



**FILWOOD, KNOWLE AND WINDMILL HILL
NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP
6.00 PM ON 25TH SEPTEMBER 2012
AT STAR AND DOVE, ST LUKE'S ROAD
WINDMILL HILL, BRISTOL BS3 4RY**

PRESENT:

Ward Councillors:

Councillors Jeff Lovell and Chris Jackson
Councillors Gary Hopkins and Chris Davies
Councillor Mark Bailey

Filwood Ward
Knowle Ward
Windmill Hill Ward

Other members of the Partnership:

Les Bowen
Denise Britt
Judith Brown
Ken Jones
Lee Reed
Ann Smith
Trevor Sweeting (sub for Insp Salmon)

Knowle Resident
Filwood Resident
Equalities Representative
Resident
Equalities Representative
Filwood Resident
Avon and Somerset
Police
Windmill Hill Resident
Knowle Resident

Nancy Carlton
John Scott

Also Present:

Lloyd Allen
Karen Blong
Terry Bullock

Martin Cummings
Richard Gwyn
Paul Owens

Community Safety Officer, Bristol
Democratic Services
Highways and Traffic Manager, BCC
Highways
May Gurney
Area Environment Officer
Programme Manager, Major Projects,
BCC

Kurt James
Mark Upham

Area Coordinator, Bristol City Council
May Gurney

Also in attendance - 16 residents of St Martins Road, 2 residents of Priory Road and a resident of Stoneleigh Rd who regularly used the Scout / Guide Hut on St Martins Road.

APOLOGIES:

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Alf Havvock and Gill Brookman.

Item No:

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair for the meeting, Cllr Mark Bailey welcomed the Members and the public in attendance.

The Chair highlighted that agenda item number 8, St Martins Road Decision Report, would be brought forward due to the number of residents in attendance to hear the item.

Agenda item number 9, Neighbourhood Partnership Waste and Environment Plan would also be brought forward to allow the representatives from May Gurney to answer questions.

2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP HELD ON 12th JUNE 2012

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP AGREED –

That the minutes of the meeting held on 12th June 2012 be agreed as a correct record.

Matters Arising

All actions had been completed unless otherwise stated. The following comments were made;

a. Microasphalt Programme in Pyle Hill Crescent

The work would begin on the 10th October 2012 (weather permitting).

b. Notice Board Repair, Marksbury Road

Richard Gwyn confirmed that the repair had been complete.

c. Welfare Reform and Localised Taxations Support

A summary of the predicted impact of the changes was attached to the minutes.

Cllr Jackson referred to information collected by Ward Councillors that appeared to contradict the information supplied in the report. Mathew Kendall would be requested to liaise with Ward Councillors to clarify information.

Action – The AC to ensure that Matthew Kendall liaise with the Filwood Ward Cllrs.

d. Recycling – May Gurney

Dave McGill, May Gurney had been notified of the issue and assured that concerns related to non-collection of recyclables would be fed back to the collection crew. Non – recyclable waste should be placed in the black bin. It was noted that wet clothes, pillows and duvets would not be collected for re-cycling.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

4. PUBLIC FORUM AND REQUESTS FOR LOCAL ACTION

A number of residents were in attendance for agenda item 8 – St Martins Road Decision Report. Public forum would be heard prior to the item.

5. ST MARTINS ROAD DECISION REPORT

The Chair indicated that those residents who wished to address the Committee would be limited to three minutes due to the number of residents in attendance.

Residents addressed the Neighbourhood Partnership and a report summarising the views of the Residents Committee was circulated (appendix a to the minutes). It was noted that the views of the Residents Committee would not reflect the views of all the SMR residents.

The Representative from Resident Committee highlighted the following;

- The public consultation information stated in the officer reports appeared to be contradictory to the information collected by the Resident Committee. The second Bristol City Council (BCC) consultation was completed 9 months ago and no update has been provided to the residents. The view of those people living in areas most affected by the proposal should be given greater weight.
- The Councils data states that 467 vehicles travel from St Martins Road to Priory/Talbot Road in a 12 hour period; almost 1000 vehicles during the day. Many of these vehicles use it as a rat run.
- Residents were informed that SMR would not be part of the Greater Bristol Bus Network (GBBN) consultation and concerns about the use of the road would be considered separately. However, the GBBN Consultation notes stated that the installation of traffic lights would respond to the traffic levels at the junction and adjust the green time appropriately with the aim to reduce the rat running along SMR. Residents challenged the Officer opinion that the junction would be unable to cope with the now reduced traffic volumes.
- The Residents Committee consider Road Humps to cause discomfort for road users; damaging vehicles, generate traffic noise and cause discomfort for cyclists.
- The Residents Committee suggested that the road closure proceeds on a six-month experimental basis, which would assess the long-term impact on neighbouring roads.

Other residents and users of SMR were invited to present their views;

- Some residents and users of the Church Hall / Scout and Guide / Surgery acknowledge that the speed of vehicles using the road would need to be addressed but were not of the opinion that closing SMR would be the correct solution to the problem. Up to 100 children could use the scout hut at one time and a road closure could increase the danger to children from people turning due to logistic challenges. Some of the children were as young as 5 and they could not be expected to walk along suggested alternative routes. Not all residents living on roads in close proximity to SMR had been consulted on the road closure.

The Chair highlighted that a number of roads in Bristol were used as rat runs and it would be impossible to close all of them.

Terry Bullock (TB), Highways and Traffic Manager, BCC addressed the NP;

- The affect of road closures should not be assessed in isolation and all forms of traffic should be considered to create a balanced view. If SMR were to close the traffic would use alternative routes in the area.
- Proposals to prohibit vehicles from turning right into SMR would require drivers to use the Wells Road/Priory junction. The junction would be unable to support this increase, causing the right turn lane to queue back blocking the inbound movement on the Wells Road. Closing the road would increase traffic flow on other minor roads, such as Greenleaze and Crossways Road.
- If SMR were closed congestion could increase at certain times of the day, with motorists having to turn the same way that they entered the road. Two-way traffic could be an issue when motorists were dropping off or picking up passengers at the Church or Scout Hut.
- The law related to road closures clearly stated that an experimental closure could only be used when the outcome of the closure could not be foreseen. An experimental closure could not be used in this instance as the consequences of the closure could be predicted.
- TB noted that the recommendation not to close the road had been based on a professional assessment and should the NP agree to go ahead with the closure this would need to be escalated to the Executive Member.

The Ward Councillors were invited to address the Committee and the following comments were made;

Cllr Hopkins highlighted that there would be no perfect solution to the issue but the views of the professionally trained Officers should be taken into account. Motorists using SMR to cut through do not save any time but a sign saying 'no through road' would probably be ignored.

- The full impact of the traffic lights had yet to be assessed. The lights could be phased and altered at peak times to ensure the traffic continues to move.

- The Ward Councillors had circulated a leaflet which highlighted their position on the proposed road closure; 2/3 of emails received in response had opposed the closure. Following installation of the traffic lights some residents who previously agreed the closure now opposed it. It would currently be impossible to assess resident's opinions and a more detailed consultation should take place. The speed of vehicles had been recognised as a concern.

Cllr Chris Davies re-enforced Cllr Hopkins views, noting that the main concerns from residents related to the rat run use of the road and the speed of vehicles. The cost and viability of road narrowing could also be considered.

TB suggested that speed monitoring could take place, with an introduction of speed humps on the straight stretch of road. The traffic light phasing could be altered to ensure a smooth traffic flow whilst remaining fair to all road users. In response to a suggestion for a No Right Turn provision between 7 and 9.30am, TB referred to the challenge of enforcement. Police representatives would be required to monitor this daily, which would be resource heavy. It would be illegal to erect a sign without a traffic order; a temporary road closure could not legally be applied for.

Cllr Hopkins suggested that the traffic light phasing should be altered during peak hours to enhance traffic flow. Following a six-month monitoring period resident consultation would take place and an update provided to the NP.

The NP Members were requested to vote on the Cllr Hopkins proposals. Cllrs Lovell and Jackson abstained from the vote.

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP AGREED;

- (1) that the traffic light phasing should be altered during peak hours to enhance traffic flow;**
- (2) that St Martin Road be monitored for a period of six months prior to further resident consultation and an update provided to the Neighbourhood Partnership;**

- (3) that a letter be written and distributed to residents of St Martin's Road stating the NP decision.

6. NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT PLAN

The Partnership received a report from the Area Environment Officer (agenda item no. 9) relating to the Waste and Environment Plan.

Martin Cummings and Mark Upham from May Gurney were in attendance to respond to queries from the NP.

Richard Gwyn (RG) referred to the meeting of the Filwood, Knowle and Windmill Hill Environment Group, which had produced the Waste and Environment Plan, identified three priorities and created an Action Plan for 2012-13.

- Cllr Bailey confirmed that the meeting with Windmill Hill Residents regarding street cleansing issues had taken place. A follow up meeting would be arranged. The Area Co-ordinator stated that the base line would be the standard starting point. A copy of this would be circulated to the NP Members.

Action – Richard Gwyn to circulate the baseline street cleansing standards for each Ward to the NP Members.

- RG confirmed that the 12 bins on William Street had been numbered. Enforcement actions would be taken against persistent offenders. This would form the basis for a city wide policy. The May Gurney Representative highlighted that in cases of fly tipping cleaning would take place around bin bags but they would not be removed.

- The AC referred to praise received from residents related to the street cleansing completed in the area by May Gurney. Litter continued to be an issue in the area.

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMITTEE RESOLVED –

That the Waste and Environment Plan be noted.

7. COMMUNITY SAFETY UPDATE - INSPECTOR COLIN SALMON

The Neighbourhood Partnership considered an update report from the Neighbourhood Delivery Team (agenda item no. 6).

Trevor Sweeting, Avon and Somerset Police attended as a substitute for Inspector Colin Salmon. The following comments were made;

Recorded Crime

- Crime of all types had generally shown significant reductions over the three Wards.

- The robbery rates in Windmill Hill had risen by 18% but this had been due a spate of 7 robberies committed by one perpetrator who had now been apprehended.

- Cllr Jackson highlighted that some residents still perceived crime and antisocial behaviour as areas of concern. Cllr Lovell reiterated that the reduced crime levels in the area should be advertised in the community.

The NP requested that information on the reduced crime figures in the area be advertised to the community, i.e. through the web, news letters and leaflets in libraries / community centres.

Action – The AC to investigate ways to advertise the reduced crime levels in the Filwood, Knowle and Windmill Hill Wards and report back to the next NP.

Anti-social behaviour

- The figures suggested an increase in anti-social behaviour in Knowle. It was noted that some police calls received were incorrectly tagged as anti-social behaviour and in reality the figures were much lower than the statistics suggested.

- The long-term problem solving measure taken in Marshall Walk / The Mede Community Centre (Filwood) had proved successful.

- The No Drinking Zone in Filwood had been highlighted as a priority, with the aim to implement the zone in March 2013. The zone would be smaller than originally envisaged.

- A number of incidents had been recorded in Redcatch Park. The park was very busy and the majority of people gathering in groups were law abiding. Some underage drinking had been noted but this had reduced over the last few weeks. Some warnings had been issued for cannabis smoking in the park.

Parking enforcement guidelines

The report included a summary of Responsibilities for Parking Enforcement, which was split between BCC Parking Services and the Police.

Cllr Bailey indicated that specific areas of concern could be addressed correctly at Neighbourhood Forum meetings. Resident Les Bowen indicated that vehicles parked on the corner of Stonleigh Road continued to cause concern for residents.

Cycling on Pavements

- Les Bowen highlighted concerns related to cycling on pavements (appendix 6b of the agenda). He also notified the Police that they had received a number of complaints from residents at meetings about cycling on pavements that was not reflected in the tabled report. Judith Brown echoed the concerns on behalf of the Older Peoples Forum.

- Cllr Jackson highlighted the danger to cyclists when riding on to road in Broadwalk and suggested a cycle path would be beneficial. Cllr Davies referred to the high number of letters received from residents requesting installation of cycle lanes.

The Neighbourhood Committee agreed that investigatory work should take place on the viability of a cycle lane. This should consider the needs of pedestrians, motorists, cyclists and residents using Broadwalk.

Cannabis Factories

Cllr Jackson referred to a meeting of the Drugs Forum which highlighted the number of drug factories operating in the area. A number of organised crime groups operated in the area, paying residents to grow cannabis in their homes. Any suspicious activity, i.e. blacked out windows, cannabis smells etc should be reported to the police.

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP RESOLVED –

(1) That the summary of outcomes from 1st April – 31st August 2012 be noted;

(2) That investigatory work should take place on the viability of cycle lanes on Broadwalk; this should consider the needs of pedestrians, motorists, cyclists and residents using Broadwalk.

8. KNOWLE WEST REGENERATION FRAMEWORK

Paul Owens, Programme Manager, Major Projects was in attendance to verbally update the NP.

- BCC's Cabinet on 4th October 2012 would consider a report on the Knowle West Regeneration Framework, to include endorsement of the spatial plan (copy of plan- appendix b to the minutes).

- BCC's Cabinet on 4th October would also consider a report on the proposed Filwood Green Business Park. This included a proposal to invest up to £11m in implementation/development, subject to successful external funding bids.

- BCC would also propose a new 2 form entry primary school on part of the Marksbury Rd College site. This would open September 2014, subject to consultation.

- 2000 new homes were planned in the Knowle West area – this would also include provision for jobs / retail and leisure. Wildlife / Green corridors would also be incorporated but the locations were yet to be agreed.

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMITTEE RESOLVED;

THAT THE VERBAL UPDATE BE NOTED.

9. AREA COORDINATOR'S REPORT

The Neighbourhood Partnership considered a report of the Area Coordinator (agenda item no. 7) regarding progress on actions undertaken.

a) Action Plan Update

The NP agreed that the Action Plan should be presented and updated at each NP meeting. When progress has faltered this should be highlighted.

b) 20 MPH speed limit update

The AC confirmed that consultation on the 20mph zone would take place after January. An Officer would attend the January NP meeting to provide an update.

Action – AC to add 20mph consultation to the agenda for the January NP meeting.

c) Community Cohesion workshop

Members agreed that the workshop should take place but requested the length should be reduced to a maximum of 1.5 hours.

d) Note the Endeavour: the Raising Aspirations Project Launch

Reference was made to the year 4 children who would be touring the Council House and Mansion house on the 26th September 2012.

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Neighbourhood Partnership Action Plan be agreed;**
- (2) That the Neighbourhood Forum meeting updates be noted;**
- (3) That the roll out of 20 MPH speed limit update be noted;**
- (4) That it be agreed a Neighbourhood Partnership Community Cohesion Workshop be held;**
- (5) That the Employment and Enterprise Strategy be noted;**
- (6) That the Endeavour: Raising Aspirations Project Launch be noted;**
- (7) That the Mayor and Police Commissioner Elections be noted; and**

(8) That the land surplus to requirements be noted.

10. PARKS CAPITAL INVESTMENT REPORT

The Partnership received a report from the Area Environmental Officer (agenda item no. 10) requesting agreement to the match funding requirements contained in Table 3 of the report in order to secure capital stimulus money allocated to parks investment projects within the Filwood, Knowle and Windmill Hill Neighbourhood Partnership area.

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMITTEE RESOLVED –

- (1) that the match funding requirements contained in Table 3 of the report in order to secure capital stimulus money allocated to parks investment projects within the Filwood, Knowle and Windmill Hill Neighbourhood Partnership area be agreed; and**
- (2) that the requirement in Table 1 of the report to seek funds from the Knowle West Regeneration Framework at a future date be noted.**

11. DEVOLVED SERVICES REPORT – AREA COORDINATOR

The Neighbourhood Partnership considered a report of the Area Coordinator (agenda item no. 11) regarding the devolved transport schemes update and the Section 106 update.

It was noted that the Bristol Clean and Green Community Paybacks Jobs table was incorrect and indicated that Water Lane was in Knowle rather than Brislington West.

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMITTEE RESOLVED –

- (1) That the Devolved Transport Schemes 2012-13 update be noted;**
- (2) That the Section 106 Update be noted and the Bus Shelter Expenditure be agreed;**
- (3) That the Filwood, Knowle and Windmill Hill Local Sustainable Transport Grant Bids be noted;**

- (4) That the Bristol Clean and Green Funding bids be noted;**
- (5) That the Bristol Clean and Green Expenditure be agreed;**
- (6) That the Bristol Clean and Green Community Payback Jobs be noted; and**
- (7) That the Capital Stimulus Programme Park Investments Projects be noted.**

11. WELLBEING REPORT

The Neighbourhood Partnership considered a report of the Area Coordinator (agenda item no. 12) relating to the funding allocations for 2012-2013.

Members agreed that Wards who were not contributing £1,500 towards Operation Biker should not benefit from the service provided. Further information was requested.

Action – The AC to circulate information on Wards not contributing towards Operation Biker before releasing funds.

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMITTEE RESOLVED;

- (1) That the Filwood, Knowle and Windmill Hill Wellbeing Grant fund financial position as at 25 September 2012 be noted;**
- (2) that the Wellbeing Grant Fund recommendations for Filwood, Knowle and Windmill Hill be agreed; and**
- (3) subject to further information, that it be agreed that £1,500 be made available to support Operation Biker.**

12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

a) Harcliffe Road

A dip in the road had been reported – local Councillors agreed to investigate.

b) Walk-in Centre Signs

These were still incorrect but a work order had been raised with the Highways Department.

c) Salcombe Road

Residents noted that the area had recently been dug up, re-turfed and then dug up again – the water company should be encouraged to work in partnership to ensure less disruption.

d) Fuel Poverty

Judith Brown, Older People Forum requested that the NP consider actions which could assist the vulnerable in the community as winter approached. Grants were available from a Sustainable Energy Fund and should be advertised in the community. The Grant would fund training for volunteers who could check homes and offer advice on how to improve energy consumption.

Action – Judith Brown to circulate information to the NP (via the AC).

e) Traffic Schemes Grant

The AC confirmed that a decision on a recent grant application was imminent.

13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was confirmed that the date of the next meeting be at 6.00 pm on the Tuesday 8th January 2013 at the Knowle West Media Centre, Leinster Avenue, Filwood, Bristol BS4 1NL.

(The meeting ended at 8.06 pm)

CHAIR

Neighbourhood Partnership – St Martins Road Traffic

Background

Individual residents have had concerns for many years over the level of rat running along St Martins Road with vehicles seeking to avoid traffic lights at Priory Road/Wells Road junction.

In May 2011 a meeting was held of residents to press for action, following this an informal vote was taken of preferred options and residents overwhelmingly supported a road closure over all other options. 80 votes for No Through Road out of 100 votes with no more than 5 votes for any other option.

In June 2011, residents spoke at the Neighbourhood Partnership when it agreed to “support the St Martins Road Committee proposals which suggest making the Road a no through Road; and (2) that the Bristol City Council Highways Office be asked to create formal proposals for consultation.

This was followed by consultation led by James Dowling in September 2011 when residents again overwhelmingly supported the road closure. We were delighted that the results of the consultation carried out by the City Council of those people / areas most affected by the proposal mirrored those carried out informally by the residents committee. 83 per cent of the St Martins Road residents voted in favour of a No Through Road. There was also a very high response rate for consultations of this type which demonstrated that there exists a strong desire within residents of the road for a change.

There was then a second round of consultation in December 2011 when three options were proposed with a preferred option of a road closure. This was distributed to a much wider area than the immediate residents.

At this point there was what I would characterise as a campaign of misinformation when St Martins Surgery (and possibly other locations) distributed leaflets from an unnamed individual that appeared to be the council’s consultation leaflet but only asked patients/residents to consider the disruption that the No Through Road would cause.

The residents committee received 39 forms from residents of St Martins Road (representing 120 residents) and 21 forms from residents of St Martins Close (representing 22 residents) all supporting the No Through Road option. This represented 142 residents of St Martins Road who we know contacted Bristol City Council to support the road closure plus an unknown number who contacted the council directly.

We are unclear how the figures in the report to the Neighbourhood Partnership referring to 68 households in support and 68 objections have been calculated. I suggest that it is unfair that those in favour have been aggregated as households whilst those against have been counted as individuals. It would also appear that almost no-one in support of the closure contacted the council – this appears

unlikely from conversations I personally have had. How many of the 68 objections were from residents of St Martins Road?

We are very concerned that it is nine months since the second round of consultation and the council has not yet reported to the residents or those who responded what the outcome of the consultation. This is a breach of the Council's Code of Good Practice on Public Consultation and has prevented the residents from addressing their concerns.

We would also respectfully request that, when assessing the consultation responses, that the views of those people / areas most affected by the proposal should be given greatest weight whether expressed in response to the first or second consultation and however submitted to the council. We requested the Traffic Engineer to differentiate between the responses from residents and non-residents. We also asked the Traffic Engineer to ensure that the views from the first consultation were considered alongside the second consultation as many residents thought that they had already submitted their views to the council in response to the first consultation.

Traffic volumes

According to Bristol City Council monitoring in 2010 and 2012 there has been some improvement as a result of the improvements to the Wells Road/Priory Road junction.

However, according to the council's data that still leaves 467 vehicles travelling from St Martins Road to Priory Road/Talbot Road in a 12 hour period and presumably a similar number travelling in the opposite direction which equate to almost 1,000 vehicles during the day (plus some overnight traffic). Furthermore the survey was taken in the summer when traffic levels are significantly lower than in dark, wet, winter months.

In the morning rush hour, there are still 80 vehicles per hour travelling from St Martins Road to Priory Road/Talbot Road. We do not believe that many of these vehicles are legitimate users of the road - except in the sense that rat running is a legitimate use of the road! Despite the improvement 80 vehicles use St Martins Road to get from Wells Road to Priory Road/Talbot Road compared to 120 using the using the safer, highly sophisticated and carefully engineered solution. This is some improvement on the previous 100 : 100 split but it remains the case that 2/3 as many vehicles turn up the road as use the main junction.

In terms of the overall volume of traffic there is now less traffic turning from Wells Road into Priory Road than there was in 2010. There were 130 cars per hour in 2012 instead of 139 cars per hour in 2010 (a 6.5 per cent decrease).

Greater Bristol Bus Network

In parallel with this the GBBN consultation was undertaken and measures implemented. Residents were advised that St Martins Road was not part of the GBBN and that we should not attempt to use GBBN as St Martins Road was already being dealt with separately.

Prior to the GBBN, Traffic Engineers had monitored traffic volumes and understood the level of traffic using St Martins Road and the traffic lights to travel from Wells Road onto Priory Road. This information was then used to design the new traffic lights.

The GBBN Consultation response notes "The proposal [for alterations to Broadwalk Junction] will be retained as detailed and will be one of the first aspects of the scheme to be implemented. The lights will respond to the traffic levels at the junction and adjust the green time appropriately. There is a limit as to how much green time can be given to any one movement but where possible additional green time will be provided for the right turn movement. The aim of this is to reduce rat running along St Martin's Rd, should this fail to alleviate the problems additional measures will be explored to prevent traffic using St Martin's Rd."

The higher figures in 2010 were known to the council as confirmed in the officer's report and this data was used to design the new GBBN traffic lights. There is therefore no reason for officers to claim that the junction would be unable to cope with the now reduced traffic volumes using the junction unless the traffic lights were deliberately designed on the assumption that 80 cars per hour would continue to use St Martins Road in the rush hour.

If the council officers deliberately designed the Wells Road / Priory Road on the basis that 2/3 of the cars turning right during the rush hour would use St Martins Road instead then residents will, I feel, have grounds for feeling misled and seriously aggrieved. I can personally assure the committee that those residents I have spoken to are furious at this suggestion.

Concerns over the impact on neighbouring roads

Adam Crowther, BCC Traffic Signals and Street Lighting Manager has cited the Traffic Management Act 2004 claiming that "the local authority has a responsibility for the expeditious movement of traffic". This is a seriously inaccurate statement of the council's duties as the Act actually states that local traffic authority has a duty to secure the expeditious movement of traffic "so far as may be reasonably practicable having regard to their other obligations, policies and objectives"

Thus, to quote Traffic Management (Guidance on Intervention Criteria) (England) Order 2007 the "network management duty, as set out in section 16 of the Act, is qualified to the extent that each authority has other obligations, policies and objectives which they must also address. Accordingly, the duty should not take precedence over everything else that they do."

I find it disappointing that a council officer can so seriously misquote the legal basis for actions proposed by the Council.

There are numerous policies that the Council needs to take account of including:

- The Council Walking Strategy (2011) which sets out Transport User Priorities including placing pedestrians and walkers at the top of the priority list to "increase walking through developing, promoting and maintaining safe, secure, convenient, efficient and attractive infrastructure."
- Community Safety where the Council states that "Neighbourhood Partnerships provide an opportunity for local communities to have a greater say and are well placed to collect,

consider and prioritise local concerns." It gives a definition stating that "Community safety means preventing, reducing or containing the social, environmental and intimidatory factors which affect people's right to live without fear of crime and which impact upon their quality of life. It includes preventative measures that contribute to crime reduction and tackle anti-social behaviour."

- The Joint Local Transport Plan has as one of its Road Safety Objectives "Improve safety for all road users, particularly the most vulnerable members of the community." It also commits to a review of the travel purpose of each route to ensure the route reflects the appropriate social, environmental or economic need.
- The Greater Bristol Cycling Strategy 2011-2026 aims to make to make cycling a normal, safe and attractive choice for travel and recreation by adults and children. This notes as the first necessity for increasing cycling that "motorised traffic volumes and vehicle speeds should be considered first; if volumes and speed can be reduced sufficiently, cycling-specific measures will not be needed, and there will be benefits for other users of the street"
- Neighbourhood Partnerships are supposed to offer local residents an opportunity to influence and shape services minor traffic schemes.
- Finally, the "foreseeable delays to neighbouring roads" cited in the report should already have been built into the design of the traffic lights.

Taken together these council policies with the consultation response regarding GBBN, I believe that the Traffic Management Act is not relevant to the matter, as the consultation response indicated that further action could/would be taken if required.

Residents believe that the existing measures have failed to alleviate the problems and that additional measures should be explored to prevent traffic using St Martin's Rd (to quote the consultation response) which explicitly says "prevent traffic".

Other matters

The report refers to vehicular activity and congestion with motorists returning the same way. The only vehicles that would need to make a double pass are those that would otherwise have driven the whole length of the road. The up and back journey may be slightly longer or slightly shorter than a single journey along the road but overall there would be no impact on traffic.

Eliminating rat-running through traffic will significantly increase the safety of children being dropped off and collected from the Church and/or Scout Hut.

Residents of St Martins Close are particularly vulnerable and would greatly appreciate the reduction in traffic which leaves some of them feeling virtual prisoners in their own flats.

Alternative proposals from councillors

Without consulting residents involved in the traffic committee, the ward councillors have proposed a road narrowing and raised table as the solution to the problem suggesting that this would eliminate

the perceived benefit in rat running. The road is already narrowed by parking and we do not believe that the raised table would deter very many of those 80 rat runners per hour.

This is despite the fact that residents have at no stage requested this option.

Road humps of all types can cause discomfort for road users (and pain for some); they can be a major problem for emergency vehicles such as ambulances and fire engines. They have even been known to cause accidents and injuries themselves.

They frequently cause damage to vehicles, even at normal speed levels, though it is legally very difficult to make a claim against a local authority as a result. Residents would suffer this most as they travel along their own road.

It is widely recognised that road humps generate traffic noise and ground-borne vibrations which can amount to a nuisance. Furthermore, for cyclists this is the type of hump that causes the most discomfort. This also generates the highest noise levels for goods vehicles.

Proposals

As there are still a significant number of rat runners, particularly during the rush hours, we would request that the Neighbourhood Partnership fulfil the commitment made by the Council in the consultation response to GBBN that “additional measures will be explored to prevent (not just reduce) traffic using St Martin’s Rd.” and the original commitment of the Neighbourhood Partnership when you supported the St Martins Road Committee proposals which suggested making the Road a no through Road.

We are particularly encouraged by the fact that the vast majority of the group who would be most inconvenienced by any closure are so supportive of the proposal to close the road to through traffic. There is a consensus among this group that the benefits of a quieter and safer environment in which to live and play outweigh the inconvenience and thereby redress the balance between car users and other users.

As a cyclist I feel particularly vulnerable riding along my own road as vehicles squeeze past me in completely inappropriate locations and two weeks ago I even encountered a City Council van sitting behind me revving like mad as I cycled to my house and then ranted at me as he went past!

I have also had my car, bike and person hit by cars travelling along the road.

We have recently collected information on the numbers of residents who have suffered hit and run accidents, been subjected to road rage and/or felt threatened by other road users.

St Martins Road residents therefore propose that the Neighbourhood Partnership implement the proposed road closure on the basis that although the situation has improved somewhat - particularly outside the rush-hour - the changes have still left 80 cars per hour in the morning rush hour travelling from St Martins Church to Priory Road. The residents have consistently expressed an overwhelming preference for this option. It is consistent with the Council's other strategies.

If the Neighbourhood Partnership declines this request - on the basis of concerns over the impact on the Wells Road/Priory Road junction, St Martins Road residents request a six-month experimental traffic order to assess the long-term impact on neighbouring roads.

If the Neighbourhood Partnership declines this request, St Martins Road residents will make a formal complaint to Bristol City Council that we have been victims of maladministration.

The basis for this complaint would be that either:

- the Council failed in September 2011 to take account of the work underway on St Martins Road when it designed the GBBN junction at Broadwalk. By doing so it prevented the implementation of the Neighbourhood Partnership's stated intention from June 2011; or
- the council designed the traffic lights on the deliberate premise that significant numbers of vehicles would continue to use St Martins Road instead of using the traffic lights despite having detailed traffic counts available. It concealed this from residents and made misleading or inaccurate statements thereby preventing them commenting on the design until after the implementation of the scheme; and/or
- that Council has failed to fulfil its intention to prevent traffic using St Martins Road despite the continued high levels of rat running in the rush hour.

Had we been advised of this we could have pressed for changes to the Greater Bristol Bus Network to take account of the rat runners. However, we were specifically advised not to use the GBBN consultation. This prevented us having the opportunity to alter the design.

Grant Addison

on behalf of St Martins Road traffic Committee

THE PROPOSED PLAN KNOWLE WEST

