

The main points we heard at scrutiny

- **Opposition to P&R (particularly on the meadows).**
- **Dissatisfaction with congestion and emissions**
- **Rail was not going to provide an early solution and would need further investment from BANES to extend it to the east**
- **Buses would not improve without subsidy**
- **Support for Link and Ride**
- **Support for the Nottingham model**
- **Support for hard measures including congestion charging**

Opposition to P&R. Peter Dawson set out that people travel in to work from all sides of the city but did not break this down to show who would use a Park and Ride from the east and why. Guest speakers (community and professional) spoke against a P&R at Batheaston and the general mood of the meeting was against P&R and particularly on the meadows. Not a single workshop table suggested P&R as an alternative transport solution.

The Alliance and Professor Parkhurst argued that P&R attracts more traffic and therefore make congestion and emissions around the sites worse. Mott Macdonald's estimate was that P&R would only reduce traffic on London Road by 5%. This was not well received given the investment required to deliver this modest change.

The Bath preservation Trust/Parish Council spoke about the value of the meadows, environmental impact and impact on the Heritage City status

The Alliance argued that there is little demand for P&R to the East. Andrew Lea showed that there is much spare capacity in existing P&R sites, and that they only reach capacity during predictable events such as the Xmas market. He showed that only about 24% of P&R users are commuters. Peter Dawson meanwhile claimed that 43% are commuters. Mott Macdonald estimate a demand for around 1000 P&R spaces to the east by 2029.

Congestion and emissions Fobra expressed dissatisfaction with congestion and emissions. This was a unifying theme across all attendees in the city and on the periphery. Fobra want to see a solution and support P&R but don't need it to be on the meadows. They also want more pedestrianisation in the city (particularly Queens Square) and for city centre parking to be removed.

Rail is not a solution

We learned from Peter Hendy's presentation and from Metrowest that Rail was not going to provide a solution in the near future and that BANES would need to come up with finance if their remit was to be extended to the east.

Buses would not improve without subsidy The message from First was that without subsidy bus services would not improve. They claimed there was not a demand for the 231 to Wiltshire, yet there was demand for a P&R to the east. They wanted any P&R to be within 10 minutes of the city, but then admitted that buses often got stuck on the London Road.

Link and Ride There was interest and support for Professor Graham Parkhurst's suggestion of smaller P&R alongside service bus routes. He argues that cars should be intercepted early in their journey and that this would protect bus services.

Support for the Nottingham model There was applause for the tram system, but an understanding that this needed long-term commitment and a funding stream such as the Work Place Levy. There was some concern that these solutions may not work in Bath and that there are fewer large employers with car parks here.

Support for hard measures There was broad agreement that a radical solution such as Congestion Charging may be needed.