

South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods

Consultation report
May 2026



Funded by
UK Government

Funding secured by

WEST | MAYORAL
OF ENGLAND | COMBINED
AUTHORITY



Contents

1	Executive summary	2
2	Background	5
2.1	South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods	5
2.2	Consultation survey	7
3	Consultation tools	8
3.1	Online survey.....	8
3.2	Business operations survey.....	8
3.3	Communications	8
4	How we consulted	11
4.1	Drop-in sessions.....	11
4.2	Community partners	11
4.3	Business engagement	12
4.4	School engagement	12
4.5	Stakeholder engagement	13
5	Results	14
5.1	South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods survey.....	14
5.2	Business operations survey.....	67
6	Stakeholder feedback and suggestions	68
6.1	Feedback from community organisations	68
6.2	Feedback from schools.....	71
6.3	Feedback from resident groups	73

1 Executive summary

We believe streets are for everyone

Liveable Neighbourhoods aim to make streets healthier, more accessible and more pleasant by:

- **Putting people first** – reducing traffic and lowering vehicle speeds to create safer, more welcoming and accessible streets. Vehicles would still be able to access all properties at any time, though some routes may change.
- **Prioritising health** – improving air quality and allowing more people to choose physically active travel options, like walking, wheeling and cycling, and be safe doing so.
- **Making better community spaces** – designing calmer streets and greener areas where people can relax, children can play, and families feel safe travelling to school.

In 2024, we asked residents and stakeholders across the South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods (SBLN) area what was already working well in their streets and local environment and what they would like to see improve. We received over 6,000 comments using an interactive map. This feedback, plus other traffic data collection, informed proposals which met with Department for Transport and Active Travel England guidance.

How we consulted

In the autumn of 2025, we consulted on specific proposals for South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods, including parking measures and measures to reduce through-traffic and unsafe speeds in some areas.



To promote this, we ran a high-profile communications campaign across both physical and online platforms. This included billboards, blogs, adverts on bus shelters, online adverts.

Nine drop-in information events were held at local centres around the SBLN area.

We received over 4,000 responses to the autumn 2025 survey.

Key results

Parking:

- **Residents' Parking Schemes** were **broadly supported** with 52% of respondents agreeing and 39% disagreeing. Support varied across neighbourhoods but was strongest in areas with existing schemes and close to the city centre. There was less support in areas farther from the city centre and from respondents who live outside of the project boundary.
- **Matchday Parking Schemes** were **supported** in areas **close to Ashton Gate Stadium** and less supported elsewhere.
- **Areas close to both the city centre and Ashton Gate Stadium**, such as Ashton Gate, The Chessels and Southville showed **support** for a **Residents' Parking Scheme and Matchday Parking Scheme** together.

Proposed parking area	Residents' Parking Scheme (RPS)	Matchday Parking Scheme (MPS)
Ashton Gate	Agree	Agree
Ashton Vale	Disagree	Agree
Bedminster East (existing RPS)	Agree	Mixed
Malago Vale	Disagree	Mixed
Parson Street	Mixed	Agree
Perretts Park	Disagree	Mixed
Southville (existing RPS)	Agree	Agree
The Chessels	Agree	Agree
Totterdown	Agree	Mixed
Totterdown East	Disagree	Mixed
Windmill Hill	Agree	Mixed
Outside SBLN	Disagree	Mixed
Location unknown	Disagree	Mixed

- Agree: 50% or more "agree" or "strongly agree"
- Disagree: 50% or more "disagree" or "strongly disagree"
- Mixed: Fewer than 50% "agree" or "strongly agree" and less than 50% "disagree" or "strongly disagree"

Streets:

- **Reducing traffic speed and volume on residential streets** was **broadly supported** with 50% of respondents agreeing and 42% disagreeing.
- **Reducing traffic speed and volume on streets near schools and local centres** was **more strongly supported** with 70% of respondents agreeing and 14% disagreeing.
- **Measures to improve connector roads and high streets** were **broadly supported**, especially street trees and greenery, pedestrian crossing points and side road junction improvements.

Phase 1 neighbourhoods:

- Southville:
 - Measures to reduce through-traffic and unsafe speeds in **Southville** were **not broadly supported** with 23% agreeing and 63% disagreeing.
 - Proposals for **Ashton Gate School** were **more supported** with 45% agreeing and 28% disagreeing.
 - Proposals for **Gathorne Road** were **not broadly supported** with 33% agreeing and 50% disagreeing.
- Bedminster East:
 - Proposals for **Bedminster East** were **broadly supported** with 50% agreeing and 35% disagreeing. Of the respondents living in Bedminster East, 71% supported the proposals.
- Totterdown:
 - Measures to reduce through-traffic and unsafe speeds in **Totterdown** were **not broadly supported** with 27% agreeing and 64% disagreeing.
 - Options for access to **Bellevue Road** were **mixed** but **option 2** (timed closure, weekday mornings only) was **more popular** with respondents who live in **Totterdown** (64% agree), compared to 19% of Totterdown respondents who agree with option 1 (permanent one-way on Cambridge Street).

2 Background

2.1 South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods


Overview

The South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods (SBLN) project aims to make improvements to streets across a large area of Bedminster, Southville, and Windmill Hill.

In 2024, we asked residents and stakeholders across the SBLN area what was already working well in their streets and local environment and what they would like to see improve. We received over 6,000 comments from more than 1,550 different people using an interactive map, plus more than 500 responses to a survey. [Read the SBLN Engagement Report.](#)

Based on feedback and local features, we have identified 11 distinct neighbourhoods within the SBLN area.

Figure 1: Map of the neighbourhoods within the SBLN area



You told us that managing parking, speeding and volume of traffic are big issues. Safety for pedestrians and cyclists is a top priority in most areas.

We have developed proposals that would reduce the number of vehicles using residential streets as short cuts. This would help maintain safer speeds. The proposals would make it easier to:

- Walk, wheel and cycle
- Manage parking
- Create attractive spaces to spend time outdoors

The proposals make sure that cars, delivery vehicles and emergency services can reach all properties. Buses would be able to operate as usual. We will consider additional parking and access for Blue Badge holders.

What we are proposing

Proposals as part of this project include:

- **Parking measures** – Residents' Parking Schemes and Matchday Parking Schemes.
- **Changes to traffic movements** – including one-way streets, no entries, closing roads to through-traffic, while keeping access to all properties.
- **Local transport options** – car clubs, cycle parking and cycle hangars, dedicated e-scooter and e-bike parking locations, and chargers for electric vehicles (EVs) in lampposts.
- **Improving road safety on some connector roads** – the busier roads in the area, including traffic calming and pedestrian crossings.
- **Improving high streets and places where there are schools and local centres** – including safety improvements, trees and greening, benches, café seating, and arts and culture programming.

Phasing and timescales

The proposed improvements are planned in two phases.

Phase 1

Phase 1 would include the following measures across all South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods (SBLN) area:

- Changes to parking
- Improving streets around schools, local centres and high streets
- Some measures for residential streets such as cycle parking and EV chargers

Phase 1 also includes a focus on three neighbourhoods:

- Southville
- Bedminster East
- Totterdown

In these Phase 1 neighbourhoods, we are proposing changes to traffic movements as well as the types of measures planned for the whole SBLN area. Proposed boundaries are shown in Figure 1.

The Phase 1 neighbourhoods have been selected based on the number of traffic concerns and the level of support expressed in the 2024 engagement, their proximity to the city centre and strong links to the existing transport network.

This project is largely funded by City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement which must be invested by March 2027. This is funded by the UK Government and secured by the West of England Mayoral Combined Authority.

Phase 2

This phase could provide additional improvements in the remaining neighbourhoods that are not part of Phase 1. This will require further work and securing additional funding from 2027 onwards.

2.2 Consultation survey

A survey was hosted at www.bristol.gov.uk/SBLN from Thursday 4 September 2025 until Thursday 30 October 2025.

Paper copies were also available from a number of local organisations.

3 Consultation tools

3.1 Online survey

A survey was hosted at www.bristol.gov.uk/SBLN from Thursday 4 September 2025 until Thursday 30 October 2025. An Easy-Read version of the survey was available from Monday 6 October to Monday 1 December 2025.

Paper copies were available from a number of local organisations.

The survey was split into two main sections, with sub-sections within them:

Part A: area-wide measures

- Changes to parking
- Measures to reduce the amount and speed of traffic and improve community spaces on four types of streets:
 - Residential streets
 - Connector roads
 - High streets
 - Streets with schools and local centres

Part B: Phase 1 neighbourhoods

- Southville
- Bedminster East
- Totterdown, including a proposal for Angers Road in the neighbouring Totterdown East neighbourhood

3.2 Business operations survey

A survey for people representing businesses was available on the South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods website from 4 September until 15 November.

The survey included questions to help with the design of the scheme, including loading/delivery requirements and staff and visitor travel.

We promoted the survey through the business events in section [4.3](#). The survey was also central to conversations with business owners during drop-in sessions, where Bristol City Council officers visited hundreds of businesses in the main areas where changes were proposed.

3.3 Communications

To raise awareness of the survey, we ran a high profile promotional campaign.

3D visualisations

3D visualisations were produced to show what some of the proposals could look like if introduced, including:

- Ashton Gate Primary School, Southville
- North Street, Southville
- Gathorne Road, Southville

- Cannon's Road, Bedminster East

Bedminster Library window graphics

Large graphics were printed and displayed in the window of Bedminster Library, which fronts onto Bedminster Parade, a busy shopping street and route into the city centre.

Billboard posters

Large posters were displayed on billboards across the project area.

Blog from Transport and Connectivity Chair, Councillor Ed Plowden

On 16 October 2025, Councillor Ed Plowden, Councillor for Windmill Hill and Chair of the Transport and Connectivity Committee, published [a blog post on Bristol City Council's Newsroom website](#).

Bus shelter adverts

Bus shelter adverts were used across Bristol to promote the consultation during the eight-week period.

Local media and magazine advertising

Adverts that included information about the survey and drop-in events were displayed in:

- The Pigeon
- South Bristol Voice

Newsletter

Weekly newsletters were sent out during the eight-week consultation. From the opening date of the consultation to the closing date, the subscriber list increased by 61% from 986 to 1,590 subscribers.

Posted information flyers

Over 30,000 information flyers were sent to all addresses within the BS3 and some households in the BS1, BS2 and BS4 postcodes.

Social media

Posts and adverts promoting the survey were programmed throughout the consultation period. Adverts were targeted at the local area.

Spotify adverts

Spotify adverts ran targeting residents in Bristol to take part in the consultation.

Plans of proposals

Plans were created for the survey and other consultation materials.

Whole area plans:

- Project area map, showing the extent of the project area
- Connector roads and high streets, showing the roads proposed to be connector roads and high streets

- High streets, showing the streets proposed to be high streets
- Local transport changes and developments, showing other transport projects and notable developments within the area
- Overview, indicating all areas with proposals
- Parking area boundaries, showing the proposed Residents' Parking Schemes and Matchday Parking Schemes areas
- Parking measures, showing proposed Residents' Parking Schemes and Matchday Parking Schemes
- Schools and local centres, showing areas around schools and local centres for targeted transport proposals
- South Bristol neighbourhoods, showing the 11 neighbourhoods within the area

Southville plans:

- Existing traffic movement
- Proposed traffic movement

Bedminster East:

- Proposed traffic movement

Totterdown:

- Existing traffic movement
- Proposed traffic movement

Press release

A [press release](#) was posted on Bristol City Council's Newsroom on 4 September to promote the consultation.

Stakeholder information pack

A stakeholder pack with social media graphic, printable posters and copy for use on relevant channels was created and distributed to a list of 97 key stakeholders.

Website

Additional information about the proposals and updates on the project timeline were added to the project website at www.bristol.gov.uk/SBLN.

Videos

Three videos were created to supplement the survey, including information about the proposals:

- [South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods](#)
- [South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods - What is a Residents' Parking Scheme?](#)
- [South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods - What are Modal Filters?](#)

4 How we consulted

4.1 Drop-in sessions

Drop-in sessions were held at venues across the area, with a greater focus on phase 1 neighbourhoods, including:

Venue	Date and time	Attendees
SouthBank Club, Southville	24 September 4pm - 7pm	129
The Southville Centre, Southville	30 September 12pm - 3pm	124
Windmill Hill Community Hall, Windmill Hill	1 October 4pm - 7pm	99
The Southville Centre, Southville	7 October 12pm - 3pm	100
Ashton Vale Community Centre, Ashton Vale	8 October 4pm - 7pm	35
The Old Picture House, Totterdown	9 October 4pm - 7pm	73
Chessell Centre, The Chessels	15 October 3:30pm - 6:30pm	75
Library of Things, East Street, Bedminster East	16 October 4pm - 7pm	72
The Harbour Totterdown (formerly Totterdown Baptist Church), Perretts Park	20 October 12pm - 3pm	60
Total		767

Physical materials, such as surveys, information boards and maps, were available at the drop-in events.

4.2 Community partners

We partnered with Action Greater Bedminster and Bristol Disability and Equality Forum to reach a larger number of people within the community to ensure their voices were heard.

Action Greater Bedminster

Action Greater Bedminster (AGB) continued to be our community partner for this round of consultation. Their networks and expertise enabled the team to reach a greater number of local stakeholders.

AGB set up and supported nine engagement events and three meetings with residents who found access to the drop-in sessions difficult.

They:

- promoted all drop-in sessions on local Facebook groups
- promoted and shared the link to the online survey
- alerted local councillors of upcoming activities in their wards
- promoted the consultation in local newspapers

- assisted with the event for traders
- hosted an older people's session at St Frances Church

Bristol Disability and Equality Forum

Supplemental to the nine engagement sessions hosted by Bristol City Council, Bristol Disability Equality Forum (BDEF) were commissioned to work with Disabled people and allies in South Bristol to gain their insight on the proposals. BDEF supported residents in understanding and completing the survey with two in person events and one online at different times of day. Some preferred to engage outside of the formal sessions. At the end of the consultation period, a total of 34 Disabled people and allies were engaged with and a report produced (insert link here).

4.3 Business engagement

The team door-knocked businesses in areas where there were significant proposed changes, including many of the high streets and other clusters of businesses.

- Totterdown and Mead Street, 4 September
- North Street west, 5 September
- North Street middle, 10 September
- North Street east, 11 September
- West Street, 15 September
- Cannon Street area, 16 September
- Beaufort Road area, 10 October
- Wells Road, 22 October
- Coronation Road area, 24 October

A business-focused drop-in event was also held at the Steam Crane, North Street between 3pm and 7pm on 29 September. Representatives of 16 businesses attended.

The team also offered meetings to representatives of all businesses that had requested further information.

The team spoke to people from almost 200 businesses across the SBLN area, either in-person or by phone. We attempted to speak to many more business representatives in-person but they were closed or unavailable when approached. In addition, many more businesses were contacted by email and letter.

4.4 School engagement

The team contacted all schools in the area to offer meetings.

The team also attempted to speak to parents in the afternoon pick-up at:

- Oasis Academy Temple Quarter, 18 September
- Southville Primary School, Merrywood site, 22 September
- Southville Primary School, Myrtle site, 23 September
- Luckwell Primary School, 24 September
- Ashton Gate Primary School, Infants' site, 29 September
- Ashton Gate Primary School, Juniors' site, 29 September

- Victoria Park Primary School, 30 September
- St Mary Redcliffe Primary School, 1 October
- Holy Cross Primary School, 2 October
- Compass Point Primary School, 3 October
- Hillcrest Primary School, 6 October
- Ashton Vale Primary School, 14 October

4.5 Stakeholder engagement

944 local and citywide stakeholders were emailed to notify them of the launch of the survey.

5 Results

5.1 South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods survey

There were 4,823 responses to the survey. All questions were optional so some questions may have a different number of responses.

Some questions were multiple-choice where respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with a proposal. The results to these questions are shown in graphs and broken down by the neighbourhood that the respondents live in or the proposed parking areas they live in, according to the postcode the respondent left at the end of the survey.

Other questions allowed for participants to respond in writing. The results are summarised in tables. The full categories can be found in [appendix section 2](#).

Overview of respondents

A full breakdown of the 'About you' questions and an assessment of how representative the respondents were compared to the Bristol and local population can be found in [appendix sections 3 and 4](#).

- 87% of respondents provided their postcode. 74% of valid postcodes provided were within the SBLN area and the below neighbourhoods:
 - Ashton Gate: 349 (7%)
 - Ashton Vale: 77 (2%)
 - Bedminster East: 83 (2%)
 - Malago Vale: 76 (2%)
 - Parson Street: 100 (2%)
 - Perretts Park: 162 (3%)
 - Regeneration area: 38 (1%)
 - Southville: 1,345 (28%)
 - The Chessels: 495 (10%)
 - Totterdown: 280 (6%)
 - Totterdown East: 136 (3%)
 - Windmill Hill: 421 (9%)
 - Outside area: 613 (13%)
- Respondents aged 25-74 were overrepresented whereas ages 0-24 and 75-85 or older were underrepresented when compared to the Bristol population.
- The proportion of respondents who said they consider themselves to be a Disabled person (10%) was slightly higher than the Bristol population (7%).
- The proportion of respondents that were White British (86%) was higher than the Bristol population (72%). Mixed or multiple ethnic groups was broadly similar and all other groups were underrepresented.
- The proportion of respondents that had no religion (76%) was higher than the Bristol population (55%). Those that stated Buddhist, Jewish or other religion was similar to the Bristol population. Christian and Muslim were both underrepresented.

- The proportion of respondents whose sex was male or female was similar to the Bristol population.
- The proportion of respondents who stated they have a gender identity different from their sex recorded at birth was similar to the Bristol average (1%).
- The proportion of respondents that identified as Heterosexual / Straight (88%) was slightly lower than the Bristol population (93%). Other groups were overrepresented.
- The proportion of respondents that were pregnant or had given birth in the last 26 weeks was the same as the Bristol population (3%).
- The proportion of respondents that were carers (11%) was similar to the Bristol population (10%).
- The proportion of respondents that were carer-experienced was the same as the Bristol population (2%).
- The proportion of respondents that were a refugee or asylum seeker was the same as the Bristol population (0.3%).


Area-based results

Where valid postcodes were provided, we matched survey responses to the neighbourhood or parking area in which the respondent lives. This enabled us to see whether views differed based on where the respondent lives.

Part A: Area-wide measures

Parking measures

Figure 2: Map of proposed parking measures



We proposed:

- One area with an existing Residents' Parking Scheme (no Matchday Parking Scheme):
 - Bedminster East existing RPS area
- One area with an existing Residents' Parking Scheme, plus a new Matchday Parking Scheme:
 - Southville existing RPS area
- Two areas with a new Residents' Parking Scheme, plus a new Matchday Parking Scheme:
 - Ashton Gate
 - The Chessels
- Six areas with new Residents' Parking Schemes (no Matchday Parking Scheme):
 - Parson Street
 - Windmill Hill
 - Malago Vale
 - Totterdown
 - Totterdown East
 - Perretts Park
- One area with a new Matchday Parking Scheme (no Residents' Parking Scheme):
 - Ashton Vale

The following questions (1-5) show responses from all respondents and are also grouped by respondents who live within each **proposed parking scheme area**. These are shown in Figure 2.

Q1. Please tell us if you agree or disagree with each of the following options for parking in your street and neighbouring streets:


Q1.1. I support a **Residents' Parking Scheme** in my street and neighbouring streets (4,638 responses).

Q1.2. I support a **Matchday Parking Scheme** in my street and neighbouring streets (4,579 responses).

Q1.3. I support a **Residents' Parking Scheme AND additional Matchday Parking Scheme** in my street and neighbouring streets (4,576 responses).

Q1.4. **No changes** to current parking are needed (4,497 responses).

Figure 3: Summary of views on parking measures (all respondents)



Residents' Parking Schemes

Across all respondents, 52% support the scheme. Areas that already operate under an existing RPS, Southville and Bedminster East, show the highest support, with 75% and 64% respectively selecting agree. In contrast, respondents from Ashton Vale and some respondents outside the SBLN area show stronger opposition.

Matchday Parking Schemes

Overall, 53% of all respondents support the scheme. Support is strongest in The Chessels (78%) and Ashton Gate (76%), who are closest to Ashton Gate Stadium and do not have an existing RPS. Areas further away from the stadium, such as Perrett's Park (28%) and Totterdown East (32%), show lower levels of support.

Residents' Parking Schemes and Matchday Parking Schemes

Across all respondents, 41% support both schemes together but this varied by area and proximity to Ashton Gate stadium. 59% of Southville respondents support both schemes. Meanwhile, 56% of respondents in Totterdown East prefer no changes to parking, compared to 39% of all respondents who believe that no changes to parking arrangements are needed.


No changes to parking needed

39% of all respondents agreed that no changes to parking was needed and 46% disagreed. This varied by area with Malago Vale, Perretts Park and Totterdown East with significantly higher support for no changes to parking.

[See appendix 1.1](#) for more information.


South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods: Consultation report 2026

Figure 4: Summary of views on parking measures (proposed parking scheme area) (1 of 2)



South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods: Consultation report 2026

Figure 5: Summary of views on parking measures (proposed parking scheme area) (2 of 2)



South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods: Consultation report 2026

Q2. Please tell us what times you think a Residents' Parking Scheme should operate on your street and neighbouring streets on **weekdays** (Monday to Friday). Select one option.

Question 2 asked respondents what times a Residents' Parking Scheme should operate on weekdays. The top three chosen times are shown below. See [appendix 1.2](#) for the full results.

Figure 6: Weekday preferred RPS operating times

Area	Respondents	Top 1	Top 2	Top 3
All respondents	4560	RPS not needed (35%)	9am-5pm (26%)	9am-9pm (13%)
Southville (existing RPS)	1244	9am-5pm (41%)	9am-9pm (18%)	9am-6pm (14%)
Bedminster East (existing RPS)	165	9am-5pm (39%)	RPS not needed (18%)	9am-9pm (16%)
Totterdown	339	RPS not needed (32%)	9am-5pm (26%)	9am-9pm (13%)
Windmill Hill	329	RPS not needed (34%)	9am-5pm (21%)	9am-9pm (14%)
The Chessels	486	RPS not needed (35%)	9am-5pm (17%)	9am-6pm (17%)
Ashton Gate	334	RPS not needed (40%)	9am-5pm (19%)	9am-9pm (16%)
Parson Street	96	RPS not needed (40%)	9am-9pm (19%)	9am-6pm (14%)
Malago Vale	71	RPS not needed (58%)	9am-5pm (25%)	9am-6pm (8%)
Perretts Park	158	RPS not needed (59%)	9am-5pm (22%)	9am-6pm (9%)
Totterdown East	122	RPS not needed (59%)	9am-5pm (16%)	9am-6pm (12%)
Ashton Vale	76	RPS not needed (64%)	9am-5pm (14%)	9am-9pm (12%)

In areas with existing parking schemes, the current timings (9am to 5pm) were the preferred timings.

In areas without existing parking schemes, "RPS not needed" was the largest group of suggestions. However, in most areas (Totterdown, Windmill Hill, The Chessels, Ashton Gate and Parson Street), this was not a majority. The most preferred timings were 9am to 5pm.

In Malago Vale, Perretts Park, Totterdown East and Ashton Vale, the majority of responses said that RPS was not needed.

South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods: Consultation report 2026

Q3. Please tell us what times you think a Resident's Parking Scheme should operate on your street and neighbouring streets on **Saturdays**.

Question 2 asked respondents what times a Residents' Parking Scheme should operate on Saturdays. The top 3 chosen times are shown below. See [appendix 1.2](#) for the full results.

Figure 7: Saturdays preferred RPS operating times

Area	Respondents	Top 1	Top 2	Top 3
All respondents	4552	RPS not needed (53%)	9am-5pm (19%)	9am-9pm (13%)
Southville (existing RPS)	1242	9am-5pm (36%)	RPS not needed (28%)	9am-9pm (17%)
Bedminster East (existing RPS)	165	RPS not needed (44%)	9am-9pm (20%)	9am-5pm (19%)
Totterdown	336	RPS not needed (61%)	9am-5pm (13%)	9am-9pm (13%)
Windmill Hill	329	RPS not needed (62%)	9am-5pm (13%)	9am-9pm (12%)
The Chessels	486	RPS not needed (52%)	9am-9pm (15%)	9am-5pm (14%)
Ashton Gate	334	RPS not needed (47%)	9am-9pm (18%)	9am-5pm (17%)
Parson Street	97	RPS not needed (59%)	9am-5pm (15%)	9am-9pm (14%)
Malago Vale	72	RPS not needed (78%)	9am-5pm (10%)	9am-9pm (7%)
Perretts Park	159	RPS not needed (85%)	9am-9pm (4%)	9am-6pm (3%)
Totterdown East	123	RPS not needed (80%)	9am-5pm (8%)	9am-9pm (5%)
Ashton Vale	75	RPS not needed (67%)	9am-5pm (13%)	9am-9pm (11%)

In Southville (existing RPS), the most preferred option was to operate the parking scheme between 9am and 5pm on Saturdays, which is the current arrangement. This was followed by "RPS not needed" and 9am to 9pm.

In Bedminster East (existing RPS), the most common suggestion was that an RPS was not needed on Saturdays, although this was not a majority. Bedminster East RPS does not operate on Saturdays.

In all other areas, which do not have an RPS, "RPS not needed" was the most common suggestion and made up more than 50% of suggestions, except in Ashton Gate (47%).

South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods: Consultation report 2026

Q4. Please tell us what times you think a Residents' Parking Scheme should operate on your street and neighbouring streets on **Sundays**.

Question 2 asked respondents what times a Residents' Parking Scheme should operate on Sundays. The top 3 chosen times are shown in figure 8. See [appendix 1.2](#) for the full results.

Figure 8: Sundays preferred RPS operating times

Area	Respondents	Top 1	Top 2	Top 3
All respondents	4548	RPS not needed (68%)	9am-9pm (12%)	9am-5pm (11%)
Southville (existing RPS)	1239	RPS not needed (60%)	9am-9pm (14%)	9am-5pm (13%)
Bedminster East (existing RPS)	165	RPS not needed (52%)	9am-5pm (20%)	9am-9pm (17%)
Totterdown	336	RPS not needed (69%)	9am-9pm (12%)	9am-5pm (7%)
Windmill Hill	327	RPS not needed (68%)	9am-5pm (12%)	9am-9pm (12%)
The Chessels	484	RPS not needed (59%)	9am-9pm (15%)	9am-5pm (11%)
Ashton Gate	335	RPS not needed (57%)	9am-9pm (16%)	9am-5pm (14%)
Parson Street	97	RPS not needed (65%)	9am-9pm (14%)	9am-5pm (13%)
Malago Vale	72	RPS not needed (79%)	9am-5pm (8%)	9am-9pm (7%)
Perretts Park	158	RPS not needed (89%)	9am-9pm (4%)	9am-6pm (2%)
Totterdown East	123	RPS not needed (85%)	9am-5pm (6%)	9am-9pm (4%)
Ashton Vale	76	RPS not needed (82%)	9am-9pm (8%)	9am-5pm (7%)

In all existing and proposed parking scheme areas, over 50% of respondents said that a parking scheme was not needed on Sundays.

South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods: Consultation report 2026

Q5. Do you agree or disagree with the boundaries of the proposed parking scheme area that contains your property?

Question 5 asked residents whether they agreed or disagreed with the proposed boundaries of the parking scheme area that includes their property. A total of 4,623 respondents provided feedback.

Figure 9: Map of proposed parking scheme area boundaries





Figure 10: Summary of views on proposed parking scheme area boundaries



Overall support for the proposed parking scheme area boundaries is mixed and related to general support for parking schemes.

Support is strongest in The Chessels, Totterdown, Ashton Gate and Southville, where over half of respondents agree.

Areas with lower support tend to have higher proportions of respondents saying a parking scheme is not needed, particularly Malago Vale, Perretts Park.

Across all respondents, 43% agree or strongly agree, while 28% feel a parking scheme is unnecessary. 13% think that a parking scheme is needed but disagree with the proposed boundaries.

See [appendix 1.3](#) for more information.

Q6. Do you have any comments or suggestions about parking measures in your street or neighbouring streets? For example, you could mention reasons for your answers to earlier questions or tell us about specific parking issues you would like addressed.

Question 6 sought written feedback on parking measures, allowing respondents to explain their earlier answers or highlight specific issues in their street or surrounding areas. In total, 2,677 comments were submitted, however comments may contain multiple themes.

Figure 11: Summary findings of comments about parking measures

Theme	Count
Opposition to parking schemes	978
Support for parking schemes	768
Parking scheme operation suggestions (days, times, area, visitors)	579
Parking enforcement suggestions	455
Parking pricing, permits and eligibility suggestions	396
Public transport, Park & Ride and sustainable travel suggestions	247
Specific locations, developments and events	198
Parking supply concerns	142
Equity and displacement impacts	126
Concerns about on business impacts	105
No change	100
Comments not relevant to the question	97
Traffic management and street changes	53
Comments that requested additional information	44
Other	51

Written comments focused mainly on overall views on parking schemes followed by comments about how any scheme would operate.


Common issues included operating arrangements such as hours, coverage and visitor parking, enforcement and kerbside controls, and permits and pricing. Some respondents also raised wider transport comments, including public transport and sustainable travel.

Residential streets

Most of the roads in South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods are residential streets. We propose that vehicles would be able to access all streets, but through-traffic would be discouraged or prevented, and lower speeds encouraged. Residential streets should be safe and comfortable for walking, wheeling and cycling, and attractive as social spaces.

Responses are broken down by **neighbourhood**, which are areas bound by connector roads shown in figure 12.

Figure 12: Map of the neighbourhoods within the SBLN area



On residential streets, we proposed two types of measure:


- measures to reduce through-traffic and unsafe speeds, including:
 - closing some roads to through-traffic using modal filters, such as bollards, planters or bus gates
 - making traffic one-way
 - traffic calming
- measures to improve community space and help walking, wheeling and cycling, including:
 - street trees and greening
 - parklets
 - visitor cycle parking
 - cycle hangars
 - electric vehicle (EV) chargers
 - car club bays
 - e-scooter and e-bike share parking areas

South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods: Consultation report 2026

Q7. Do you agree or disagree with the principle that, on most residential streets, through-traffic should be discouraged or prevented and lower speeds would be encouraged? These roads would still be open for access by motor traffic, but alternative routes may be required.

Question 7 asked residents whether they agreed or disagreed with the principle of discouraging through-traffic and encouraging lower speeds on most residential streets, while still allowing motor vehicle access. A total of 4,703 respondents answered this question.

Figure 13: Summary findings of views on reducing through-traffic and speeds on residential streets



Overall, 50% of all respondents agree while 42% disagree.

Most neighbourhoods (Windmill Hill, Bedminster East, Totterdown, The Chessels, Totterdown East, Perretts Park, regeneration area, Ashton Gate, Parson Street and Malago Vale) agreed with reducing through-traffic and speeds on residential roads.

See [appendix 1.4](#) for more information.

South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods: Consultation report 2026

Q8. How important do you think each of the following traffic and speed reduction measures are for residential streets?

Q8.1. Modal filters (using bollards, planters or cameras to restrict vehicles)

Q8.2. Bus gates (using cameras to only allow some vehicles like buses, Blue Badge holders and emergency services)

Q8.3. One-way streets

Q8.4. Traffic calming to reduce unsafe speeds

Figure 14: Summary findings of views on measures for traffic and speed reduction on residential streets (1 of 2)





Figure 15: Summary findings of views on measures for traffic and speed reduction on residential streets (2 of 2)



All measures for traffic and speed reduction on residential streets were of some importance to at least 51% of all respondents.


Measures that would prevent through-traffic (modal filters and bus gates) rather than reduce traffic (traffic calming and one-way streets) were less popular with 58% and 51% saying they were of some importance.

See [appendix 1.8](#) for more information.

Q9. How important do you think each of the following measures to improve community spaces are for residential streets?

- Q9.1. Street trees and greening
- Q9.2. Parklets
- Q9.3. Visitor cycle parking
- Q9.4. Cycle hangars – secure resident cycle parking
- Q9.5. EV chargers – installed into lampposts
- Q9.6. Car Club bays – for shared use vehicles
- Q9.7. E-scooter and e-bike share parking areas

Figure 16: Summary findings of views on measures to improve community spaces on residential streets



All measures to improve community spaces on residential streets were of some importance to at least 60% of respondents.

The most important improvements included street trees and greenery (83%), EV chargers (81%) and cycle hangars (74%).

See [appendix 1.9](#) for more information.

South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods: Consultation report 2026

Figure 17: Top two high importance and low importance measures by area (percent of respondents)

Area	High importance – top 1	High importance – top 2	Low importance – top 1	Low importance – top 2
Southville	Traffic calming (54%)	Street trees and greening (51%)	Bus gates (68%)	Modal filters (65%)
Bedminster East	Traffic calming (69%)	Street trees and greening (68%)	Car Club bays (47%)	Bus gates (45%)
Totterdown	Street trees and greening (50%)	Traffic calming (49%)	Bus gates (64%)	Car Club bays (54%)
Ashton Gate	Street trees and greening (53%)	Traffic calming (52%)	Bus gates (65%)	Car Club bays (55%)
Ashton Vale	Traffic calming (44%)	Street trees and greening (38%)	Parklets (75%)	Bus gates (73%)
Malago Vale	Street trees and greening (60%)	Traffic calming (53%)	Bus gates (61%)	Car Club bays (61%)
Parson Street	Traffic calming (57%) (tie)	Street trees and greening (57%) (tie)	Car Club bays (61%)	One-way streets/Bus gates (54%)
Perretts Park	Traffic calming (50%)	Street trees and greening (48%)	Bus gates (68%)	Parklets (66%)
The Chessels	Street trees and greening (63%)	Traffic calming (56%)	Car Club bays (54%)	Bus gates (53%)
Totterdown East	Street trees and greening (57%)	Traffic calming (55%)	Bus gates (62%)	Car Club bays (56%)
Windmill Hill	Street trees and greening (62%)	Traffic calming (62%)	Bus gates (57%)	Car Club bays (49%)
Regeneration area	Street trees and greening (67%)	Traffic calming (49%)	Car Club bays (65%)	E-scooter and e-bike share parking areas (54%)
Outside SBLN area	Street trees and greening (50%)	Traffic calming (43%)	Bus gates (67%)	Car Club bays (63%)
Unknown location	Street trees and greening (40%)	Traffic calming (31%)	Bus gates (78%)	Modal filters (75%)
All respondents	Street trees and greening (52%)	Traffic calming (50%)	Bus gates (64%)	Parklets (58%)

Q10. Are there other things you think we should do to improve residential streets?

Question 10 asked residents to suggest any additional measures they believe would improve residential streets. A total of 2,210 respondents provided comments; however, comments may contain multiple themes.

Figure 18: Other improvements for residential streets

Theme	Count
Maintenance, cleanliness and waste	554
Cycling and micromobility suggestions including enforcement	532
Traffic management and enforcement	492
Parking, parking enforcement and kerbside management	480
Do nothing / generally unsupportive	460
Greening, public realm and placemaking suggestions and concerns	405
Walking, wheeling and accessibility suggestions	357
EVs, car clubs and shared mobility suggestions and concerns	155
Opposition to specific measures (modal filters, one-ways)	122
Equity, displacement and impacts	115
Public transport improvements	97
Generally supportive	36
Comments about the survey	33
Children and play	25
Location-specific and wider city issues	24
Safety, security and anti-social behaviour	12

Comments raised a range of issues, the most common was around maintenance and cleanliness.

Transport issues, including cycling and micromobility, traffic and parking management and enforcement and public transport were raised.


Measures to improve public space, including greening, placemaking, play and community infrastructure, were also suggested.

Connector roads

Connector roads run along the edges of each neighbourhood and form the connections between them. Connector roads would be used by most of the vehicles passing through the area and they connect to other parts of Bristol. Bus routes tend to use connector roads, and they would also be important routes for walking, wheeling and cycling.

This would mean there would be less traffic on other residential streets.

Figure 19: Map of connector roads and high streets



On connector roads, the types of changes we proposed would make it safer and more convenient to walk, wheel and cycle and to cross the roads. Changes include:

- pedestrian crossing points
- side road junction improvements
- traffic calming – designed to be suitable for bus routes
- wider pavements

Traffic calming and wider pavements are likely to be suitable on the following roads only:


- Cannon Street
- Duckmoor Road
- North Street (a high street and connector road)
- West Street (a high street and connector road)

South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods: Consultation report 2026

Q11. Do you agree or disagree with designating some roads in the area as connector roads, which run along the edges of each neighbourhood and would be used by most of the vehicles passing through the area?

Question 11 asked residents whether they agreed or disagreed with designating certain roads as connector roads along the edges of neighbourhoods, intended to carry most through traffic. A total of 4,629 respondents answered this question.

Figure 20: Summary findings of views on designating some roads as connector roads



Overall views were mixed but slightly supported designating some roads as connector roads. 42% agree and 39% disagree.

Support was strongest in Totterdown (61%) and Windmill Hill (59%) and remained above half in The Chessels (55%), Totterdown East (54%) and Bedminster East (53%). By contrast, Ashton Vale (53% opposed) and Southville (47% opposed) have the strongest opposition.


See [appendix 1.10](#) for more information.

South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods: Consultation report 2026

Q12. Are there any roads listed as connector roads that you think should not be included as connector roads?

Question 12 asked residents whether any of the proposed connector roads should be excluded from the scheme. A total of 1,410 respondents provided comments.

Figure 21: Summary findings of roads that should not be included as connector roads



North Street was most mentioned followed by St John's Lane and Duckmoor Road/Luckwell Road (south).

See [appendix 1.11](#) for more information.

Q13. Are there any other roads you think should be included as connector roads?

Question 13 invited residents to suggest any additional roads that should be designated as connector roads. A total of 1,189 respondents provided comments, however comments may contain multiple themes.

Figure 22: Views on other roads that should be included as connector roads

Connector roads	Count
St Luke's Road	118
Raleigh Road	88
Stackpool Road	37
Beauley Road	31
Dean Lane	27
Greenway Bush Lane	23
Greville Road/Street	22
Luckwell Road	16
Roads outside project boundary	24
Roads already designated as connector roads	73
Other roads (10 suggestions or fewer)	104

The most suggested roads were St Luke's Road (21%) and Raleigh Road (15.7%).

A second group of streets were mentioned at lower levels, all of which are in Southville, and included Stackpool Road (6.6%), Beauley Road (5.5%), Dean Lane (4.8%), Greenway Bush Lane (4.1%), and Greville Road/Street (3.9%).

While the question asked about additional connector roads, respondents also used this section to raise a wider range of views. Comments about connector roads in general formed the largest share (36.4%), followed by comments indicating no change or general unsupportiveness (34.9%). General ideas about connector roads without naming a specific street (9.5%), and opposition relating to non-connector roads (6%). Smaller groups raised points about North Street pedestrianisation (2.5%) or expressed general support (0.8%).

Figure 23: Other comments about connector roads

Grouped theme	Original count
Do nothing / generally unsupportive	538
No / Not applicable / I don't know	152
Connector roads – general suggestions	147
Opposition – specific roads not connector roads	92
Traffic reduction / pedestrianisation (North Street)	39
General supportive	12

See [appendix 1.12](#) for more information.

Q14. How important do you think each of the following measures are for connector roads?


Q14.1. Pedestrian crossing points

Q14.2. Side road junction improvements that encourage vehicles to slow down and give way to pedestrians

Q14.3. Traffic calming (on Cannon Street, Duckmoor Road, North Street, West Street)

Q14.4. Wider pavements (on Cannon Street, Duckmoor Road, North Street, West Street)

Figure 24: Views on measures for connector roads



All measures were of some importance to at least 74% of respondents.

Pedestrian crossing points were the most important, with 90% of respondents rating them important in some way.

See [appendix 1.13](#) for more information.

South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods: Consultation report 2026

Q15. Are there any other things you think we should do to improve connector roads?

Question 15 invited residents to share any other ideas they had for improving connector roads.

A total of 3,196 responses were received, however comments may contain multiple themes.

Figure 25: Other improvements to connector roads

Theme	Count
Pedestrian improvements (priority, crossings, footway, junctions, visibility)	470
Unsupportive (general)	240
Speed reduction and traffic calming	205
Concern about traffic levels and traffic displacement	186
Cycle infrastructure	184
Do nothing	131
Opposition to pavement widening	125
Parking controls (enforcement, supply, RPS)	102
Road and path maintenance (signage, markings, lighting)	101
Environment and air quality	98
Make connector roads able to handle traffic	89
Opposition to designating some roads as connector roads	87
General support	84
Other (n/a responses)	60
Camera enforcement	57
Operational issues (access, passing points, loading, HGV)	50
Junction improvements, including visibility	49
Improve public transport	49
Opposition to North Street being designated as a connector road	35
Reduce traffic volumes	34
Opposition to loss of parking	34
Opposition to zebra crossings on junctions	21
Opposition to connector roads being within the Clean Air Zone	10
Other / existing issues – bins blocking paths.	10
Other	9

The most frequently raised comment was a suggestion to improve pedestrian infrastructure on main roads, including pavement widening and crossings.

Some respondents were concerned about designating some roads as connector roads and the level of traffic using them.


There were a range of other suggestions including maintenance, enforcement and sustainable transport improvements.

High streets

High streets have a mix of functions. They are key destinations for shopping and leisure. Some have a movement function similar to connector roads, including being bus routes. They are also important social spaces.

North Street, West Street, East Street, part of Wells Road and a section of Oxford Street in Totterdown are designated high streets in the Local Plan. These streets combine shopping, leisure and social functions and some carry significant local and through-traffic.

Figure 26: Map of high streets



On high streets the type of changes we proposed would make the streets more attractive, support local businesses and make it easier to walk and cycle. These include:

- pedestrian crossing points
- side road junction improvements
- traffic calming – this would be designed to be suitable for bus routes
- wider pavements
- seating
- street trees and greenery
- spill out space in the street for bars and cafes
- arts and culture programming
- visitor cycle parking

Q16. Are there other roads you think should be included as high streets?

Question 16 asked respondents whether there are other roads that should be included as high streets. A total of 808 respondents provided suggestions however comments may contain multiple themes.

Figure 27: Other roads that should be included as high streets

Street	Count
Bedminster Parade	161
Cannon Street	58
St John's Lane	56
Streets already designated as high streets	27
Other streets (fewer than 10 suggestions each)	83

Respondents also used this question to share views on high streets and other aspects of the scheme.

Figure 28: Other comments about high streets

Theme	Count
Oppose expanding high street list (generic)	230
Oppose all / do nothing	91
Questions and general suggestions	89
Wells Road scope (expand or focus)	49
No clear comment / unsure	39
Overall support for project	10
Consultation materials / engagement issues	10
Pedestrian improvements (crossings, pedestrianisation)	10
Oppose inclusion of specific streets	9
Scope expansion: include all roads	2
Physical constraints / feasibility (street width)	2
Traffic management and road function (one-way, widening)	2
Parking policy (RPS)	1

Respondents were primarily negative towards designating more streets as high streets or to all proposals.

A significant number of comments suggested expanding or reducing the length of Wells Road considered a high street.

See [appendix 1.14](#) for more information.

Q17. How important do you think each of the following measures are for high streets?

Q17.1. More seating

Q17.2. Pavement widening

Q17.3. Street trees and greenery

Q17.4. Spill out space in the street for bars and cafes

Q17.5. Arts and culture programming

Q17.6. More visitor cycle parking

Q17.7. More pedestrian crossing points


Q17.8. Side road junction improvements that encourage vehicles to slow down and give way to pedestrians

Q17.9. Traffic calming - suitable for bus routes

Q17.10. More pay and display parking

Q17.11. More Blue Badge Disabled parking

Figure 29: Summary findings of views on measures for high streets



All measures to improve high streets were of some importance to at least 68% of respondents.

Pedestrian crossing points were the most important (88%), followed by street trees and greenery (86%) whereas more pay and display parking was the least important (68%).

See [appendix 1.15](#) for more information.

Q18. Are there other things you think we should do to improve high streets?

Question 18 asked residents whether there are other things we should do to improve high streets. A total of 1,269 responses were received however comments may contain multiple themes.

Figure 30: Other things to improve high streets

Theme	Count
Parking supply, cost and enforcement	262
Do nothing	257
Pedestrian improvements including pavement widening and crossings	213
Maintenance and street management including lighting, surface, flooding and bins	196
Greening, pocket parks and social spaces	115
Cycling infrastructure and support	101
Business and scope of high street designation	89
Hospitality spill-out and arts and culture programming	88
Anti-social behaviour and policing	80
Disabled access and parking	62
Public transport improvements	59
Seating	53
Access control and road function including bus gates, closures and HGVs	49
Traffic and speed calming	48
Environment and pollution	21
Public toilets	15
Signage, wayfinding and public information	9

The largest proportion of comments was about the supply, cost and enforcement of parking.

Secondly, a large proportion of comments requested that no changes were made.

Following these two groups, a number of suggestions were made including pedestrian improvements, maintenance, public realm and cycle infrastructure.

Streets with schools and local centres

Streets with schools and local centres are sensitive sites used by large numbers of pedestrians, including children. They need to be safe and attractive locations where the speed and volume of traffic is managed carefully.


There are 13 schools in the South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods area and another 4 schools just outside the area.

There are 5 local centres in the Phase 1 neighbourhoods, and other local centres in the 8 Phase 2 neighbourhoods.

In Phase 1 (end of 2027), we proposed the following measures near all schools within the SBLN area and around the 5 local centres in the Phase 1 neighbourhoods:

- measures to reduce the speed and amount of traffic, including:
 - modal filters
 - School Streets
 - traffic calming, such as pavement build-outs to slow traffic
- other improvements to make it easier and more pleasant to walk and spend time outside, including:
 - improved walking routes, including crossing points and pavement widening
 - greenery – trees, planters and ground level planting
 - arts and culture programming

Figure 31: Map of schools and local centres




Responses are broken down by **neighbourhood**.

South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods: Consultation report 2026

Q19. Do you agree or disagree that the speed and volume of traffic should be reduced near **schools** to improve safety?

Question 19 asked residents whether they agreed or disagreed that reducing vehicle speed and the amount of traffic near schools would improve safety. A total of 4,682 people responded. This question relates to measures such as lower speed limits, slower driving, and having fewer cars around school entrances at busy times.

Figure 32: Summary findings of views on reducing speed and volume of traffic near schools



Across all respondents, 70% agreed with reducing vehicle speed and the number of cars near schools. This was fairly consistent across all neighbourhoods.


See [appendix 1.16](#) for more information.

South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods: Consultation report 2026

Q20. Do you agree or disagree that the speed and volume of traffic should be reduced near **local centres** to improve safety?

Question 20 asked people whether reducing the speed of vehicles and the volume of traffic near local centres would improve safety. A total of 4,663 people responded.

Figure 33: Summary findings of views of reducing speed and volume of traffic near local centres



Across all respondents, 53% agree with reducing the speed and volume of traffic near local centres, while 23% disagree.

Agreement varied among neighbourhoods with Windmill Hill and The Chessels agreeing the most.

Ashton Vale was the only neighbourhood with agreement below 50% (41%), although disagreement remained relatively low at 28%.


See [appendix 1.17](#) for more information.

South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods: Consultation report 2026

Q21. Do you agree or disagree that we should make other changes near **schools** to make it easier and more pleasant to walk and spend time outside?

Question 21 asked residents whether they agreed or disagreed that other changes near schools should be made to make it easier and more pleasant to walk and spend time outside. A total of 4,657 people responded.

Figure 34: Summary findings of views on other changes near schools



Overall, 55% of respondents agreed that other changes should be made near schools. This was fairly consistent across neighbourhoods, except in Ashton Vale where 42% of respondents agreed and 27% disagreed.


See [appendix 1.18](#) for more information.

South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods: Consultation report 2026

Q22. Do you agree or disagree that we should make other changes near **local centres** to make it easier and more pleasant to walk and spend time outside?

Question 21 asked residents whether other changes near local centres should be made to make it easier and more pleasant to walk and spend time outside. A total of 4,657 people responded.

Figure 35: Summary findings of views on other changes near local centres




Overall, 50% agreed and 23% disagreed and is fairly consistent across neighbourhoods, except for Southville and Ashton Vale which have lower levels of support (44% and 36% respectively).

See [appendix 1.19](#) for more information.

Q23. How important do you think each of the following measures are for streets with schools and local centres?

Question 23 asked residents how important different measures are for streets with schools and local centres. A total of 4,620 - 4,607 people responded across the measures.

Figure 36: Summary of importance for different measures on streets with schools and local centres



All measures on streets with schools and local centres were of some importance to at least 67% of respondents.

Improved walking routes were the most popular (84%) and arts and culture programming was the least popular (69%).

Figure 37: Highest and lowest important measures on streets with schools and local centres

Measures on streets with schools and local centres by neighbourhood				
Area	Highest importance measures		Lowest importance measures	
	Top 1	Top 2	Bottom 2	Bottom 1
Southville	Improved walking routes (51%)	More greenery (48%)	Modal filters (53%)	Arts and culture programming (52%)
Bedminster East	More greenery (76%)	Improved walking routes (74%)	School Streets (35%)	Modal filters (34%)

South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods: Consultation report 2026

Totterdown	More greenery (59%)	Improved walking routes (57%)	Arts and culture programming (38%)	Modal filters (38%)
Windmill Hill	Improved walking routes (66%)	More greenery (60%)	Modal filters (34%)	Arts and culture programming (32%)
The Chessels	Improved walking routes (66%)	More greenery (62%)	Arts and culture programming (38%)	Modal filters (36%)
Ashton Gate	Improved walking routes (58%)	More greenery (52%)	Arts and culture programming (49%)	Modal filters (42%)
Parson Street	Improved walking routes (58%)	More greenery (52%)	Arts and culture programming (48%)	Modal filters (44%)
Malago Vale	More greenery (61%)	Improved walking routes (61%)	Arts and culture programming (51%)	Modal filters (44%)
Perretts Park	Improved walking routes (62%)	More greenery (53%)	Arts and culture programming (53%)	Modal filters (39%)
Totterdown East	Improved walking routes (66%)	More greenery (62%)	Modal filters (46%)	School streets (45%)
Ashton Vale	Improved walking routes (41%)	More greenery (32%)	Arts and culture programming (74%)	Modal filters (60%)
Regeneration area	More greenery (69%)	Improved walking routes (63%)	School streets (50%)	Modal filters (43%)
Outside SBLN area	Improved walking routes (45%)	More greenery (44%)	Arts and culture programming (58%)	Modal filters (55%)
Location not stated	More greenery (37%)	Improved walking routes (35%)	Modal filters (66%)	Arts and culture programming (65%)

Across all neighbourhoods, improved walking routes and more greenery were consistently rated as the most important measures.

In contrast, lower importance ratings clustered around arts and culture programming and modal filters. Ashton Vale recorded the highest “low importance” ratings for arts programming (74%) and modal filters (60%). Southville showed more than half of residents placing arts programming (52%) and modal filters (53%) in the low-importance categories.

See [appendix 1.20](#) for more information.

South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods: Consultation report 2026

Q24. Are there other things you think we should do to improve streets with schools and local centres?

Question 24 asked residents whether there are other things that should be done to improve streets with schools and local centres. A total of 1,696 suggestions were received; however comments may contain multiple themes.

Figure 38: Summary of views on other measures to improve streets with schools and local centres

Theme	Count
Do nothing or generally unsupportive	331
Pedestrian safety and accessibility improvements	215
Restricting traffic including School Streets and modal filters	213
Environment, air quality and public realm	191
Parking and parking enforcement, including for school staff	138
Road and personal safety	136
Location-specific issues	125
Traffic calming	123
General sentiment / consultation stance	85
School crossing patrol and walking or cycling buses	76
Concern about traffic displacement	71
Cycling and micromobility	55
Public transport improvements	48
Generally supportive	40
Wider planning and development	21
Suggestions for other places to be designated as local centres	19
Allow access to residents	13
School operations including timings and entrances	11
Other	15


The largest share of comments was generally not supportive of changes.

This was followed by suggestions for pedestrian and accessibility improvements and restricting vehicle access on streets with schools and local centres, such as School Streets and modal filters.

Part B: Phase 1 neighbourhoods

We have designed proposals for three Phase 1 neighbourhoods where we are proposing the most changes by March 2027. These areas have been selected based on the number of traffic concerns and the level of support expressed in the 2024 engagement, their closeness to the city centre and strong links to the existing transport network.

Figure 39: Map of the three neighbourhoods in Phase 1



At this stage, we proposed to reduce through-traffic and unsafe speeds using:


- modal filters
- bus gates
- one-way streets

The Phase 1 neighbourhoods would also have measures to improve community space, including:

- street trees and greening
- parklets
- visitor cycle parking
- cycle hangars – secure resident cycle parking
- EV chargers – installed into lampposts
- car club bays – spaces for car sharing vehicles
- e-scooter and e-bike share parking areas

Q25. Please select which focus areas you want to answer questions on (select any which interest you).

Figure 40: Focus area neighbourhoods



See [appendix 1.21](#) for more information.

South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods: Consultation report 2026


Southville

Southville’s housing is mainly Victorian and Edwardian terraced homes, built before the motor car. The street layout has a grid-like street pattern and narrow roads. Local high streets and the city centre are within convenient walking distance. There are five school sites within this neighbourhood and two nearby secondary schools.

We proposed installing 12 modal filters in key locations to prevent cut-through traffic. Modal filters are bollards, planters, or cameras, which prevent motor vehicles passing through, while allowing access by walking, wheeling and cycling.

The modal filters would create four areas protected from through-traffic – see figure 41. All properties would remain accessible, although routes may change. Removing through-traffic would reduce traffic volumes and speeds and would make the area safer and more pleasant for walking, wheeling, and cycling.


Figure 41: Map of proposals to reduce through-traffic and unsafe speeds in Southville



Q26. Do you agree or disagree with the proposed measures to reduce through-traffic and unsafe speeds in Southville?

Question 26 asked residents for their views on measures to reduce traffic and speeds in Southville. A total of 2,580 people responded.

Figure 42: Summary findings of local views on Southville proposals



Overall, 28% agreed and 63% disagreed. In Southville, 23% agreed and 71% disagreed.

Neighbouring areas had higher levels of support but were still mixed.

See [appendix 1.22](#) for more information.

South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods: Consultation report 2026

Q27. If you have any comments about the proposed changes to how traffic would move in the Southville neighbourhood, please tell us here.

Question 27 asked residents to share comments about the proposed changes to how traffic would move in the Southville neighbourhood. A total of 3,282 comments were grouped into themes, however comments may contain multiple themes.

Figure 43: Summary findings of written views on Southville proposals

Theme	Total
Concern about traffic and network impacts	740
Concern about longer routes	461
Not needed / do nothing	330
Suggestions for traffic calming / one-ways	233
Concern about access for large and emergency vehicles and manoeuvrability at modal filters	151
Clean Air Zone issues, including access only through the CAZ	116
Support (general)	110
Concern about parking impacts	104
Suggestions for more connector roads	99
Generally unsupportive	98
Comments about connector roads junctions, especially Coronation Road	76
Concern that people are unable to choose sustainable transport options	72
Public transport comments or concerns	68
Concern that new routes include roads that are too narrow	64
Comments or concerns about Gathorne Road	60
Concern about impact on Disabled people	58
Active travel & pedestrian safety	54
New internal shortcuts, including Frayne Road and Alpha Road	51
Milford Street comments, including Home Zone impact and one-way reversal	47
Concern about business impacts	46
Suggestions for exemptions, for example for residents or peak time closures	32
Comments about local developments, including Amarind Grove	28
Concern about parking impact	20
Traffic flow suggestions	19
Suggestions for liveable neighbourhoods elsewhere	18
General transport comments	17
Residents' Parking Scheme comments	16
Concern about impact on people, including personal safety and gentification	16
Suggestions for public realm and greening	15
Suggestions for implementation, including trial or phasing	13
Suggestions for School Street, mostly at Myrtle Street	13
Suggestions for parking enforcement and junction protection	10
Suggestions to enforce traffic	10
Other (fewer than 10 comments each)	13

The largest proportion of comments showed concern for the impact on traffic if the scheme were implemented, including displacement of traffic and the resilience of the network if there were closures, for example on Coronation Road. Further comments raised concerns about the scheme, including increased journey times stating there was not an issue with traffic. There was also a range of further suggestions.


Q28. Do you agree or disagree with the proposals for Ashton Gate School?

Question 28 asked residents for their views on the proposals for Ashton Gate School. A total of 2,519 people responded.

Figure 44: Visualisation of proposals for Ashton Gate School



Figure 45: Summary findings of local views on Ashton Gate School proposals



Overall, 45% agree and 28% disagree.

Support in Southville is similar (44% agree and 25% disagree). In neighbouring area Ashton Gate, 57% agree and 25% disagree.

See [appendix 1.23](#) for more information.

South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods: Consultation report 2026

Q29. If you have any comments or suggestions on the proposals for Ashton Gate School, please provide them below.

Question 29 asked residents to provide comments or suggestions on the proposals for Ashton Gate School. A total of 590 comments were grouped into themes, however comments may contain multiple themes.

Figure 46: Summary findings of written views on proposals for Ashton Gate School

Theme	Count
Suggestion for School Street	91
Do nothing	79
Alternative suggestions including one-ways, traffic calming or modal filters	79
Traffic displacement	74
General support, including to improve safety for children	57
Access for emergency and large vehicles	47
Suggestion for pedestrian improvements, including crossings	33
Location-specific constraints (too narrow)	21
Concern about impact on residents and businesses	19
Public realm and greening improvements	13
General survey comments or queries	12
Road Safety Education for parents and children	8
Public transport, Clean Air Zone (CAZ) and EVs	9
Concern about road safety outside of school as a result of conflicts	9
Suggestion for exemptions or parking for residents or the school	8
Suggestion to enforce existing parking rules	6
Concern about equity of proposals	6
Suggestion to improve cycle infrastructure	5
General opposition	4
Concern about loss of parking	4
Other	1

The largest proportion of comments were suggestions for a School Street timed closure instead of a modal filter. This was followed by suggestions to do nothing and alternative suggestions for one-ways, traffic-calming or modal filters.

South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods: Consultation report 2026

Q30. Do you agree or disagree with the proposals for Gathorne Road?

Following feedback from the community, we propose to close the end of Gathorne Road to traffic at the North Street junction using modal filters. This would:

- make it easier to cross the road
- create spill out space for hospitality
- release space for greenery and arts and culture programming


Gathorne Road would be made two-way and double yellow lines would be installed to create a turning space for vehicles.

Figure 17: Visualisation of proposals for Gathorne Road



Question 30 asked residents for their views on the proposals for Gathorne Road. A total of 2,534 responses were analysed, with results broken down by neighbourhood

Figure 48: Summary findings of local views on Gathorne Road proposals



Overall, 33% agreed and 50% disagreed.

In Southville, 27% agreed and 52% disagreed. In neighbouring Ashton Gate, 40% agreed and 43% disagreed.

See [appendix 1.24](#) for more information.

South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods: Consultation report 2026

Q31. If you have any comments or suggestions on the proposals for Gathorne Road please provide them below.

Question 31 asked residents to provide comments or suggestions on the proposals for Gathorne Road. A total of 1,195 comments were grouped into themes, however comments may contain multiple themes.

Figure 4918: Summary findings of written views on proposals for Gathorne Road

Theme	Count
Concern about traffic movement including displacement, manoeuvring and longer routes	258
Concern that proposal was not needed and that there was not demand for seating here	254
Concern about loss of parking	134
Alternative proposals including suggestions for other roads such as Exeter Road and Raleigh Road	80
Generally support	65
Concern that road isn't wide enough to be made two-way	61
Concern about access for emergency and large vehicles	52
Suggestions for side road improvements including crossings and build-outs	52
Suggestions for public realm and design of the space, including comments that the proposals were ugly	41
Comments about servicing and delivery vehicles	36
Concern about impact on businesses	30
Concern about anti-social behaviour and personal safety	31
Support for proposals because of improved crossing	17
Suggestions for controlling or enforcing parking	15
Suggestions for cycle infrastructure improvements	15
Supplementary proposals including passing and turning places	13
Request for additional consultation	9
Suggestions for public transport improvements	7

The highest proportion of comments were concerns about traffic movement, including displacement, manoeuvring and longer routes. This was closely followed by concern that the proposals were not needed either for traffic purposes or that there was no need for seating in this area.

Following comments were concerned about the loss of parking.

Bedminster East


The Bedminster East neighbourhood is the area bordered by Bedminster Parade, Malago Road, Sheene Road, Cannon Street, part of Dean Lane, Catherine Mead Street, St John’s Road, and Coronation Road (figure 50). This is part of the existing Bedminster East Residents’ Parking Scheme area. The streets to the west are in the proposed Southville neighbourhood. The streets to the east have improvements planned as part of regeneration projects – we do not describe these here.

The Bedminster East neighbourhood includes the partially pedestrianised East Street high street. Many of the side streets have already been closed or have modal filters to prevent through-traffic. The area is a mix of commercial and residential uses. The South of the neighbourhood is also part of the Bedminster Green regeneration area, providing new homes, mixed-use buildings and public spaces.

East Street is often used by motor vehicles that ignore the bus gate, which makes the road less safe for pedestrians and cyclists. The junction of East Street, Cannon Street and British Road is also difficult to cross as a pedestrian or cyclist. Cannon Street has narrow pavements which makes walking more difficult.

As part of Phase 1 of the SBLN project, we proposed to improve the gateways at both ends of the pedestrianised section of East Street, at the junctions with Cannon Street and Lombard Street. This would make East Street more accessible by walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport. These gateways would need further co-design with businesses and the community and could include more space for pedestrians, seating, trees and greening, and arts and culture.


Figure 50: Map of proposals for Bedminster East



Q32. Do you agree or disagree with the proposals for Bedminster East?

Question 32 asked residents for their views on the proposals for Bedminster East. A total of 1,369 responses were analysed across neighbourhoods.

Figure 5119: Summary findings of local views on Bedminster East proposals



Overall, 50% agreed and 35% disagreed.

Within Bedminster East, 71% agreed and 20% disagreed.

In neighbouring areas, support was higher in The Chessels and Windmill Hill and broadly similar in Parson Street, the regeneration area (centred around Whitehouse Street) and Southville.

See [appendix 1.25](#) for more information.

Q33. If you have any comments or suggestions on the proposals for Bedminster East neighbourhood, please provide them below.

Question 33 asked residents to provide comments or suggestions on the proposals for the Bedminster East neighbourhood. A total of 604 comments were grouped into themes, however comments may contain multiple themes.

Figure 52: Summary findings of written views on Bedminster East proposals

Theme	Count
Suggestions for pedestrian improvements, including crossings, priority and pedestrianisation	72
Do nothing	71
Suggestions for public transport and bus priority improvements	71
Suggestions for cycle infrastructure improvements	53
Concern about historic and upcoming transport changes including East Street pedestrianisation, Bedminster Bridges changes and Clean Air Zone	41
Support for improving safety for cycling	34
Concern about anti-social behaviour and the economic vitality of the area	28
Public realm and high street improvements	26
Location-specific references	24
Concern about conflict between pedestrians and cyclists	19
Support for local centre improvements	18
Opposition to widening pavements, reducing parking or road space	16
Suggestions for parking and kerbside measures	15
Comments about survey format	13
Suggestions to widen or resurface pavements	10
Concern proposals are not ambitious enough	10
Other (under 10 suggestions each)	54

The largest proportion of comments were suggestions for pedestrian improvements, including crossings, priority and pedestrianisation.

This was followed by suggestions to do nothing and suggestions to improve public transport, including bus priority.

Totterdown

Totterdown has a number of steeply sloping streets and steps. This can be a challenge for people who want to walk, wheel or cycle.

Totterdown's streets are often dominated by vehicles. Pedestrian access can be challenging due to narrow and cluttered pavements. There is good access to shops and public transport on Wells Road, but Totterdown has no bus service at the western side of the neighbourhood.


There are important green corridors within the area. These are natural routes like tree-lined paths, parks or green spaces that connect different parts of the neighbourhood. They are pleasant for walking, wheeling and cycling and allow people to enjoy nature.

We proposed:

- a bus gate on St Luke's Road to prevent traffic cutting through the area
- a modal filter on William Street between the junctions of Henry Street and Cambridge Street (between The Shakespeare and The Sundial Kitchen)
- to make most of the roads within the Totterdown neighbourhood one-way. This would prevent vehicle stand-offs and reversing
- options to prevent through-traffic on Cambridge Street

We also proposed a new one-way on Angers Road in the adjacent Totterdown East neighbourhood. This would prevent traffic shortcutting from Bath Road to Wells Road.


Figure 53: Map of proposals to reduce through-traffic and unsafe speeds in Totterdown. Note access to car park on Oxford Street is retained.



Q34: Do you agree or disagree with the proposed measures (bus gates, modal filter and one-way streets) to reduce through-traffic and unsafe speeds in Totterdown neighbourhood?

Question 34 asked residents for their views on measures to reduce traffic and speeds in Totterdown. A total of 1,325 responses were analysed across neighbourhoods.

Figure 54: Summary findings of local views on Totterdown proposals



Overall, 29% agreed and 64% disagreed.

The proposals were more popular in Totterdown East with 42% agreeing and 47% disagreeing.

See [appendix 1.26](#) for more information.

Q35: Do you agree or disagree with option 1 and option 2 for Bellevue Road access?


Option 1: full time one-way on Cambridge Street

Option 2: Timed closure weekday mornings only

Question 35 asked residents for their views on Bellevue Road Option 1 (a full-time one-way on Cambridge Street) and Option 2 (a weekday-morning timed closure).

A total of 1,254 responses were analysed for option 1 and 1,256 for option 2 across neighbourhoods.

Figure 55: Summary findings of local views on Bellevue Road access



Overall, 21% supported option 1 and 33% supported option 2 (56% disagreed with option 1 and 42% disagreed with option 2).

In Totterdown, 19% supported option 1 and 64% supported option 2 (67% disagreed with option 1 and 25% disagreed with option 2).

See [appendix 1.27](#) for more information.

Q36: If you have any comments about the proposed changes to how traffic would move in the Totterdown neighbourhood - or the part of Totterdown East affected by the proposed Angers Road one-way - please tell us here.

Question 36 asked residents to provide comments on the proposed changes to how traffic would move within Totterdown and the part of Totterdown East affected by the proposed Angers Road one-way system. A total of 1,228 comments were grouped into themes, however comments may contain multiple themes.

Figure 56: Summary findings of written views on Totterdown proposals

Theme	Count
Concerns about measures to reduce traffic volumes: bus gates, modal filters, Clean Air Zone and public transport	384
One-way systems and direction changes	309
Traffic displacement	102
Business and deliveries impact	80
Driving convenience and distance for car users	64
Road closures and restricted access (including timed/resident-only)	56
Suggestion to do nothing	44
Environment, greening and streetscape/signage	30
Road safety, junctions and signals (speed/calming/turns)	29
General unsupportive	22
General support	17
Bellevue Road access suggestions	16
Connector roads and network performance	14
Access and equity (emergency services, disabled, mosque users)	12
Active travel infrastructure (walking and cycling)	11
Consultation and engagement	11
Cost and value for money	11
Other (fewer than 10 suggestions)	8

Most comments raised concerns about proposals to reduce traffic volumes (bus gates and modal filters). A high level of concern was also raised about the proposed one-way changes.

Otherwise, issues were raised about the perceived impacts including traffic displacement, impact on businesses, and inconvenience for drivers.

5.2 Business operations survey

87 businesses completed the business operations survey.

The survey asked for information about business operations, including deliveries, collections, staff travel and parking.

The results will be used to aid design of Liveable Neighbourhood measures in specific locations and incorporate business needs whenever possible. Through the survey, a number of businesses indicated their interest in taking advantage of opportunities, including using more pavement space.

6 Stakeholder feedback and suggestions

All stakeholder feedback represents the views of the organisations or individuals that submitted them and not necessarily the views of the council.

6.1 Feedback from community organisations

Action Greater Bedminster (AGB)

AGB shared the following notes from their session with older people at St Frances Church:

The older people's group at St Frances Church valued the session held by AGB on 22.10.25. There were 22 individuals in attendance, and all took a paper copy of the survey. Some at this group needed transport or support to attend, which applied equally to the Drop-In sessions.

They raised concerns about access for carers and relatives, particularly in the areas where a resident's parking schemes were planned. However, they also raised issues which were potentially outside the scope of Liveable Neighbourhoods Scheme. Poor pavement maintenance, including leaves and damage by tree roots came up in the discussion.

The voice of Disabled residents was harder to reach but contact was made with the local BS3 Group. Paper copies of the survey were offered and distributed. Those with poor mobility felt that they were disadvantaged by the proposals, as access to key venues was reduced. Many described the need to use a car. Again, they raised concerns about access for carers and relatives, particularly in the areas where a resident's parking schemes were planned. There were 4 attendees.

Bristol Disability Equality Forum (BDEF)

BDEF shared the following comments from their engagement sessions:

Disabled people in South Bristol are trying to understand how the proposed South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods (SBLN) scheme will affect their daily lives. They are already facing social and economic pressures, cuts to public services, and long-standing barriers to access. Because of this, changes to roads, parking, public transport, and neighbourhood design cannot be viewed separately from people's real-life needs. These decisions directly affect Disabled residents' safety, independence, wellbeing, and ability to take part in their communities.

Many Disabled people who took part in the research felt they would be disproportionately affected by the SBLN proposals. Measures aimed at reducing car use may unintentionally increase inequality if essential access needs are not fully considered. For many Disabled people, cars, taxis, carers, and visitors are not optional — they are essential for daily life. Changes that increase journey distances, reduce parking, or block direct routes can lead to isolation, difficulty reaching healthcare and services, increased safety risks, and poorer mental health.

The consultation process itself also caused distress. Some Disabled residents felt anxious, frustrated, and excluded, and some felt the scheme penalised them for being Disabled. Accessible information, including Easy Read versions, was released late, making it hard for many people to take part fairly. This made the process feel reactive instead of genuinely collaborative.

Residents also highlighted several elements they strongly supported. Many welcomed measures to create more people-focused neighbourhoods, particularly the addition of benches and rest areas, which they felt would help those with mobility impairments, chronic conditions, fatigue, or pain to travel further and participate more fully in community life.

Residents also responded positively to plans for more green space, improved public areas, and cleaner, safer neighbourhoods. They particularly valued the council's collaboration with a Disabled People's Organisation (DPO) to deliver targeted outreach sessions, describing these as a rare opportunity to speak openly in a safe and accessible setting where their experiences were taken seriously.

The report calls for early co-design, clear communication, and accessible engagement throughout. Truly inclusive neighbourhoods require recognising Disabled people as experts in their own lives and embedding accessibility and equity from the start.

Bristol Jamia Mosque, Totterdown

Bristol Jamia Mosque is the most senior and oldest mosque in Bristol and the only mosque in south Bristol. Over 220 people attend the mosque every day and over 520 on Fridays.

Less than 5% of users live within Totterdown, 25% live within the Brislington/Bedminster area and the remaining 70% travel from the rest of Bristol.

90% of all users drive to the mosque.

An approximate total of 836 signatures were collected from mosque users into a petition against:

- A Residents' Parking Scheme (RPS) in Totterdown.
- A bus gate on St Luke's Road.
- One-way streets in Totterdown.

Users felt that their ability to visit the mosque would be made more difficult.

Totterdown Residents Environmental and Social Action CIC (TRESA)

TRESA was formed in November 2005 by a group of Totterdown residents keen to bring together local people for the benefit of the environment we live in and the things we do in it. In May 2008, TRESA became a Community Interest Company.

TRESA ran a questionnaire which was available at: Bristol City Council drop-in events at The Old Picture House and The Harbour; street survey outside Tesco in Totterdown Square, and at The Bakehouse and The Banana Boat in Oxford Street.

138 people completed the questionnaire between 9 October and 9 November 2025.

There is opposition to:

- The St Luke's Road bus gate
- Permanent no through exit from Cambridge Street to Bellevue Road/Wells Road
- No through traffic on William Street between junctions with Henry Street and Cambridge Street

- Oxford Street part one-way beyond the car park entrance for vehicles from St John's Lane
- The one-way street system

There is notably more support than opposition for:

- Camera enforcement of existing no exit Cambridge Street to Bellevue Road/Wells Road Mon-Fri, 7am-10am
- No left turn from Bath Road into Angers Road
- School street restrictions for Hillcrest Primary School (Cemetery Road)

Views are broadly balanced for and against a Residents' Parking Scheme.

Victoria Park Bowling Club, Windmill Hill

Victoria Park Bowling Club is concerned that a proposed RPS in Windmill Hill would prevent people from accessing the club. The club has over 60 bowling members plus additional non-bowling members. They also have a clubhouse used for social and community events.

They note that many of their members are older and reliant on their car because their bowls are too heavy to travel long distances with.

Proposed solutions:

- RPS timings to run from 8am to 1pm, allowing for afternoon access.
- Make an area available for bowlers to park in.
- Make the parking side of Nutgrove Avenue available for bowlers after 1pm.

6.2 Feedback from schools

Compass Point Primary, The Chessels

Below is a summary of conversations had with the school:

- The school has a large number of children with SEND, meaning a number of taxis arrive every day. The school would be hesitant to a full-time closure on South Street for this reason.
- The school uses South Street Park as their school field and children cross the road every day.
- Existing traffic islands on South Street lead to people parking cars on the pavement. Some people also park on the hatched middle of the road.
- The school previously applied for CIL funding but was unsuccessful. However, plans were drawn up which also included Blue Badge parking, wider pavements and a raised table, which the school liked. They noted this was similar to the raised table and priority give-way in front of Southville Primary School on Merrywood Road.
- Other ideas mentioned included making South Street one-way, although this may encourage people to drive past the school and a timed School Street closure. Street art could also make the area more attractive.
- RPS proposals were briefly touched on but more consideration was needed.

Southville Primary School, Southville

Below is a summary of conversations had with the school:

Merrywood site:

- Concern was raised about the pick-up and drop-off and vehicular access between the Merrywood and Myrtle sites. Under the proposals, vehicles would have to exit onto Coronation Road, drive to St John's Road, Dean Lane and North Street to access Myrtle Street.
- Concern about the proposed reversed one-way on Milford Street and that this would result in increased traffic behind the school where there is an entrance/exit. There are no pavements on Milford Street as it is a Home Zone.
- Concern about coach access which is needed weekly. Currently buses travel from Coronation Road onto Dean Lane, Stackpool Road and then exit via Beasley Road. There was concern that coaches would not be able to turn around or make a loop.
- Concern about proposed RPS in the Chessels with regard to staff recruitment and retention. The school does have a small car park (7 spaces), but it is leased out to raise funds for the school. The possibility of business permits was discussed and was to be explored. The school would require around 25 permits and a solution for visitors.
- There is an existing issue with bin lorry access. When road markings were redone, the loading area was not repainted and now vehicles park in the way.

Myrtle site:

- Interested in exploring a timed School Street closure on Myrtle Street at pick-up and drop-off times. If implemented, an appropriate Park and Stride site would need to be located.
- Interested in a zebra crossing at the junction with North Street as children move between the two sites throughout the day, not just at pick-up and drop-off.

Southville Primary School governors, Southville

Concerns:

- Safety on Myrtle Street. Despite many requests not to, vehicles often park on the zigzags or pavements.
- Loss of staff parking. Staff often park in the Chessels which is proposed to receive an RPS. They are concerned this will lead to greater staff turnover.
- Safety on Milford Street. The pre-school and after school club both have an entrance/exit on Milford Street. Under the current proposals, the governors are concerned that parents might park on Milford Street if travelling from the south as Stackpool Road would not be accessible without driving a farther distance.
- Travel between sites.
 - Walking between sites occurs daily via Milford Street, Greville Road, Mount Pleasant Terrace, Fairfield Place, King William Street, North Street, Myrtle Street and vice versa. The governors are concerned about increased traffic on Greville Street and Milford Street more dangerous
 - Driving between sites occurs often for safeguarding and logistical reasons. These journeys would take much longer.
- Coach access to Merrywood site. Currently buses travel from Coronation Road onto Dean Lane, Stackpool Road and then exit via Beauley Road. Governors are concerned that coaches would not be able to turn around or make a loop.
- Food deliveries to Merrywood site. The kitchen is accessed from Merrywood Road (blue area) meaning they would have to travel via Greville Street then Milford Street, or Kingston Road which are narrow.
- North Street traffic displacement. The governors are concerned that traffic could increase on North Street which is used by children, parents and staff when travelling between sites.

Proposed solutions:

- Make Myrtle Street a School Street.
- Provide free parking permits to school staff, provide safer cycling, and more reliable public transport.
- Retain Milford Street one-way and use timed cameras instead of modal filters on Merrywood Road, Greville Street and Leighton Road to allow school traffic.
- Conduct a traffic impact assessment on roads between the two sites.
- Remove the Stackpool Road modal filter at the junction with Dean Lane or make it camera enforced with coach access.

6.3 Feedback from resident groups

Residents of Ashton Gate Road and Ashton Gate Terrace, Southville

31 residents of Ashton Gate Road and Ashton Gate Terrace wrote to Ashton Gate Primary School to express their concerns around the proposed modal filter on Ashton Gate Road, in front of the primary school.

Their main concerns were:

- Unsafe access to Ashton Gate Terrace and Ashton Gate Road. Residents were concerned that Ashton Gate Terrace and Back Road are too narrow and too steep for access, especially for large vehicles, including emergency services.
- Difficulty turning around on Ashton Gate Road or Ashton Gate Terrace, instead of being able to exit via Greenway Bush Lane.
- Unclear justification for permanently closing the road. While the residents agree with the need to keep the road clear at pick-up and drop-off times, they suggest a timed closure with removable or rising bollards, allowing residents to use the road at other times.
- Traffic displacement onto North Street and Coronation Road, increasing pollution and road safety issues.
- Increased traffic on Greenway Bush Lane as a result of modal filters on Greenway Bush Lane, Greenbank Road and Walter Street.
- Increased anti-social behaviour.

The residents note that many of them are reliant on their cars for work.

Residents of Gathorne Road, Southville

40 residents of Gathorne Road wrote to the team and local ward councillors to express their concerns about the proposal to install a modal filter on Gathorne Road at the junction with North Street.

Their main concerns were:

- The modal filter is not positioned between two traffic areas, meaning that it will not reduce traffic in the area.
- Traffic on Gathorne Road appears to be local traffic, not cut-through traffic. Most of the cut-throughs occur on Raleigh Road or Greville Road.
- Air pollution would increase as a result of vehicles having to turn around and drive the route of the road again rather than exit more quickly onto North Street.
- Lack of space for two-way traffic to pass, including large vehicles blocking the road and lack of space for large vehicles to turn around.
- Loss of car parking spaces. The residents estimated a loss of 12-14 spaces for the modal filter and associated turning space.
- Negative impact on Disabled people and people with illnesses due to loss of parking, risk of becoming stuck behind a large vehicle.
- Reduced road safety as a result of vehicles manoeuvring around the modal filter.

- Lack of need for seating at the end of Gathorne Road. Only Parson's Bakery is seen as benefitting from the seating and could increase noise and anti-social behaviour.

Suggestions:

- Reverse the one-way flow and install a traffic light at the Raleigh Road and North Street junction, or
- Install the previously approved build-outs at the Gathorne Road and North Street junction
- Improve public transport and alternatives to driving

Residents of Greenbank Road, Southville

34 residents of Greenbank Road wrote to the team and the Transport and Connectivity Committee to express their concerns about the proposals in the area, including modal filters on Greenbank Road, Greenway Bush Lane and Ashton Gate Road. The proposal for a modal filter on Greenbank Road also included converting Greenbank Road from one-way to two-way traffic.

Their main concerns were:

- Lack of local engagement and assessment. Residents were concerned that the team was not aware how narrow Greenbank Road is and the potential loss of parking that would be required to make the road two-way. This was seen to increase road safety risk and make it more difficult for emergency and large vehicles to access the area.
- Negative community impact. Residents were concerned that the proposals would increase the volume of traffic on North Street leading to increased pollution, including around schools and increase inequality. The proposals would also lead to longer driving routes for some journeys.
- Inadequate data, representation and consultation. Residents were concerned that the proposals appeared to be based on feedback from around 50 people a number of years ago. They also had concerns that the SBLN survey is too long and confusing, leading to inaccurate survey responses. They request updated, accessible and transparent data, including:
 - traffic flow and safety studies for each affected road
 - Equality Impact Assessments covering access for Disabled people, school safety and socio-economic fairness
 - air pollution modelling for all streets

To address these concerns, residents suggest:

- Widening the Clean Air Zone boundary to include Southville and Greenbank Road to discourage polluting vehicles from shortcutting through the area.
- Using temporary School Street barriers instead of a permanent closure on Ashton Gate Road, outside of Ashton Gate Primary School.
- Improving public transport connections to Temple Meads and Ashton Gate.
- Implementing continuous cycle routes.
- Use an ANPR camera on Greenbank Road with access for residents.
- Trial any changes for at least 12 months.

- Use traffic calming and bus gates instead of physical modal filters to allow access for residents and emergency services.
- Address match-day parking

The letter ended with a request to pause the SBLN implementation before addressing the above concerns.

“Stop Southville Roadblocks!” petition

The “Stop Southville Roadblocks!” petition was presented to the Transport and Connectivity Committee on 23 October after meeting the threshold for debate (1,500 signatures).

The petition text is outlined below.

The roadblocks (modal filters) will:

- Delay emergency services, carers, delivery services, waste services and tradespeople
- Displace traffic unnecessarily, increasing safety risks and pollution
- Unnecessarily and disproportionately increase distance and journey time for essential vehicle trips
- Create traffic bottlenecks and congestion on smaller roads
- Make it harder to access shops, schools, and health services
- Create unsafe dead-end roads
- Reduce parking availability
- Trap some residents inside the Clean Air Zone (CAZ) with no exemptions for non-compliant vehicles

Our concerns about the consultation

- We don't believe the consultation process has been adequate or transparent.
- Many residents do not feel properly informed of the details of the proposals. Details such as road blocks are presented towards the end of the consultation survey after much of the response has been gathered.
- We are also concerned that the consultation process has not allowed space for objections or alternative ideas, and that key data, such as traffic modelling and emergency access plans, has not been shared.

Community suggested alternatives to road blocks

We urge the Council to consider more inclusive and practical alternatives, including:

- Raised zebra crossings at the end of roads to replace modal filters to slow traffic and improve pedestrian safety
- Road narrowing for traffic calming instead of full closures
- Improved cycling infrastructure to local streets
- A more transparent and inclusive consultation process that reflects lived experience

What we would like from the Bristol City Council

- An immediate halt to the South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood scheme in its current form.
- A comprehensive review and re-evaluation of the Southville neighbourhood proposals, taking into account the overwhelming opposition to modal filters from local residents and businesses.
- The development of alternative, more cost-effective, and community-supported measures (zebra crossings, traffic calming measures) that will reduce congestion, improve safety, and protect our local economy, without the waste of public funds or disruption to our daily lives.

Survey of Southville residents

There were 70 responses, some of which represented multiple people due to access issues (elderly etc. as it was online only). 95% of the respondents were from BS3, those that weren't were either:

- Undisclosed
- Business owner in the area
- Supporting people in the area

The main concerns included:

- Lack of consultation, transparency and trust
- Perceived lack of evidence or justification for the scheme
- Displacement of traffic and increased congestion
- Emergency services, access and safety risks
- Impact on vulnerable residents
- Impact on local businesses and community services
- Parking concerns and loss of spaces
- Dividing the community into “zones”
- Public transport isn't good enough to support modal shift
- Anxiety, emotional stress and mental health impact
- Criticism of the design
- Cost and use of public money
- Perceived political agenda
- Personal safety concerns
- Structural concerns about New Cut and Cumberland Basin walls
- Scheme clarity, maps and communication failures
- Objectives are unclear
- Co-design, consultation quality and democratic legitimacy
- Economic impact on businesses
- Contingency planning and resilience
- Maintenance
- Undermining access and mobility for residents
- Trust, accountability and motives
- Specific questions about practical issues e.g. CAZ charges