>6. Always seeing proposals about spending tax payer's money to prove need for council staff jobs.</p> <p>7. Will not be getting vote in next election and is going to register protest with MP.</p>	<p>1. The previous restrictions here were part of a scheme to improve safety, especially around junctions. The RPS scheme seeks to optimise parking opportunities for residents and to make it easier for residents to find somewhere to park.</p> <p>2. The scheme proposals were advertised in accordance with the statutory process, which requires a notice to be placed in the local press. In addition to this, notices were placed on lamp columns throughout the scheme area and each property was sent a postcard to raise awareness of the consultation taking place.</p> <p>3. See response 1 to objection 16.</p> <p>4. This not the intention of the RPS, we have found in other areas that the scheme will make the area a more attractive place to live with less cars circling the area and safer, quieter streets. Residents will also find it easier to park closer to their homes.</p> <p>5. See response 5 to objection 39.</p> <p>6. See response 5 to objection 39.</p> <p>7. Comments noted.</p>

115	Fernbank Road	Does not want double yellow lines in front of their driveway.	The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.
116	Ashgrove Road	Does not want double yellow lines in front of their garage which is on Chertsey Road.	The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.
117	Fernbank Road	Does not want double yellow lines across driveway.	The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.
118	Lower Redland Road	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explains it would seem logical to merge the Cotham North and Redland schemes now the Redland scheme is so much smaller, then all residents could then use their permits for visiting Whiteladies Road. 2. The pedestrian refuge on Redland Road, outside the convenience store at 111 Lower Redland Road is dangerous and forces delivery vehicles to perform dangerous manoeuvres. 3. The bus stops are shown to have pay & display and permit holders' parking located on them. 4. Burlington Road is very wide and most of it is reserved for permit holders' bays even though most properties have off-street parking on the south side on Lower Redland Road. Exeter Buildings, however, is a much narrower road which is proposed for more pay & display parking. It would make sense if there was more permit holders' parking was located on Exeter Buildings and echelon 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scheme boundaries have been carefully chosen using main roads and natural boundaries and it is the Council's view that the boundary of the proposed Cotham North RPS area is appropriate. One of the aims of the scheme is to encourage the use of more sustainable forms of transport and to make it easier for residents to find somewhere to park close to where they live. 2. The pedestrian refuge is outside the remit of these residents' parking scheme proposals as they only deal with waiting and loading restrictions, but it has been passed to the relevant officer to consider. These proposals provide a loading bay close to the convenience store on Redland Road which is intended to make deliveries easier. 3. See response 1 to objection 53. 4. The shared use parking in Exeter Buildings is intended to provide parking for the local community amenities on this road as a result of the information received during the non-statutory consultation. The area is densely populated so it is also important to balance the needs of residents but the situation on Burlington Road will be monitored and looked at in the six month post-implementation review.

		<p>pay & display parking was placed on Burlington Road, offering more spaces to people using Whiteladies Road and the new St Johns Primary School.</p> <p>5. There should be more pay & display parking on Lower Redland Road between Redland Terrance and Evans Road.</p> <p>6. Permitted loading hours on Lower Redland Road are too long. Suggests they start before 8am and finish before the evening rush hour. This would reduce congestion in the narrow western part of Lower Redland Road.</p>	<p>5. The Council has carefully considered this issue whilst developing the final proposals. It is a matter of striking a balance between providing for the competing needs of residents, local shops and businesses. The scheme is flexible and the six months review will offer an opportunity to amend the balance of parking provision if necessary.</p> <p>6. The loading bay on Lower Redland Road is primarily a facility for the new school and the hours of operation match other school restrictions in the city.</p>
119	Stoke Gifford	<p>1. Works for a property management company on Whiteladies Road and travels in each day from Stoke Gifford, parking wherever they can.</p> <p>2. They are not sure if the push is to remove cars is to cut emissions or congestion.</p> <p>3. Asks why permission was given for Simply Health to build a new building at the top of Whiteladies Road, employing many staff who will need parking.</p> <p>4. Explains how many houses in the area have been converted into HMOs with 6-8</p>	<p>1. Comments noted.</p> <p>2. The scheme aims to do both of these things. See response 3 to objection 2.</p> <p>3. Delivering a thriving economy and providing employment land is one of the adopted policies set out in the Bristol Core Strategy 2026. See policy BCS8. Developing a sustainable travel plan formed part of their planning conditions.</p> <p>4. As part of the scheme, households with off-street parking will only be able to apply for one permit and houses without off-street</p>

		<p>students sharing all with cars.</p> <p>5. To reduce congestion, roads should be opened up instead of being made one way and there should be less islands between lanes – North Road near Waitrose is a prime example. Emergency services now find it difficult to get down Whiteladies Road with the recent islands being put in as the traffic cannot move out of the way.</p> <p>6. Says it seems to be a stealth tax on residents as they already pay council tax.</p> <p>7. If they have to use public transport they will have to take two buses and will make the day much longer. Walking in the dark at night in the winter would be intimidating and there are no facilities such as showers at work to ride bikes to work every day.</p> <p>8. Often has to visit elderly parents after work out of town and getting a taxi to see them would incur extra costs. Will not be able to afford bus fares as well as costs of running a car.</p> <p>9. Worried about the viability of struggling businesses on Whiteladies Road. People will have to leave their jobs and Bristol City</p>	<p>parking will be eligible for three permits so this should encourage larger households to consider their car requirements. Each permit can hold two registrations and it is anticipated that most households will be able to manage their needs in this way.</p> <p>5. The recent investment in Whiteladies Road was carried out as part of the Greater Bristol Bus Network scheme to improve public transport in the area and to improve the streetscape to be less focused on cars whilst providing more informal pedestrian crossing opportunities.</p> <p>6. See response 5 to objection 39.</p> <p>7. One of the aims of the scheme is to encourage people to use more sustainable modes of transport to travel to work. The Council can provide travel planning support to their employer and can offer a range of incentives to make it easier to travel to work by walking, cycling or using public transport.</p> <p>8. Long-stay parking is available at Clifton Down.</p> <p>9. Local businesses will benefit from the improved turnover of parking space that the scheme will bring, which will make it easier for customers to find somewhere to park nearby.</p>
--	--	---	--

		Council and South Gloucestershire Council may find themselves having to pay more benefits.	
120	Wells Close, Long Ashton	<p>Says the scheme is not what local people want.</p> <p>If they had to get the bus to work, they would need to get two, they are often too busy and it would take considerably longer. The bus is more expensive than driving.</p> <p>The park and ride system only aids people travelling to the city centre; maybe another route to Clifton could be looked at?</p> <p>Cycling to work is not an option as there are no facilities at work and they are asthmatic.</p> <p>Recently bought a low emission car which it would be impossible to park anywhere near place of work if the scheme is introduced.</p>	<p>Many local residents experience difficulties in finding somewhere to park close to where they live.</p> <p>Public transport improvements have taken place in recent years and further improvements are planned for future years, as set out in the Joint Local Transport Plan 2011-2026. See also response 7 to objection 119.</p> <p>When more people use such services, routes often improve as there is a greater need for them.</p> <p>Long-stay parking is available at Clifton Down.</p> <p>A residents' parking scheme is aimed at reducing congestion and at making life easier for residents. The overarching strategy is about making a healthier, greener city for the future as set out in the in the Joint Local Transport Plan 2011-2026 and the Bristol Core Strategy 2026.</p>
121	Salisbury Road	Notes that Northumberland Road and Salisbury Road are not listed as being included on the notices attached to lampposts in the area. Wants confirmation that they are not included.	Neither Salisbury Road nor Northumberland Road is included in the Cotham North scheme. However, they are part of the Council's proposals for Redland, which will be subject to statutory advertisement shortly.
122	Redland Park	1. The church has not received any notice or communication of the proposals and was totally unaware until a notice on a lamppost was noticed a few days ago. Wants to formally complain to the council for this failure.	1. The notices on lampposts are part of the statutory consultation process. They are placed on lampposts throughout the area and checked every week. Informal consultation took place during spring and summer 2013.

		<p>2. Says that recent parking restrictions on Redland Park and Whiteladies Road were reluctantly accepted by the church a few months ago after discussions with council officers on the understanding that there would be no restrictions in front of the churches access lane and parking ramp in Redland Park. Believes that the Council must have known about these plans then which if put forward could have resulted in meaningful discussions. Wants to formally complain about this.</p> <p>3. No leaflet or notice has been received with regards to the Clifton East proposals therefore the church does not have a passcode which is needed to complete the survey.</p> <p>4. The church has done lots of community work for the city. Says that the church is not a trade or a business as the proposals imply. Permits cannot be purchased out of profits as the church relies on donations and gifts from its members.</p> <p>5. The church is hoping to increase daytime activities during the week, and these are attended by people living outside of the area who need to get there by car, especially those who are elderly. Says that because of the lack of notice, the Elders of the church have not had time to consider the proposals</p>	<p>2. The recent investment in Whiteladies Road was carried out as part of the Greater Bristol Bus Network scheme to improve public transport in the area and to improve the streetscape to be less focused on cars. The double yellow lines will be removed from in front of the access and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments.</p> <p>3. Only properties within the Clifton East scheme would have received the full survey. The church is in the Cotham North scheme but is still welcome to comment on the Clifton East proposals by following the process on our website.</p> <p>4. Charities and other similar organisations can apply for business permits at a discounted rate.</p> <p>5. The scheme should make it easier for your visitors who need to travel by car to park closer to the church as the commuter parking will be removed. The scheme offers pay & display facilities in the area which are free for 30 minutes or £1 per hour for a maximum of three hours. There are car parks for longer stay located on Whiteladies Road.</p>
--	--	--	---

		therefore the right is reserved to make further objections, including raising discrimination issues.	
123	Stanley Road	<p>Does not want double yellow lines in front of garage.</p> <p>The loading bay shown by the pub on Kensington Road is not needed 9-5, only needed for about 30 minutes a day. This unnecessarily reduces parking for local residents. Suppliers can use the space in front of the side garage entry on Chandos Road.</p>	<p>We have assessed the situation and unfortunately this request cannot be met because the space in front of the garage is not big enough to park a car and would restrict access to the adjacent garage.</p> <p>Loading bays in the scheme areas have been provided to formalise loading arrangements, which can be required throughout the working day. There will be more parking capacity once the scheme is introduced.</p>
124	Greenway Road	<p>Objects to having double yellow lines painted across driveway.</p> <p>Their neighbour is in the process of moving out but also would not like double yellow lines across driveway.</p>	<p>The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p> <p>Requests made on behalf of other residents cannot be accommodated as part of this process. The new resident may wish to protect their driveway so the double yellow lines will remain at this location. The six month review will provide the next opportunity to make changes.</p>
125	Hampton Road	<p>Does not want double yellow lines across their garage which is at the rear of their house on Auburn Road. Would like to ensure enough room is left so they can easily use the space as there will be car parking opposite. If a space cannot be made which is not big enough to easily use then they would request double yellow lines are put down instead.</p> <p>Concerned the parking schemes will have a detrimental impact on local shops and community groups such as toddler groups etc.</p> <p>Public transport is not really suitable when travelling</p>	<p>The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p> <p>It is not intended that RPS will have a negative impact on local shops, businesses and community groups. The scheme has been designed so that pay & display facilities are located near shops, businesses and community places. People will be able to park free for 30 minutes or £1 per hour. The scheme is intended to make it easier for customers to park by creating higher turnover of parking spaces.</p> <p>The scheme should make it easier for you to park closer to your home by</p>

		<p>with three small children and a pram.</p> <p>There is no park and ride facility for coming from the north of the city.</p> <p>The lack of properly segregated cycle paths makes cycling dangerous for a family.</p>	<p>removing commuter parking. Using public transport with children can encourage them to travel more sustainably in the future. Many buses now accommodate pushchairs and the Council has worked in partnership with bus operators to provide raised kerb platforms on bus stops served by those routes to make public transport accessible to all.</p> <p>Many public transport improvements have taken place in recent years and further improvements are planned for future years, as set out in the Joint Local Transport Plan 2011-2026.</p> <p>The Council is investing in measures to improve cycling within the city which includes plans to develop separate cycle lanes and other improvements in safety.</p>
126	Etole Road	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Westbury Park lies adjacent to the proposed RPS; the association has no objection to the principles of the RPS. 2. Says that in previous schemes, each household was consulted and asked to comment in a public debate but this has not happened in Cotham North so it cannot be claimed that there is the necessary support for its implementation. 3. There is no evidence to show that RPS will improve traffic problems. There is no published data on commuter travel patterns, commuter parking numbers and locations. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comments noted. 2. We are aware that many residents of Cotham North are experiencing difficulty in parking close to where they live. It is the Council's view that a scheme is necessary and will bring significant benefits to the area. 3. There is evidence in the 2011 census which shows how people travel in and out of the city to work. We have received many representations from commuters parking in the area and it is the Council's view that the area will benefit from the removal of commuter parking, which will deliver road safety improvements whilst making it easier for residents to park close to where they live.

		<p>4. The impact on air quality also remains unexplored.</p> <p>5. The lack of evidence to prove its justification will become more significant in the evaluations of the schemes when displacement affects are addressed. There will be nothing to judge the scheme against in the annual reviews to see if it has really changed commuter habits.</p> <p>6. Concerned that the effects will be that people will park even further along the main bus routes such as Westbury Park, Henleaze and Bishopston.</p> <p>7. The RPS is being implemented without a published assessment of its role in the overall transport policy for the city.</p>	<p>4. Improving air quality is one of the over-arching goals of the city outlined in the Bristol Core Strategy 2026 and the Joint Local Transport Plan 3 2011-2026 and it is everyone's responsibility to take a role in making a greener and healthier city. There will be many fewer cars in the area, meaning people will spend less time searching for a space resulting in lower emissions. More people using buses and using other forms of public transport will mean there are less single occupancy cars driving into the city centre along main routes improving air quality further.</p> <p>5. The annual reviews of the schemes that are already in place are focused on making sure that the scheme is working as well as it can do for the local area. The overall effects of the scheme on commuter travel behaviour will become more apparent over time.</p> <p>6. The effects of the scheme on neighbouring areas will be monitored and assessed.</p> <p>7. The RPS fits into the overall policy context for Bristol and is a key delivery tool for the city achieving its goals of becoming a greener, healthier place to live for everyone. The policy context for the scheme is set out in the Joint Local Transport Plan 2011-2026 and the Bristol Core Strategy 2026.</p>
127	Burlington Road	Does not want double yellow lines across driveway.	The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.
128	Clyde Park	1. The residents' association are not opposed	1. Comments noted.

		<p>to the principle on principle but have some objections.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Suggests that because the oval is in a conservation area, parking could be restricted by a single yellow line but also see the need for parking as some of the houses in the street are divided into flats. 3. Residents on the west side of the oval have considerable problems getting into their driveways when cars are parked on that side of the oval. Any double yellow lines protecting entrances should allow for manoeuvrability. 4. Says there should be greater improvements in public transport for those commuting into Bristol. 5. Concerned that garages on Clyde Lane are not protected by double yellow lines. 6. The entrance to Clyde Lane, next to the Mews is very tight and parking should be restricted to only one side of the road to allow for emergency vehicles. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Single yellow lines are not used as part of the RPS because we want to make it clear to people where is safe to park and where it is not. Once the scheme begins, there should be fewer cars trying to park in the area which should leave space around the oval free. The scheme will be reviewed after six months and then annually so changes to the layout could be made at a later stage if required. 3. This has been taken into account in designing the scheme. 4. The area is well connected by public transport links and there are park and ride facilities in the city. Public transport improvements and investments are also being made, see response 3 to objection 74. 5. Clyde Lane is proposed as a permit parking area, which means that a sign will be erected at the start of the street to tell people that they need a permit to park on the road. This means that only permit holders will be able to park on Clyde Lane and will allow the existing parking layout to continue. However, the situation here will be monitored and if obstructive parking becomes a problem, the design for the street will be amended. 6. As set out above, if obstructive parking does occur then the scheme design will be amended.
--	--	---	---

		<p>7. Thinks people with one space on their drive should be allowed 2 permits, not one.</p> <p>8. Concerned that permit prices are linked to emissions when the scheme is about solving parking problems, unsure about the legality of this.</p>	<p>7. See response 1 to objection 104.</p> <p>8. The first permit price is linked to vehicle tax bands, which are partly determined by vehicle emissions. It is the duty of the City Council as traffic authority under section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to exercise its traffic management functions so as to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. This includes the need to give regard to air quality strategies that are in place. One of the aims of the Joint Local Transport Plan is to improve air quality by reducing vehicle emissions. A greater polluting vehicle will have a greater negative impact on air quality, and therefore the amenity of the area, than a lesser polluting vehicle.</p>
129	Lower Redland Road	<p>Has recently had a white advisory line installed in to protect access to garage and would like this to continue but has seen on the plan double yellow lines are proposed.</p> <p>Does not want double yellow lines across the garage.</p>	<p>White advisory markings are not going to be installed as part of the scheme as they are not enforceable and we want to make it clear to people where they can and cannot park.</p> <p>The request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p>
130	Cotham/Kingsdown	<p>1. Objects because currently owns a business in Cotham/Kingsdown and has lost lots of clients because they cannot find anywhere to park.</p> <p>2. Says the scheme is being forced on them when the majority do not want it.</p>	<p>1. Businesses based in the Cotham and Kingsdown RPS areas can apply for customer permits which may help to address this problem. Pay & display facilities are located throughout the areas. They currently offer a free 15 minute option and are priced at £1 per hour after that.</p> <p>2. We have received many requests to introduce a scheme and are aware that parking pressures in the area mean that many residents and visitors find it difficult to find somewhere to park.</p>

		<p>3. The scheme is only thinking about residents, not businesses. Commuters need places to park and clients need access to services. The scheme will make Bristol a selfish, unfriendly place.</p> <p>4. Asks if implementing the scheme is illegal if the majority do not want it?</p> <p>5. Worried about losing staff.</p>	<p>3. Although this is a residents' parking scheme, aimed at making life easier for them it is also about encouraging people to use more sustainable modes of transport to get to work. There are, however business and customer permits available and pay & display facilities in all schemes. We have found that many businesses prefer the schemes because their customers can find places to park closer to the business and the maximum stay encourages turnover of space.</p> <p>4. The Council's Cabinet have approved a recommendation to develop proposals for a scheme in Cotham North. There is no requirement to quantify support for a scheme. The statutory consultation process enables everyone to object to the scheme, whether they are based in the area or not, and each objection must be carefully considered before a decision to proceed can be made.</p> <p>5. The scheme is designed to prioritise parking in the wider residential area for use by local residents, businesses and their visitors. It is also intended to encourage people to travel to work using more sustainable modes of transport. The area is well connected by bus and rail routes. The council is also committed to helping employers in developing work place travel plans.</p>
131	University of Bristol	<p>1. Objects because the scheme will make parking impossible for those who work in the area but do not live in the area.</p> <p>2. The proposal makes a deliberately misleading claim by saying that the scheme will make parking easier for businesses and their visitors. This is proved by existing</p>	<p>1. One of the aims of the scheme is to encourage people to travel to work using sustainable modes of transport. The city is well served by public transport and this is something that will improve in the future with further investment. There are also long stay car parks close to the University.</p> <p>2. Businesses can apply for business and customer permits and pay & display facilities are provided throughout the area. It will be much easier to find somewhere to park in the area than it is now. People needing to park for longer than three hours can use long-stay car</p>

		<p>schemes where you cannot park for long periods of time.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The proposal also claims that it aims to reduce traffic which is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property. These roads have been used for parking for decades. 4. The proposals also claim that the scheme will reduce the amount of traffic circling the area looking for a space, this is also untrue as the maximum three hour stay will mean staff will have to go and move their cars during the day and look for another space. 5. The proposal doesn't mention any forms of mitigation or alternatives to people who currently use the area for daytime parking. 6. In the existing schemes, the benefits are that spaces have been marked out on the road and junctions have been protected but the empty spaces all day long are a testimony of the overprovision of spaces during the day. 	<p>parks if they do not have a permit.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The scheme will remove obstructive and unsafe parking from the area and will make it easier for emergency services to access the area. 4. The pay & display with a maximum stay of three hours is not aimed at commuters using it to park all day. It is really aimed at visitors who may need to stay for a shorter time. The university has staff car parks and there are long stay car parks nearby. Experience in our existing schemes has shown that the volume of traffic has reduced. 5. See response 1 to this objection. 6. A residents' parking scheme does formalise the space and make the area safer. One of the aims of the scheme is to make it easier for residents to park close to their homes when they need to. For this to be possible, some spaces need to be empty when the resident arrives. This is not considered to be an overprovision of space.
132	Clarendon Road	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Says there are 47 houses in Clarendon Road, of which most are divided into four flats. Due to the amount of student flats, most houses have 2-4 cars. There are about 120 residents' cars on Clarendon Road. 2. Feeling the knock-on effect of other 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarendon Road is not in the proposed Cotham North scheme, it is in the proposed Redland scheme which will be subject to a separate statutory consultation process in the very near future. Each household will only be able to apply for a maximum of three permits. 2. The scheme should tackle the negative knock-on effects of

		<p>schemes, as lots of non-resident cars park around the school.</p> <p>3. If the RPS is introduced here, then where will all the residents' cars go as there will not be enough room?</p> <p>4. The scheme will adversely affect tradespeople and visitors.</p> <p>5. Understands that money will not be refunded if application for a permit is unsuccessful.</p> <p>6. Many people will destroy their gardens if they have nowhere to park which will cause drainage issues.</p> <p>7. Separated cycle tracks and cheaper buses is a way to keep cars out of Bristol.</p> <p>8. Already pays council tax and does not want to pay anymore.</p>	<p>neighbouring schemes as these people will no longer be able to park there. The aim of the scheme is to reduce commuter parking and encourage more sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>3. It is anticipated that there will be enough space for residents to park their cars.</p> <p>4. Each household will be entitled to 50 free visitors' permits and 50 more for £1 each per year. Tradespeople will be able to apply for a trader's permit which is valid in every zone or use the pay & display facilities. Both of these groups will only need to use permits during the operational hours of the scheme.</p> <p>5. This is not the case; any money paid will be refunded if a permit application is not successful.</p> <p>6. See response 3 to objection 7.</p> <p>7. Public transport improvements have taken place in recent years and further improvements are planned for future years, as set out in the Joint Local Transport Plan 2011-2026. See also response 3 to objection 74.</p> <p>8. Costs to residents have been kept to a minimum and are designed to pay for the implementation, administration and enforcement of the scheme. The cost for one permit is usually £48 but could be cheaper, depending on the emissions of your car.</p>
133	Bristol Property Agents Association	<p>1. Extremely concerned that this will effectively drive businesses out of Cotham and target those least able to afford alternative means</p>	<p>1. One of the aims of the scheme is to encourage people to travel to work using sustainable modes of transport. The city is well served by public transport and this is something that will improve in the</p>

		<p>of transport.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Says the consultation process has failed to engage with major businesses in Cotham. There has been no questionnaire to discover commuter travel patterns. There has been no economic impact survey. 3. Cotham will now be a less attractive place to site a business as there is no option whatsoever for commuters to park. 4. Alternative transport is completely inadequate and they have no confidence that this will improve in the future. 5. Scheme disregards the needs of an area with a diversity of educational, religious, commercial, residential and medical users. 6. The proposals do not make any attempt to address the fairness of parking allocation. 7. The hours of operation should be switched so that commuters are allowed to park during the day but have to leave by the evening so the residents can have the spaces. 8. Larger businesses should be allowed to 	<p>future with further investment. There are also long stay car parks which connect with the bus services that serve Cotham.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The council offers a travel planning service to businesses which can provide incentives to encourage the use of more sustainable forms of transport. 3. See response to point 1 above. 4. See response 7 to objection 132. 5. The needs of all users have been considered. There are different types of permits available to cater for a variety of parking need. 6. The scheme is an attempt to fairly allocate parking for residents, visitors, traders and businesses. It aims to remove commuter parking in order to address the negative impact of commuters in residential streets. 7. The scheme aims to make it easier for local residents and visitors to the area to find somewhere to park during the day as many people currently find this very difficult. 8. Businesses can apply for up to seven permits per business address.
--	--	--	---

		<p>apply for more permits.</p> <p>9. There should be consideration for businesses that require flexible parking for their staff, such as hotels and shift workers.</p> <p>10. A phased approach over five years is imperative to the Bristol economy</p>	<p>There has to be a limit on the number of permits issued in order for the scheme to work.</p> <p>9. See response 8 above.</p> <p>10. There are currently significant parking pressures in the area which these proposals are designed to address. It is highly likely that these would worsen considerably over the next five years. Current levels of congestion are damaging the local economy and it is the Council's view that this is the most appropriate time to introduce the scheme.</p>
134	Clyde Road	<p>1. Suffer enormously from commuter parking throughout all the streets in the local area.</p> <p>2. People with a driveway should be able to apply for two permits, not one. It is not fair that people in flats can apply for three.</p> <p>3. Their driveway is very narrow with high walls; it would require the walls to be removed if it were to be used.</p> <p>4. Relating charges to emissions is a further tax when they already pay road tax and fuel tax based on emissions.</p> <p>5. Charging for visitors permits is excessive.</p>	<p>1. Comments noted. This is what the scheme is aimed at removing.</p> <p>2. See response 3 to objection 69.</p> <p>3. If the driveway really is completely unusable, the address would be deemed to have no off-street parking.</p> <p>4. One of the aims of the scheme is to improve air quality and emissions are linked to this. The cheaper permits may also encourage people to make different choices when buy a car.</p> <p>5. Each household is entitled to 50 free permits and 50 for £1 each. The price is relatively inexpensive compared to using pay & display or other car parks. Visitors will not need to use permits outside the hours of operation, which includes evenings and weekends.</p>

		<p>6. Suggests a single yellow line on the west wall of the Clyde Park gardens so there is good access to drives and residents' can still park there in the evenings.</p> <p>7. Says the double yellow lines around the west corner of Clyde Road and Clyde Park are excessive and are not needed for traffic safety.</p> <p>8. Does not want double yellow lines across driveway.</p> <p>9. Not opposed in principle but says it is not the best way to reach the objectives. Refers to 'Keep Clifton Special' leaflet which was attached. This leaflet does not refer to the scheme in question but the issues raised are considered in objection 138.</p>	<p>6. See response 2 to objection 128.</p> <p>7. The double yellow lines around the corner are to allow good lines of sight and to protect the junction.</p> <p>8. This request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments.</p> <p>9. See response to objection 140.</p>
135	Clyde Park	<p>Objects in the strongest terms to the proposals but understands that the problem of commuter parking needs to be tackled.</p> <p>Of significant concern is the issue that houses with off-street parking are only allowed one permit.</p> <p>Supports 'Keep Clifton Special' ideas and attached leaflet.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response 3 to objection 69.</p> <p>See response to objection 140.</p>
136	Clyde Road	Almost identical to objection 134, no new points raised.	See response to objection 134.
137	Clyde Road	Almost identical to objection 134, no new points raised.	See response to objection 134.

138	Edgecumbe Road	<p>Thinks Cotham North and Redland should be combined as this will preserve the identity of the area.</p> <p>Edgecumbe Road is on the edge of three schemes and worried they won't be able to park on Redland Road or anywhere near Whiteladies Road as this will be part of the Cotham North scheme.</p>	<p>See response to objection 9.</p> <p>See response to objection 9.</p>
139	Redland Grove	Does not want double yellow lines across driveway.	This request can be accommodated and is included on the proposed list of minor amendments.
140	Keep Clifton Special leaflet, submitted by four objectors.	<p>This document was prepared by a campaign group. This document does not refer to the Cotham North TRO but the issues raised are dealt with here.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Double yellow lines should only be where safety requires. 2. There is no public car park in Clifton. 3. Want to get rid of commuter parking but can do this without ruining the conservation area with signs. 	<p>Whilst the leaflet does not refer to the proposals considered here, we have considered it and our response is as set out below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The West End and Clifton Down car parks are a short distance from Clifton. They are on the route of high-frequency bus services which serve Clifton and which should become more reliable once these proposals remove inappropriate parking and traffic from the bus routes. The scheme is about encouraging more sustainable modes of transport and when the commuter parking is removed it will be much easier for visitors to come and find a space close to where they want to be. This is something we have found in our other schemes. 2. See response 2 to objection 2. 3. A consistent approach is needed to address commuter parking problems across the city. However, the Council appreciates that every area is different and will consider the most appropriate solution for each area before proposals are finalised.

		<p>4. Says Clifton is special and deserves a special parking solution, so residents businesses and visitors will not be the losers.</p> <p>Suggests:</p> <p>5. No pay and display machines, just limited waiting.</p> <p>6. The first permit should be free of charge.</p> <p>7. The scheme should only break even.</p> <p>8. Visitor's permits should be sold in local shops and priced to deter commuters.</p> <p>9. Businesses should be allowed extra permits for less congested streets in the area.</p> <p>10. The operating hours should be the same as the other schemes Monday-Friday 9am-5pm.</p>	<p>4. Pay & display provides better turnover of space than limited waiting, because it is more efficient for the Council to enforce and also has a self-enforcing element generated by the expiry time on the pay & display ticket.</p> <p>5. See response 5 to objection 39.</p> <p>6. See response 3 to objection 101.</p> <p>7. See response 3 to this objection.</p> <p>8. See response 3 to this objection.</p> <p>9. See response 3 to this objection.</p> <p>10. Double yellow lines are proposed for safety reasons, junction protection and to protect accesses.</p>
--	--	---	---