

# Transport and Connectivity Policy Committee

## 20 March 2025



## Public Forum Questions with Answers

The following Public Forum items have been received for the Transport and Connectivity Policy Committee on 20 March 2025

### **Public Forum Questions:**

Question 1 – Councillor Patrick McAllister - Tender process for New Cut bridge repairs

Question 2 – Mary Lyons - Closure of Park Street

Questions 3, 4, 5 – Matt Sanders - Tribunal decisions: May 2024, August 2024, February 2025

Questions 6 – Gray Craven - Transport & Parking FOI Requests

Question 7 – David Redgewell - Queens Road, coach interchange

Question 8 – David Redgewell - Bus stop facilities and services, Temple Way

Question 9 – David Redgewell - Bedminster bus priority measures

Questions 10, 11, 12 – Nicholas Davies - Portway CRSTS scheme, shared use footway

Questions 13, 14, 15 – Jesse Zyla - Yellow signs

Questions 16, 17 – Caroline Dunn – East Bristol liveable neighbourhood



## Public Forum Questions

### QUESTION 1: Councillor Patrick McAllister

#### Tender process for New Cut bridge repairs

Please may I ask what tendering process was used to allocate the contractors for the Bathurst Bridge repairs, and whether there will be changes in future tendering processes following to the works needing to be delayed due to contractor availability?

#### Officer response:

The proposed Works to Bathurst Bridge are being undertaken using an existing Framework Contract. The Contract is Lot 8 – Structural Maintenance Repairs and Reconstruction Works to Bridges and Highway Retaining Wall Structures for Work more than £150,000.00 This is a call off type of Contract with four separate successful and approved bidders, those being, Alun Griffiths Contractors, Walters UK Limited, Encon Construction Limited and Centregreat Limited. These four successful bidders have been scored and then rated based on their submitted Tenders, with Alun Griffiths Contractors being the first, with the remainder sequentially scored, as in the order above.

Unfortunately, due to commercial reasons Alun Griffiths Contractors have now declined the Works to Bathurst Bridge and therefore in accordance with the Tendering rules and process, We have now approached the next scored successful Contractor on the list, i.e. Walters Uk Limited to take on these Works. We are currently in the process of procuring this work in accordance with the awarding conditions in accordance with this Contract.

There is no intention to change this form of Contract, as it gives the Authority the mechanism to offer proposed works to other successful bidders, rather than having to out to a whole retendering process again.

### QUESTION 2: Mary Lyons

#### Closure of Park Street

I have only recently been aware of the proposal to close Park Street. I am here today to enquire where council plans to divert this traffic? I am afraid that it can only be down the already frequently gridlocked Park Row, the main access to the care and life saving hospitals.

I am deeply concerned re the councils plan to close Park Street to domestic traffic and the increasing pressure this will place on an already frequently gridlocked Park Row, the main artery for access to care and often lifesaving treatment at the large hospitals. This plan seems to have given no thought to the needs of commerce and to the domestic needs of the disabled, parents with several young children and the elderly all of whom need their cars to maintain an active life, sadly we can't all cycle or live adjacent to bus stops. I am speaking for the ordinary citizen. I have not met one person who is in favour of this scheme please consider before you destroy even more of our once beautiful city, sadly with the demise of the post we no longer have a public forum so many Bristolians are unaware of this destructive plan.

#### Officer response:

Thank you for your question

In accordance with the Department for Transport's Transport Appraisal Guidance, and the West of England Mayoral Combined Authorities Assurance Framework, a Full Business Case (FBC) has been produced which includes a section on modelling traffic movements before and after the scheme, and assesses how traffic might be reassigned (diverted) on alternative routes. Essentially what will happen once the scheme is installed is that traffic heading towards the area will either (1) use the roads nearest Park Street – for example Park Row or Anchor Road, (2) depending on their origin and destination consider changing their route further back from Park Street thus keeping away from Park Row, (3) Switch modes e.g. bus, cycling, walking. Like you said, as Park Row is already extremely busy it's unlikely that motorists will divert onto a route that is already congested and, so the expectation is that traffic will choose alternative routes further back or change modes. The Council is satisfied with the outputs from the modelling, and once the scheme is installed strategies will be implemented to actively manage traffic flow on the road network, for example through optimising traffic signals. Alongside the development of the suite of City Centre Projects currently being delivered, the Council is also developing a Transport Movement Plan looking strategically at the road network across the city and how routes should be defined for all modes and uses in the future.

Alongside the FBC, the Council commissioned an Economic Benefits Review to analyse the economic impact of the proposals on local businesses. There have also been various other studies carried out to understand the impact that schemes of this nature (i.e. removing traffic and prioritising public transport, walking, cycling and public realm) have on retail. The conclusions from these studies is that generally business owners underestimate how many customers walk and overestimate how many travel bus car, and that the impact on retail is positive with increases in retail spend, and footfall & dwell times increasing, meaning that the estimated return on investment is over £7 for every £1 invested. In the context of Park Street, motorists can still access the street albeit access will be restricted, however there will be provision for disabled parking on Park Street itself as well as the Triangle. On street pay & display parking is being reduced but there are two large multi-storey car parks nearby. The wider pavements, and reduced through traffic, will improve accessibility for non-motorists and create a safer, more welcoming environment.

### **QUESTIONS 3, 4, 5: Matt Sanders**

#### **Preamble:**

Drivers who receive a penalty charge notice relating to a bus gate may appeal to the Traffic Penalty Tribunal.

#### **The Statutory Guidance of the Traffic Management Act 2004 includes the following:**

*"Where the adjudicator has questioned or criticised a local authority's traffic signing, that authority should review the particular case, review the traffic signing and consider applying the effect of the adjudicator's decision to other cases."*

In the summer, I won several appeals for drivers who had visited the SS Great Britain, because adjudicators ruled that the single warning sign at the end of Gas Ferry Road failed to provide adequate prior warning about the bus gate lurking around the corner, on Cumberland Road.

Some adjudicators criticised the size and height of this sign. But all agreed that its positioning was the main issue, as it was obscured on the approach, by a brick wall.

In response, the Highways Dept added two more (undersized) signs in this road. They did not actually address the issue of the first sign's unfortunate positioning. But at least they did SOMETHING.

### **QUESTION 3: Tribunal Decision - May 2024**

On 9th May 2024, Adjudicator Halliwell decided an appeal in favour of a driver who arrived at the bus gate from Cumberland Basin, because he deemed the main Advance Direction Sign on Cumberland Road to be inadequate:

*"This signage is set at a considerable height above eye level; it is not illuminated; the roundel image is very small; and the sign gives no distance estimate to the restriction point or to the relevant "other traffic" side turning.*

*"There is no further information, signage or surface marking to notify drivers that they are passing the "last" escape route or diversion before the restriction is reached..."*

These are all issues which countless drivers have also flagged over the last 14 months.

Please outline what efforts were made in light of this decision in May 2024, to "review the traffic signing and consider applying the effect of the adjudicator's decision to other cases."

#### **Officer response:**

The Council reviews each ruling of the Traffic Penalty Tribunal (TPT), however, considering the wider picture of the TPT ruling in the Council's favour on 70 occasions compared to ruling in the appellants favour on 20 occasions (single PCN cases only), on the whole the Council is satisfied with the standard of signage at Cumberland Road. Since the rulings quoted by Mr Sanders the TPT continues to rule in the Council's favour with all rulings and feedback being regularly reviewed.

### **QUESTION 4: Tribunal Decision - August 2024**

On 19th August 2024, Adjudicator Robinson decided an appeal in favour of a driver who arrived at the bus gate from Bristol Marina, because he deemed the single warning sign at the end of Hanover Place to be inadequate:

*"There is a single sign at the junction itself, set to the left, and, I find, partially obscured by a 30 mph sign until a driver approaches quite close to the junction. At that point a driver's attention will naturally be on traffic coming from the right along Cumberland Road, in order to assess whether a safe entry can be made when turning left. I therefore do not find that the sign is well sited... Looking at the situation as a whole, I do not find the arrangement adequate..."*

Please outline what efforts were made in light of this decision in August 2024, to "review the traffic signing and consider applying the effect of the adjudicator's decision to other cases."

#### **Officer response:**

The Council reviews each ruling of the Traffic Penalty Tribunal (TPT), however, considering the wider picture of the TPT ruling in the Council's favour on 70 occasions compared to ruling in the appellants favour on 20 occasions (single PCN cases only), on the whole the Council is satisfied with the standard of signage at Cumberland Road. Since the rulings quoted by Mr Sanders the TPT continues to rule in the Council's favour with all rulings and feedback being regularly reviewed.

#### **QUESTION 5: Tribunal Decision - February 2025**

On 6th February this year, Adjudicator Robinson decided an appeal in favour of another driver coming from Cumberland Basin, and raised most of the same points which had been flagged, the previous May.

He conducted a more rigorous inspection of the whole area, and criticised the lack of any advance direction sign for attention of drivers crossing the Merchants Road swing-bridge, and the confusing nature of yellow signage in Cumberland Basin.

He indicated that several signs are poorly-located, compromising their visibility, and advance warning signs should have a larger blue "bus route" symbol.

*"... I am concerned that little use has been made of road markings diverting drivers towards the Council's preferred alternative route ... such as directional arrows, wording on the road surface, broken white lines to delineate the route intended for the main traffic flow and so on..."*

*"... the need for something of that nature is particularly important since the bus gate commences some 15 to 20 m after the junction with Gas Ferry Road, not at the junction itself. None of the signs at either of the turnings immediately before the bus gate mention the bus gate, or that the side turnings are a possible escape route."*

*"Even the wording 'Bus Gate' is painted towards the end of the red road surface colouration, meaning that as the driver approaches Gas Ferry Road, the most important signs and markings are still some 25-30 m away."*

*"To have a better indication at the actual junction itself of the need to turn left to avoid the restriction is, in my judgement, essential for the overall signage scheme to be adequate."*

He concluded, by writing:

*"The Council has doubtless also considered the decisions of adjudicators, including myself, that have previously found the signage arrangement to be adequate. However it is the correct approach to revisit previous decisions if an unusually large number of PCNs are still being generated by a particular location, compared to other bus gates with higher volumes of traffic in the city centre of Bristol."*

*"This decision should therefore not be taken as any criticism of the Council's decision to contest this case. A detailed analysis of the signage and road markings for the whole area was required, which led me to depart from my earlier view of the signage. I hope that the Council will find this decision helpful in identifying measures which will bring levels of compliance with this bus gate into line with other busy locations within Bristol."*

Evidently, Adjudicator Robinson realised that his decision varied from many others relating to this route. But he indicated that he expected his comments to be respected, and acted upon.

So — please outline what efforts were made in light of this decision in February 2025, to “*review the traffic signing and consider applying the effect of the adjudicator’s decision to other cases.*”

**Officer response:**

The Council reviews each ruling of the Traffic Penalty Tribunal (TPT), however, considering the wider picture of the TPT ruling in the Council’s favour on 70 occasions compared to ruling in the appellants favour on 20 occasions (single PCN cases only), on the whole the Council is satisfied with the standard of signage at Cumberland Road. Since the rulings quoted by Mr Sanders the TPT continues to rule in the Council’s favour with all rulings and feedback being regularly reviewed.

**QUESTION 6: Gray Craven**

**Transport & Parking FOI Requests**

When it receives a Freedom of Information Request, the Council should reply within 20 working days. Please give a chart for all FOI requests relating to Transport and Parking matters, received in the last 12 months, including:

- (a) The FOI Reference number,
- (b) The Title / Subject,
- (c) Date the Request was received,
- (d) Date the Response was issued (or indicate if currently outstanding),
- (e) Number of working days between (c) and (d),
- (f) Dates any Internal Review Request and Response.

**Officer response:**

Thank you for your question

Please see separate document detailing this information

**QUESTION 7: David Redgewell**

**Queens Road, coach interchange**

In view of the government white paper on integrated Transport and with Queen Road park street bus coach Taxis priority measures and bus coach Taxis lanes.

What discussion have taken place with First group plc Wales and West buses Division stagecoach west buses National Express coaches limited and Flixbus coaches west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council bus service improvement plan bus advisory Board and panel about the Design of the scheme and its role as key bus / schedule coach coach service interchange in Queen Road for the university and passengers waiting facilities including access to coaches and Buses for passengers with reduced mobility and partly sighted passengers

are they Design into the scheme to including Designs to include putting down wheelchair lifts on coaches on the coach bay.

**Officer response:**

Thank you for your question

A number of key stakeholders – such as First and the Combined Authority - have been involved in the evolution of the proposals, and have had the opportunity to provide comments and input. Ensuring that the infrastructure fit is for purpose for now and into the future at all bus stops along the route is a key aim of the project, and with regards to Queens Road we are proposing to refurbish the stop outside Sainsburys by renewing and upgrading the raised kerb and “safe haven” paving, as well as installing real time passenger information. With regards to the University, we have been in regular dialogue with their transport team and included within the proposals is the upgrade of the bus stop on Queens Avenue; this is a key stop for the University and the proposals include a build out, raised kerb and extended shelter as well as real time passenger information. Ideally we would like to go further with Queens Road and expand the stop, however there are a number of constraints which prohibit this.

**QUESTION 8: David Redgewell**

**Bus stop facilities and services, Temple Way**

In line with the Government integrated Transport white paper.

With the new bus and coach lanes on Temple way and improvement walking and cycling facilities. Will the bus stop facilities be improved outside the former Evening post and Western Daily press office.

Opposite the Hotel on Temple way and will this include bus Boards shelter and real time information displays and important to pavement?

How does the scheme fit into bus coach interchange at Bristol Temple meads station on the friary When it is open following moving the cars park to Bristol Temple meads station south entrance and public transport Network interchanges.

With the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority what proposals are to improve bus services on the Temple way Public Transport corridor at Present only service 8 railink services operate along this corridor Clifton Down to Bristol Temple meads station and stagecoach west park and ride service from Portway park and ride site to Bristol city centre Broadmead shopping centre old market Bristol Temple meads station and Brislington park and ride.

**Officer response:**

Thank you for your question

The bus shelters outside the former Bristol Post building will be moved slightly to accommodate changes to the footway but will not be substantially changed and they already contain Real Time Information boards. The pavement is being redesigned and will include new footway access to the bus stops and a new segregated cycleway.

The Temple Way scheme ends just North of Friary. The Friary scheme will be delivered after the Temple Way scheme so the integration between the two will form part of the Friary scheme. For example Temple Way footway and cycleway will be integrated into the Friary footway and cycleway. Bristol City Council is responsible for providing transport infrastructure but it is the bus operators that are responsible for planning the bus routes. The City Centre Transport Corridor provides significantly improved sustainable transport infrastructure and this is designed to facilitate improved bus provision throughout the city.

#### **QUESTION 9: David Redgewell**

##### **Bedminster bus priority measures**

With the Bedminster and Redcliffe Hill Bus priority measures and Bedminster bus gate. Have the proposals been linked to improvements to walking cycling and wheeling routes to Bristol Temple meads station and Bedminster station as part of a intergrated Transport scheme including the much welcome removal of Redcliffe way underpass for residents and passengers with reduced mobility and using the underpass now an at grade crossing. What the integrated Transport proposals within this west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and Bristol city council improvements scheme. Will the scheme go for discussions at the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council bus advisory Board and panel members.

##### **Officer response:**

Thank you for your question

The Bedminster and Redcliffe roundabout schemes both include significant upgrades to the walking, cycling and wheeling routes in the area, providing new segregated routes for cycling and linking together existing routes to make them more accessible. These routes connect various routes to Temple Meads station. The scheme will be submitted to the West of England Combined Authority for approval if the Bristol City Council Transport and Connectivity committee approve it.

#### **QUESTIONS 10, 11, 12: Nicholas Davies**

##### **Portway CRSTS scheme – shared use footway**

All these questions relate to improving the sub standard SUF, not to comply with LTN1/20, but to a less substandard standard. They do not impinge on your desire to prioritise motor vehicles retaining a 3.5m traffic lane and 3.2m bus lane, exactly **as in the current proposals**. They simply use the "left over" space more thoughtfully for cycling and walking. Given the scheme is predicated on a 70% increase in cycling for BCR purposes why would you not take on board and implement these suggestions?

#### **QUESTION 10:**



Where now will the crossings be and what will the speed limits now be please? Great that **all** the crossings are to be changed to Toucans. Presumably that means there will be no signalised crossing of the Portway or the adjoining roads (Portway roundabout, West Town Road, P&R bus entrance, Hung Road, Woodwell Road, Sylvan Road, Riverleaze, Roman Way, Sea Walls, and Bridge Valley Road) which cannot be cycled across but grateful for confirmation? If there are any exceptions please state why? Does that include the crossings at West Town Road, both of that road, and of the Portway, at the junction with West Town Road, car entrance to the P&R? Do you accept my offer to meet with officers and the designers on site to consider each crossing? If not why not? It is good news that the 30mph limit will end, heading inbound, at Park Road, rather than Woodwell Road, dozens of people in Shirehampton will sleep better. Why not keep the 30mph limit past houses in Sea Mills and Stoke Bishop; ie between Sylvan Way and the railway bridge, after Hadrian Close? Dozens more Bristolians will then get a better nights sleep. If you want to speed up motor vehicles, you could have a stretch of 40mph between Park Road and Sylvan Way, which does not pass people's houses? Alternatively, if you are concerned about speed limits changing too often, you could keep 30mph until the railway bridge?

**Officer response:**

Thank you for your question

Crossings will be located per the designs included in the appendices for the A4 Portway item at the agenda for the February 06 2025, Transport and Connectivity Committee. Speed limits are also set out in the appendices.

All signal crossings will now be Toucan Crossings.

Each crossing has already been looked at closely through the optioneering and design process. The designs are now at a point where substantial change is not possible without causing serious ramifications for the schedule, and increasing the risk of not completing the project by the funding deadline. Further discussions on optioneering at junctions would also result in Officers and Designers being taken away from critical tasks, causing further delay to the schedule and enhancing the risks aforementioned.

Speed limits have been carefully considered and are subject to further consultation through the statutory consultation process. The proposals strike a balance on contributing to a safer environment, reducing the number of time the speed limit changes, and maintaining a limit that doesn't negatively impact bus journey times.

**QUESTION 11:**

I have raised questions about reducing the verge around trees both between West Town Road and the P&R bus entrance and around Sylvan Way. The number one ask in both consultations was decent cycle infrastructure. Given the SUF is only 1.5m wide in places why is it not worth reducing the verge between trees even for short stretches? This will enable cyclists to slow, rather than dismount, when someone is coming in the opposite direction. Cargo bikes or those adapted for disabled users need as

much width as possible. Because the SUF is so narrow and substandard, even small additions of widening of two meters or so, in length, will make a useful difference. The trees are more than 2 meters apart so why ever would you not do this? Will you accept my offer to meet on site with officers and designers to consider how best to effect this?

**Officer response:**

Thank you for your question

The area of verge referenced between West Town Road and Portway P&R Bus Entrance was considered for edging back to increase the footway width, however due to the number of trees it was discounted as the benefits of widening the path for such small sections in-between trees would be limited.

Please refer to earlier comment regarding design changes, and additional discussions around designs shifting the focus of Officer and Designer time from critical tasks.

**QUESTION 12:**

There is a long (800m) substandard section between Park Road and Sylvan Way. Will you reduce the inbound bus lane from 4m to 3.2m or even 3.6m (but why do you need a bus lane over 3.2m?) and move the road markings away from the river? This is straightforward, there is no central reservation and the lanes are to be moved and repainted (possibly resurfaced) anyway. The existing SUF (or pavement) is to be widened in the current designs and it can be widened a little bit more. This is redrawing the lines in a design. You can retain the extra wide 3.5m traffic lane but the SUF would be widened by up to 0.8m or even just by 0.4m to get it from a substandard 2.6m to a standard 3m. Why ever would one not do this? It benefits walkers and cyclists with absolutely no effect on motors or buses? Why the reluctance even to consider improving this scheme? It got panned by ATE, it only made BCR by a bad fudge on cycling and a horrendous fudge on buses? Are you not proposing to hold a TRO statutory consultation? If so why not? We realise the Portway will not have the levels of cycling and walking of, say, the Rail path but the consultations show people care about this and there is potential. Even your own figures assume a greater increase in cycling than bus use, yet your response to requests for even minor improvement is there's no benefit, no demand. Isn't the refusal to design crossings, access points and widen, when it does not impact on motor, or bus, traffic, frankly, perverse?

**Officer response:**

Thank you for your question

The inbound bus lane has been made 4m wide in this location to accommodate those cyclists wishing to ride on the road. Bus lanes that are between 3.3 – 3.9m wide are not used as they create uncertainty as to whether a bus could successfully overtake a cyclist which has safety implications. Statutory consultation will be held this year.

**QUESTIONS 13, 14, 15: Jesse Zyla**

**YELLOW SIGNS**

The Council often uses yellow signs with black text, on the approaches to its bus gates, to warn drivers not to go a certain way.

**QUESTION 13 – Installation dates**

Please provide a list of the locations of all yellow signs relating to bus gates, with the year that they were installed, and whether they are still present.

**Officer response:**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Still present?</b>
Cumberland Road, on northern footway facing west, between entrances to Cottage Inn and Caravan Park	2023	Yes
Brunel Lock Road, on southern footway at junction with Cumberland Road, facing west.	2023	Yes
Avon Crescent, in middle island at junction with McAdam Way, facing north.	2023	Yes
Cumberland Road, junction with Brunswick Place, facing west	2023	Yes
Cumberland Road, opposite junction with Ashton Avenue facing north	2023	Yes
Gas Ferry Road, junction with Cumberland Road, facing north.	2023	Yes
Redcliff Street, near to Bridge Quay building, facing south	2020	Yes
Counterslip, near The Paragon building, facing northeast	2020	Yes
Victoria Street, near the junction with St Thomas Street East, facing southeast	2020	Yes
Anchor Road, to the east of Trinity St steps	2020	Yes
Wine Street, opposite Vintry House, facing east	2020	Yes
Newgate, opposite multi-story carpark, facing east	2020	Yes
Redcliffe Roundabout, on Redcliffe Way west exit on splitter island, facing southeast	2020	Yes
Prince street, north end, west side, facing south	2020	Yes
Church Road, on the approach (West and East) to Avonvale Road	2025	Yes
Days Road, from St Phillips Causeway	2025	Yes

**QUESTION 14 - TSRGD Specs**

Please indicate which specific diagram(s) are being followed, from the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016.

**Officer response:**

There is no specific diagram in TSRGD 2016 for these types of signs. Instead, reference has been made to Schedule 13, Part 9 – “Other Temporary Signs”.

### **QUESTION 15: DfT Authorisation**

If any specific authorisation has been given by the Department for Transport, please explain the details.

#### **Officer response:**

No DfT authorisation has been sought.

### **QUESTIONS 16, 17: Caroline Dunn**

#### **East Bristol liveable neighbourhood**

#### **QUESTION 16**

Why did the Avon and Somerset police officers with Drones and contractors and others turn up at 3am on Thursday 13th March 2025.

To carry work in the East Bristol liveable scheme; who Authorised, this in Bristol city council, who Authorised this in West of England mayoral combined transport Authority how much extra did it cost, and why was it thought necessity to disturb the resident community at that time of the morning.

#### **QUESTION 17**

Was this actioned by Bristol city council with the Police and crime commissioner Clare moody or the Chief constable Sarah crewe before the operation taking place?  
and did either of them Authorised it with Bristol city council or the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority mayor Dan Norris. What was the total cost to the Bristol city council and the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority mayor Dan Norris and the Avon and Somerset police police and police and crime commissioner Clare moody.

#### **Officer response to Questions 16 and 17:**

Thank you for your question

Bristol City Council sought support to ensure the health and safety of all involved with the installation works following protests that had disrupted previous unsuccessful attempts to complete the East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood between October 2024 and January 2025.

Ahead of the installation, Bristol City Council informed Avon and Somerset Police of the planned works. Police officers were present on-site to support the installation process and facilitate any peaceful protests that occurred. Any matters related to costs or operational procedures involving the police should be directed to Avon and Somerset Police separately.

The scheme's implementation was authorised on 3rd September 2024, with the relevant documentation published [here](#). The West of England Combined Authority had previously approved the outline business case for the project in March 2023. The installation costs are fully covered within the allocated capital budget from the City Regional Sustainable Transport Settlement, as approved by the West of England Combined Authority.