

Oldfield Park and Westmoreland Consultation Autumn 2021

Bath and North East Somerset Council

November 2021

Quality information

Prepared by

Sophie Stewart
Graduate Consultant

Checked by

Jonathan Warboys
Senior Technician

Verified by

Tamsin Stuart
Regional Director

Approved by

Helen Holm
Principal Engineer

Revision History

Revision	Revision date	Details	Authorized	Position
1	28.01.22	Revised following client comments see email 18.01.22	Tamsin Stuart	Regional Director
2	06.04.22	Revised following client comments see email 27.03.22	Tamsin Stuart	Regional Director

Distribution List

# Hard Copies	PDF Required	Association / Company Name

Prepared for:
Bath and North East Somerset Council

Prepared by:

AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited
1 New York Street
Manchester M1 4HD
United Kingdom

T: +44 161 601 1700
aecom.com

© 2021 AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited. All Rights Reserved.

This document has been prepared by AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited ("AECOM") for sole use of our client (the "Client") in accordance with generally accepted consultancy principles, the budget for fees and the terms of reference agreed between AECOM and the Client. Any information provided by third parties and referred to herein has not been checked or verified by AECOM, unless otherwise expressly stated in the document. No third party may rely upon this document without the prior and express written agreement of AECOM.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	5
1.1	Background: Overview of the consultation	5
1.2	The consultation	5
1.3	The questionnaire	5
1.3.1	Format of report	5
2.	Methodology	6
2.1	Receiving responses	6
2.2	Thematic coding	6
2.3	Analysis and reporting	6
2.4	Response	7
2.4.1	Respondent location	7
2.4.2	Respondent Profile	8
3.	Analysis	11
3.1	Current Parking Provision	11
3.1.1	Support of the proposals	12
3.2	Open ended comments	13
3.2.1	Objecting the proposal	13
3.2.2	Supporting the proposal	15
3.2.3	Other issues about the proposal	18
3.2.4	Impacts of the proposal	19
3.2.5	Suggested changes	20
3.2.6	Other Comments	21

1. Introduction

1.1 Background: Overview of the consultation

The Bath and North East Somerset Council's Traffic Management Team has been developing a scheme to introduce a Residents' Parking Zone (RPZ) in the Oldfield Park and Westmoreland area of Bath, which is being proposed with the support of local Ward Councillors.

A full summary of the consultation is available online at <https://beta.bathnes.gov.uk/oldfield-park-and-westmoreland-residents-parking-zone-rpz/introduction-and-policy-background>

1.2 The consultation

Bath and North East Somerset Council held a 28-day consultation between 22nd October and 18th November 2021 on the Residents' Parking Zone.

To ensure an unbiased interpretation of the responses received, AECOM were appointed to carry out the following tasks:

- Thematic coding and analysis of open-ended questions;
- Quantitative analysis of the closed question and demographic questions;
- Cleaning and analysis of postcode data provided; and
- Mapping of respondent location

1.3 The questionnaire

Bath and North East Somerset Council designed and hosted the questionnaire on the Bath and North East Somerset Council consultation portal.

The questionnaire enabled respondents to state their level of support for the RPZ and the opportunity to explain any reasons they have for not fully supporting the proposals.

1.3.1 Format of report

Following this introduction:

- Chapter 2: describes the methodology used;
- Chapter 3: details the key findings to the consultation.

2. Methodology

2.1 Receiving responses

All responses were received via the consultation questionnaire hosted on the Bath and North East Somerset Council portal. To ensure inclusivity, Bath and North East Somerset Council also gathered responses via email and hardcopy questionnaire.

2.2 Thematic coding

All free-text responses were grouped into themes to allow meaningful analysis.

Throughout the report, quotes from the free text responses have been used to illustrate the points raised. Quotes have been selected to best show the essence of what was said for each theme. For ease of reading, any clear and obvious typos or spelling errors have been corrected.

2.3 Analysis and reporting

The consultation was open to all and, therefore, respondents were self-selecting. This, coupled with the fact respondents could choose which of the questions they answered, means the results and responses should be viewed as indicative of the wider population and any identified sub-groups rather than representative. The profile of respondents is detailed in the next section.

As respondents were not obliged to answer all questions in the questionnaire, the percentages shown only include those that responded to each question. The number of people who answered each question is shown as “n=”. There are 3 tables per section, consisting of Oldfield park residents, Westmoreland residents and then all respondents. Tables in this report are further split based on:

- All respondents
- Respondents who live within the Parking Zone
 - Further split by those who live in the Oldfield Park Ward and Westmoreland Ward
- Respondents who live outside the Parking Zone

There are some respondents who did not give a valid postcode meaning it is not possible to place them in a ward or inside or outside the Zone, these respondents are only shown in the “All Respondents” column.

Where percentages do not sum to 100 per cent in the main body of the report, this is due to rounding or where more than one response was permitted.

The percentages shown for the free text comments are taken from the number of people who provided a comment.

Statistical significance testing was completed. Where results are reported as different between sub samples, this means the differences are statistically significantly different. Only data which is significantly different has been referenced in the report.

A large volume of data was received and therefore the following chapters summarise the main findings and highlight pertinent differences between groups.

2.4 Response

2.4.1 Respondent location


In total, there were 777 responses to the proposed Residents Parking zone.

757 of these through the online questionnaire with a further 17 responses via hardcopy questionnaires and 3 email responses.

353 responses were from residents located in the Oldfield Ward, 199 were from residents located in the Westmoreland Ward and a further 225 responses are from respondents whose Ward is unknown.

The figure below maps the location of those respondents who gave a valid postcode.

Figure 1 Location of respondents



Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right 2021

2.4.2 Respondent Profile

Respondents were also asked what type of accommodation they occupy. Over three quarters of respondents live in terraced properties. Within both Wards in the Parking Zone this percentage was higher with 82% of respondents in Oldfield Park living in terraced housing and 90% of respondents in Westmoreland Ward. These responses are shown in table 1 below.

Table 1: What type of accommodation do you occupy?

	All respondents		Located in Parking Zone				Located outside Parking Zone	
	Count	%	Oldfield Park Ward		Westmoreland Ward		Count	%
			Count	%	Count	%		
Terraced (incl. end-terrace) house / bungalow	600	77	290	82	180	90	69	49
Semi-detached house / bungalow	99	13	30	89	7	4	49	35
Detached house / bungalow	31	4	10	3	4	2	13	10
Flat, maisonette, or apartment in a converted house, or shared house (including bedsits)	15	2	4	1	3	2	5	4
Purpose-built block of flats, maisonette or tenement	12	2	7	2	2	1	2	1
Flat, maisonette, or apartment in a commercial building	6	1	6	2	0	0	0	0
Not specified	13	2	6	2	3	2	3	2
Base	777	100	353	100	199	100	141	100

Table 2 below shows how many people occupy a house. 45% of houses had up to 2 residents but over a third (36%) had 4 or more.

Table 2: How many people are there in your household?

	All respondents		Located in Parking Zone				Located outside Parking Zone	
	Count	%	Oldfield Park Ward		Westmoreland Ward		Count	%
			Count	%	Count	%		
0 (unoccupied)	5	1	3	1	2	1	0	0
1	88	11	40	11	24	12	18	13
2	262	34	122	35	58	29	52	37
3	130	17	56	16	40	20	19	13
4	193	25	83	24	53	27	34	24
5	65	8	33	9	16	8	10	7
6	16	2	6	2	2	1	5	4
7	5	1	5	1	0	0	0	0
Not specified	13	2	5	1	4	2	3	2
Base	777	100	353	100	199	100	141	100

Respondents were asked if they had access to a garage, 84% stated that they didn't. This is expected as 77% of respondents live in terraced houses or bungalows, as shown earlier.

Table 3: Does your household have access to a garage?

	All respondents		Located in Parking Zone				Located outside Parking Zone	
	Count	%	Oldfield Park Ward		Westmoreland Ward		Count	%
			Count	%	Count	%		
No	656	84	303	86	179	90	103	73
Yes	107	14	43	12	18	9	35	25
Not specified	14	2	7	2	2	1	3	2
Base	777	100	353	100	199	100	141	100

Table 4 shows how many off-street parking places respondents' households have. Over 70% of respondents had zero off-street parking places, with only 5% saying they had three or more.

Table 4: How many off-street parking places does your household currently have access to?

	All respondents		Located in Parking Zone				Located outside Parking Zone	
	Count	%	Oldfield Park Ward		Westmoreland Ward		Count	%
			Count	%	Count	%		
0	548	71	272	77	151	76	71	50
1	121	16	48	14	29	15	28	20
2	53	7	17	5	7	4	23	16
3+	41	5	10	3	9	5	16	11
Not specified	14	2	6	2	3	2	3	2
Base	777	100	353	100	199	100	141	100

When asked how many vehicles their household has, over half of respondents (52%) had one vehicle. Table 5 shows all respondents' answers.

Table 5: How many vehicles does your household have?

	All respondents		Located in Parking Zone				Located outside Parking Zone	
	Count	%	Oldfield Park Ward		Westmoreland Ward		Count	%
			Count	%	Count	%		
0	31	4	18	5	8	4	3	2
1	404	52	200	57	107	54	68	48
2	231	30	95	27	56	28	53	38
3+	100	13	34	10	27	14	15	11
Not specified	11	1	6	2	1	1	2	1
Base	777	100	353	100	199	100	141	100

3. Analysis

3.1 Current Parking Provision


Respondents were asked how they would rate the current parking provision in the zone, with half (51%) rating it bad. Respondents who live inside the parking Zone were significantly more likely to rate the parking provision as bad than those who live outside the zone (58% in Oldfield Ward, 59% in Westmoreland Ward, compared to 34%). The responses are shown in table 6 below.

Table 6: How would you rate the current parking provision in the area where we are proposing a Residents' Parking Zone?

	All respondents		Located in Parking Zone				Located outside Parking Zone	
	Count	%	Oldfield Park Ward	Westmoreland Ward	Count	%	Count	%
Bad	396	51	201	58	117	59	48	34
Fair	258	33	104	30	52	26	69	49
Good	118	15	44	13	30	15	23	16
Total	772*	100	349	100	199	100	140	100

*Not everyone answered this question

Figure 2: How would you rate the current parking provision in the area where we are proposing a Residents' Parking Zone? (%)



* 90% of respondents gave a valid postcode

3.1.1 Support of the proposals

Over a third (34%) of respondents support the Residents Parking Zone with a further 16% saying they partially support, the remaining 50% of respondents object to the proposals. There were some differences in the levels of support shown for the proposals:

- Households with no current off-street parking were more likely to support the proposals (39% compared to 20% of those with access to one or more parking spaces)
- Those with 3 or more vehicles were the most likely to object (88%) than those with one (39%) or two vehicles (57%)
- Those who live outside the Parking Zone more likely to object to the proposals than those located inside (78% compared to 37% in Oldfield ward and 41% in Westmoreland ward)
- Respondents in larger households (5 or more people) were significantly more likely to object to the proposals than those in one or two person households (72% compared to 41% and 44% respectively).

Table 7: Do you support, partially support, or object to a Residents Parking Zone, as described in the maps and proposals?

	All respondents		Located in Parking Zone				Located outside Parking Zone	
	Count	%	Oldfield Park Ward		Westmoreland Ward		Count	%
			Count	%	Count	%		
Object	390	50	129	37	81	41	109	78
Support	260	34	158	45	82	41	11	8
Partially support	121	16	62	18	36	18	19	14
No feeling	2	*	1	*	0	0	1	1
Total	773*	100	350*	100	199	100	140	100

*Not everyone answered this question

Respondents who gave a valid postcode* were mapped by their support. This can be seen in Figure 3 below.

House in Multiple Occupation (HMOs)

72 of the respondents who gave an address live in a dwelling registered as an HMO, these respondents were significantly more likely to state that they object to the proposals (85%) than those who live in a single-family dwelling (47%).

Table 7: Do you support, partially support, or object to a Residents Parking Zone, as described in the maps and proposals?

	All respondents		HMO		Non-HMO	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Object	390	50	61	85	329	47
Support	260	34	3	4	252	37
Partially support	121	16	8	11	118	16
No feeling	2	*	0	0	2	*
Total	773*	100	72	100	701	100

Figure 3: Do you support or object to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order? (%)



* 90% of respondents gave a valid postcode

3.2 Open ended comments

All but three respondents commented on the proposals:

3.2.1 Objections to the proposal

The most common issues raised by respondents are shown in tables 8 and 9. The majority of these comments came from people who object to the proposals overall, however some respondents are broadly in support of the scheme but have some concerns.

Table 8: Count of comments objecting the proposals by respondent location

Objecting the proposal	All respondents		Located in Parking Zone				Located outside Parking Zone	
	Count	%	Oldfield Park Ward		Westmoreland Ward		Count	%
			Count	%	Count	%		
Unhappy about the cost of permits	228	29	102	29	62	31	25	18
No problem parking at the moment	178	23	70	20	50	25	22	16
Will just move the problem outside of the RPZ	118	15	20	6	9	5	71	50
I have more cars than can get permits for	75	10	29	8	22	11	7	5
I park here but wouldn't be eligible for a permit	60	8	3	1	2	1	43	30

*Percentages are of all respondents who provided a comment.

Table 9: Count of comments objecting the proposals by support of proposals

Objecting the proposal	Object		Partially Support		Support	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Unhappy about the cost of permits	216	55	6	5	4	2
No problem parking at the moment	178	46	0	0	0	0
Will just move the problem outside of the RPZ	102	26	13	11	3	1
I have more cars than can get permits for	70	18	3	2	2	1
I park here but wouldn't be eligible for a permit	57	15	2	2	1	*

* Percentages are of all respondents who provided a comment.

29% of respondents stated they were unhappy about the cost of the permits and felt there was no guarantee of a parking space while paying the cost. Many also commented on the rising cost of living and the permit adding to that.

“Why increase the cost of living again, with no increased guarantee of a parking space.”
(Object)

“With the cost of living being higher than ever is it really fair to expect residents to pay an extra £160 a year?” (Object)

Nearly a quarter (23%) of respondents said they did not experience any problems parking and felt that the RPZ was unnecessary. In addition, 10% of residents stated that they had more cars at their property than they can get permits for. Over half of these comments came from students living in HMOs, however a small proportion mentioned that as a family unit they had 3+ cars due to having children living at home who were at driving age.

“Whilst the roads in this area can be busy, I have never had a problem parking and I object to being forced to pay for parking outside my own home when this is not currently an issue.”
(Object)

“I live with my partner and two older children, we need 3 vehicles between us to get to and from work, the two-vehicle limit is going to be hugely detrimental for us. I feel that it is unfair to punish people who aren't in a financial position to leave home and buy their own property, especially with the current housing market. Unfortunately, with the nature of our work public transport just isn't a viable solution. If public transport were to improve and become cheaper then perhaps it would discourage commuters who don't need to park here from doing so.”
(Object)

15% of respondents felt that this RPZ would just move the problem elsewhere to the streets and roads just outside the zone and would not fix the problem. Some respondents stated they park in this area (8%) but did not feel they would be eligible for a permit. Whilst a large proportion of these respondents were commuters, there was some staff who worked at the nearby school, doctor's surgery and care home.

“The introduction of residents parking just forces people to park in other streets where the permits have not been introduced & actually cause more pollution as people drive around

looking for parking. Many people working in Oldfield Park do not live locally & do not have a suitable alternative mode of transport other than their car to get to work.” (Object)

3.2.2 Supporting the proposal

Tables 10 and 11 below show the most frequently given comments that would support the business case for the proposal. However, some respondents who gave these comments object to the proposals.

Table 10: Count of comments supporting the proposals by respondent location

Support or partially supporting the proposal	All respondents		Located in Parking Zone				Located outside Parking Zone	
	Count	%	Oldfield Park Ward		Westmoreland Ward		Count	%
			Count	%	Count	%		
Difficult to park near my house	249	32	153	43	80	40	9	6
Commuters who don't live in my area shouldn't park here	222	29	134	38	71	36	9	6
The RPZ will reduce traffic in the street	178	23	111	31	54	27	9	6
Negative comments about students	156	20	82	23	49	25	15	11
There will be more orderly parking	141	18	89	25	40	20	7	5
Specific comment about HMOs	64	8	38	11	16	8	6	4

* Percentages are of all respondents who provided a comment.

Table 11: Count of comments supporting the proposals by support of proposals

Support or partially supporting the proposal	Object		Partially Support		Support	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Difficult to park near house	5	1	4	3	240	92
Commuters who don't live in my area shouldn't park here	7	2	9	8	203	78
The RPZ will reduce traffic in the street	0	0	4	3	174	67
Negative comments about students	51	13	38	32	64	25
There will be more orderly parking	0	0	3	3	138	53
Specific comment about HMOs	14	4	16	14	32	12

* Percentages are of all respondents who provided a comment.

The comment that was brought up the most often with almost a third (32%) of the respondents mentioning it, was that they felt it was currently difficult for them to park near their house and they felt the proposed RPZ would help resolve this problem. 43% of residents in the Oldfield Park ward felt this way, along with 40% of residents within the Westmoreland ward.

“This should significantly reduce the huge difficulty in parking and constant congestion in the area by stopping people parking and walking to the centre and preventing student properties being 6 car households. We are in favour of this proposal” (Support)

Another problem 29% of respondents felt would be solved with this proposal was that commuters would no longer be able to park in the area. Respondents felt that people from outside the area caused most of their parking problems by leaving their cars on residential streets and then commuting into Bath city centre. In addition, 18% of respondents felt that without commuters there would be more orderly parking and 23% felt there would be less traffic in the street. Comments were made about how this would make the street feel safer, especially those residents with young children.

“This proposal is an absolute necessity for the area, which has become overrun by commuters who utilise the local free spaces and make it hard for residents to find a space anywhere near their homes.” (Support, Westmoreland Ward)

“We have lived very close to Moorland Road in a residential road for over 6 years and have witnessed increasingly challenging circumstances regarding parking near our property. With two small children, I have found it dangerous at times having to park some distance away from our property when walking with and carrying babies/toddlers. During term time it is considerably worse due to student HMO cars and commuters going to Oldfield Park station, and into town.” (Support, Oldfield Park Ward)

A fifth of comments from respondents were negative comments about students and a further 8% specified HMOs. The comments about students, from supporters and objectors to the proposal, were expressing their frustrations with the fact that they felt most student houses housed 5 or 6 students who all owned and parked a car on the street. This was backed up with comments saying that outside of term time, residents had no problem parking. Some of those who objected to the scheme suggested adding in legislation to limit the impact student owned cars as an alternative solution to a Residents Parking Zone.

“Your information suggests that ‘exemptions for residents may apply e.g., students’. Many of the parking problems are caused by students and HMOs. Parking outside of term times is not usually a problem, this can be seen in the Lower Bristol Road at Twerton Mill and areas of Oldfield Park. With the excellent bus services to the University, it is not necessary for any student to use a car. I will support the RPZ if students are included.” (Partially Support, Outside the RPZ)

“Too many student and commuter cars in the area. When students are on holiday you can normally park easily. Perhaps only offer permits to council tax payers.” (Support, Oldfield Ward)

“The problem is caused by student cars brought to the city and not used for days / weeks at a time It is very noticeable when they go home during holidays” (Object, Oldfield Ward)

However, there were comments from respondents who lived in HMOs and weren't students but young professionals in shared accommodation who expressed their concerns.

“We live in an HMO house with 3 separate working professionals and we all need to drive and park at our house. We also cannot afford the extortionate cost of the permits on top of the already expensive cost of living in Bath.” (Object, Westmoreland Ward)

3.2.3 Partially supporting the proposal

Table 12 below shows the most frequently given comments that partially support the business case for the proposal - these are the factors that were preventing them from fully supporting. Some respondents who gave these comments object to the proposals.

Table 12: Count of comments partially supporting the proposals by support of proposals

Partially supporting the proposal	Object		Partially Support		Support	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Negative comments about students	51	13	38	32	64	25
Time zone comment	23	6	19	16	10	4
Comment about HMOs	14	4	16	14	32	12
Negative impact on Moorland Road shops	62	16	16	14	11	4

* Percentages are of all respondents who provided a comment.

Negative comments about students, the student houses and the HMOs in the area seem to be the main factor preventing respondents from fully supporting the proposal. Respondents felt that students should not receive permits as they feel the cars aren't used often and are just left in a parking space for long periods of time. Some respondents also felt that only taxpayers should receive permits and as students don't pay this, they should not receive permits.

"I've replied as "partial support" but would be in total support of permits if students did not get permits, as this would then give residents a chance to park outside or near their house & not have a student car that does not move for weeks as happens now (as they use a bus to get to Uni)" (Partially Support, Oldfield Ward)

"Permits for community taxpayers only (or those with low income/claimant exempt) not for those with student exemptions or those who default on payment." (Partially Support, Oldfield Ward)

Respondents who could not fully support the proposal gave the reason that the proposed RPZ would negatively impact the Moorland Road shops. Some suggestions were made to prevent this happening, including implementing a non resident parking time limit.

"We agree some parking restrictions are necessary especially commuters and the number of cars a house can park but feel a blanket ban will effect business in the area to the detriment of the residents. So implement the zonal parking but allow non residents a 2 hour parking limit." (Partially Support, Oldfield Ward)

3.2.4 Other issues about the proposal

Other issues included:

Table 13: Count of comments showing other issues

Other Issues	All respondents		Located in Parking Zone				Located outside Parking Zone	
	Count	%	Oldfield Park Ward		Westmoreland Ward		%	Count
			Count	%	Count	%		
Criticism of the council	56	7	18	5	16	8	12	9
Time zone comment	54	7	43	12	6	3	4	3
Need better public transport	48	6	11	3	6	3	25	18
Need to encourage use of public transport	28	4	14	4	4	2	7	5
Need more visitor permits for family/friends/care reasons	27	3	11	3	12	6	3	2
Need discounts/ exemptions on permits for key workers	14	2	9	3	5	3	0	0

* Percentages are of all respondents who provided a comment.

Criticism of the council comments (7%) from respondents highlighted that most of these respondents felt the council were just using this as a money-making scheme. Others felt that the council weren't listening to residents' concerns about the planned zone including comments about the time zone and public transport, explained below.

“There is no real problem parking, this is an awful idea and is just the council trying to make money. It won't guarantee a parking space any more than the current situation” (Object, Outside the RPZ)

12% of comments from Oldfield Park Ward were about the proposed RPZ time zone and mainly brought up the argument that the time zone is only active when the area is the least busy and should be extended. This is compared to only 3% of Westmoreland Ward and 7% overall.

“The times of the zones have been arbitrarily set without consideration of the times of day when parking is challenging - most people are not back from work by 6pm and the main challenges for finding a parking space are in the evening after work, not during the day.” (Object, Oldfield Ward)

“Please extend to 24 hours, 7 days a week. The residents' parking in the next zone applies at all times. If the hours are limited, we will continue to see some of the existing problems: work vans and trucks (non-residents) parking overnight, parking for trains from Oldfield Park for evenings out, parking to walk into town for the evenings.” (Partially Support, Oldfield Ward)

There were also 10% of comments regarding public transport. 6% of respondents felt that there needed to be an improvement in current public transport if the RPZ was to be put into place to discourage non-residents to driving and parking. However, some felt the public transport infrastructure is not good enough. Other comments said they felt public transport needed to be encouraged (4%) and suggested cheaper fares.

“If buses were cheaper then they people wouldn’t need to use their cars as much. It’s cheaper for me to drive into town and park then it is to get the bus there and back. It’s crazy.” (Partially support, Westmoreland Ward)

There were also a small proportion of comments (3%) who expressed the need for additional visitor permits for family and friends, as well as for care reasons – both childcare and older relatives. A further 2% of respondents felt that key workers needed discounts or exemptions on their permits.

“I am not opposed to a scheme, but my carers will not be able to park outside my house. My 2 carers, both my son & daughter will not be able to provide the care I need.” (Partially Support)

“Allowing an extra permit in special circumstances. We are a house of 3 social work students (key workers) and having a car is essential for our work, but under an RPZ scheme we would not have enough to cover us. We would agree with having an RPZ if the council would allow us to get special permission with supporting evidence from university to confirm we need a car each.” (Partially Support, Oldfield Ward)

3.2.5 Impacts of the proposal

Some impacts that the Residents Parking Zone were brought up and these are shown in the table below.

Table 14: Count of comments showing impacts of proposals

Impacts of the proposal	All respondents		Located in Parking Zone				Located outside Parking Zone	
	Count	%	Oldfield Park Ward		Westmoreland Ward		%	Count
Negative impact on Businesses	90	12	43	12	5	3	26	18
Business/ care facilities/ school staff park here	33	4	14	4	5	3	11	8
Will just hurt low-income families	29	4	11	3	5	3	5	4
Comment supporting students and HMOs	27	3	9	3	9	5	5	4

* Percentages are of all respondents who provided a comment.

Respondents felt that the RPZ would have a negative impact on businesses, 12% of respondents mentioned the shops and the pub on Moorland Road and stated they were worried that they would lose business or that they would no longer be able to support these businesses as there would be nowhere to park and no other way to get to Moorland Road.

“I think a resident parking only area would kill the Moorland Road business and local pubs. I think charging non-residents is a fair compromise” (Partially Support, Oldfield Ward)

Additionally, some respondents (4%) felt that the businesses and care facilities such as the nursery, doctor’s office, school and care home, would not have the parking facilities for their staff. Concern was raised as to how staff were meant to get to work if the area was permit parking only after 2 hours.

“Whilst I understand that residents should be able to have places to park there is a doctor’s surgery and dentist who employ staff who work for the NHS and would not be able to park” (Object, Outside the RPZ)

While there were many negative comments about students in HMOs, 4% of respondents did highlight their support for students and brought up that not all HMOs are inhabited by students and that young professionals also live in these. This proposal brings more problems for them.

“I’m concerned about young working adults living in HMOs, who need their cars for work, but would not all be allowed a car if there are more than 2 people living in one property” (Partially Support, Oldfield Ward)

3.2.6 Suggested changes

Other respondents (12%, n=93) gave many alternative or additional suggestions to the proposals. These are the suggestions that appeared most often.

- **Extend the proposed zone;** *“I do not think that the zone extends far enough. It should go the full way up Claude Avenue, through Lymore Terrace and up Coronation Avenue. This is one of the main routes through Oldfield Park and if the zone is not extended here then all traffic that can no longer park further down will make their way there to park making what is already a difficult place to park for residents almost impossible.” (Partially support, Outside the RPZ)*
- **Limit the number of permits given out;** *“It will definitely be a good thing if each house is limited to two permits max, and less if they have off-street provision.” (Support, Westmoreland Ward)*
- **Increase cost for 2nd permit;** *“In order to discourage residents keeping a second vehicle unnecessarily and reduce the traffic on the roads, I think the Council should raise the cost of a second permit.” (Support, Westmoreland Ward)*
- **At least one permit per household should be free;** *“The proposal is an okay idea but should be free for all residents in the zone. More permits for HMO houses with more than 2 working professionals. Only people who do not live here should have to pay. Would rather it stay the same than introduce the scheme as it is.” (Object, Westmoreland Ward)*
- **Garages should not affect gaining a permit;** *“All residents should be allowed to purchase two permits, even if they have a garage. Hardly anyone uses a garage to park a car these days, they are all used for storage.” (Support, Oldfield Ward)*
- **Bath press building shouldn’t be in the zone;** *“My concern is about the proposed new development at the old Bath Press site. If that ever goes ahead, I would like assurances that adequate parking on that site will be provided separate to Residents Parking elsewhere. If it is not, and cars from there spill onto the surrounding streets, then we are back to square one.” (Support, Westmoreland Ward)*

3.2.7 Other Comments

Some comments were made less frequently but nonetheless caused concern for respondents to the survey. Below is an outline of the type of comments that were given less frequently than those above.

Table 15: Count of comments showing other comments

Other comments	All respondents		Located in Parking Zone				Located outside Parking Zone	
	Count	%	Oldfield Park Ward		Westmoreland Ward		Count	%
			Count	%	Count	%		
Comments about enforcement	24	3	17	5	5	3	2	1
Comments about young families	22	3	17	5	4	2	1	1
The RPZ will improve air quality/ health etc	17	2	14	4	2	1	1	1
No benefit to me as a resident	14	2	10	3	2	1	1	1
Will help reduce accidents and help ambulances fit through the streets	7	1	4	1	0	0	3	2

* Percentages are of all respondents who provided a comment.

aecom.com