

CLEVELAND POOLS CONSULTATION FOR THE BATHWICK ESTATE – COMMENTARY

All the comments made on the returned forms have been recorded below in full (with one exception where sensitive personal information has been omitted). The comments are ordered by street area, and within that by the question commentary box used, and then by the answer to the question (if any). Some responses answered at least some questions but made no comments.

River Flats (i.e Forester and Rochfort Courts, Horton House)

1.Should Pools be Restored?

YES	NO
I have happy memories of swimming there as a child. But it has to be in keeping with the local environment and developed for local people as well as visitors. I consider it will be a delightful addition to our current beautiful Estate. Great for families.	Make some more houses instead. Who cares about the pools; don't you see how high the rents are in Bath?

NO INDICATION GIVEN

2.Is CPT's plan a good way of restoring Pools?

YES	NO
Fantastic. The current plans make full use of the site and locals could enjoy this as well as others. It will be very special.	The nature of their business can change and there is concern about the amount of private functions that may go on late into the evening. A social enterprise is still a money- making business.

NO INDICATION GIVEN

3. Is CPT's plan good for residential community?

YES	NO
<p>I think the local impacts you list would be rather minor. Wonderful to have a heated outdoor pool in the city. Yes, as in a great local facility to enjoy. But...concerned about people travelling by car to get here. A bus service should be considered.</p>	<p>It will increase traffic despite signage in an already congested area. Also noise, pollution/litter. Too many cars.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN

4. Is CPIN's plan good way of restoring Pools?

YES	NO
<p>It will be better for the environment and will be consistent in its usage. An asset to local people, not just tourists. But it would be a shame if we could not have the pools. We have several other parks and café's already. I'm more likely to use it if I could swim there.</p>	<p>I don't think the plans are sustainable or practical.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN
Would still like a pool.

5. Is CPIN's plan good for residential community?

YES	NO
<p>I think it would impact less on residents and be an asset to the community. There will probably be less people using the facilities which would have less impact on immediate neighbours.</p>	<p>I can't see it getting much use.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN
We have a small playpark and gardens etc in Sydney Gardens.

6. Which plan do you prefer?

CPT	CPIN
We should preserve the heritage of the pools for future generations. Ignoring the finances of the project, of which I am not aware in detail. Without doubt. I would prefer to have the swimming pools and consider that perhaps winter use should be extended to weekends so families could use the space and café.	

NO INDICATION GIVEN

7. Anything else?

With regard to parking /extra people, I don't see it having any more impact than the boating station- which is also a unique addition to the area.

Car parking in the streets around (the) area.

The long opening hours of CPT's plan and amount of visitors would be detrimental to the environment/the residents/and is likely to be of appeal to only tourists/visitors to Bath so will not benefit local people.

Public funding should go to better and more urgent use (e.g. affordable rent for old people, public care, environmental initiatives)

I think the most important thing is that the Cleveland Pools are restored; and that either proposal is vastly preferable to the status quo.

CPIN's proposal will still impact on all residents as visitors will still come, in the same amounts as CPT's plan. I would rather it go back to what it was as a pool!

I am delighted that this area will be restored and look forward to finally enjoying it when completed.

Powlett Road, including Powlett Court

1.Should Pools be Restored?

YES	NO
<p>This quirky historic gem should not be left to rot. But not on this scale. Yes most definitely – great resource. Both from a preservation of architectural heritage and a beneficial resource for the community point of view. For Bath residents only. It would provide a wonderful community resource beyond this estate, has cultural/heritage importance to Bath and beyond.</p>	

NO INDICATION GIVEN

2.Is CPT's plan a good way of restoring Pools?

YES	NO
<p>On balance, yes. Some would be comforted by an access and transport plan. There should also be consideration of specific opening hours, and "rest" days for the benefit of neighbours. Website vision very good – my son enjoyed original; so did I. Preserving but improving is fine. Yes, Yes, Yes. While parents with over inflated house prices in mind may not like it, the local children who could once again use this for school swimming disagree!! Parking impact can be managed.</p>	<p>Over ambitious and probably not viable.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN

I don't think you can leave aside the impact on the Estate -it would be huge.

3. Is CPT's plan good for residential community?

YES	NO
<p>Most of the community would not be affected one way or the other. Its catchment would be wider – Regional? National? I have lived with my family in Bathwick since original pool was in use. So, yes, it would be great to modernise and bring back. But there would need to be clear parking restrictions – there would need to be NO PARKING. Yes,yes,yes. This is something we should be proud to have on our doorstep. We are trustees of an architectural/community gem and should raise above petty personal, narrow-minded fear/concerns. Shameful!</p>	<p>Little attention has been paid to access, parking or community issues. Have the CPT stated what these benefits are? Absolutely not – it's bad enough living next door to a nursery 5 days a week- increased traffic/pollution and no parking facilities.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN

4. Is CPIN's plan good way of restoring Pools?

YES	NO
	<p>Not realistic – a feeble cop-out unworthy of any level of funding, if that was even available. There should be some opportunity for adult swimming. Not sure water garden would work – visitors' centre – why? Difficult to comment on outline plans. I would prefer to restore to its historic use. Not as a Heritage Visitor Centre but yes for Bath residents only use – there is no parking for visitors. This is the narrow minded concerns of the few at the expense of the majority.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN
Cannot comment. Insufficient information.

5. Is CPIN's plan good for residential community?

YES	NO
<p>I would say yes if only to stop speculators trying to develop some hideous building for greed.</p>	<p>Cannot imagine that members of the community would take any pride(in)/patronise this. It misses the point. There should be some opportunity for adult swimming. Considering our weather, and the number of residents without small children, I can see little benefit. Unless both Pools are restored, given [?] green policy I think Bathwick residents on foot and cyclists would predominate. There is no rational as to why this would have less impact and serves a lot smaller and narrower part of the wider community which is already catered for throughout Bath.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN
Only if the CPT's plans are rejected.

6. Which plan do you prefer?

CPT	CPIN
<p>Not perfect, but worthy of development. Would need inspirational leadership. Near to original in use plus green policy on access. I lean towards preservation and restoration to historical use. Be brave, see beyond personal reasons and give the community another GEM- PLEASE. Could even open up to local school for swimming. Increases health benefits.</p>	<p>I think the CPIN [I didn't know they existed until now!] broadly speaking is OK. But needs to work closely with BERA.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN
<p>Mainly traffic problems. What are the plans for security. Neither! Neither if it is for tourists. Either as long as the Site is maintained.</p>

7. Anything else?

Sometimes in life a project comes up where it is necessary to “bite the bullet” and press ahead, despite the doubters. This is a case in point.

I supported the original plans to restore the pools, but looking at photos of years ago I never thought swimming could take place again – real problems. I cannot see CPT’s future plans are practical.

CPIN seem to represent “near to pool” residents. Pool is a Bath resource to be used by Bath residents – they know cars won’t be any use.

I think the Pools should be restored, but in neither way currently on offer.

Would like a decision to be made soon. Either proposal needs to consider parking considerations – much like Prior Park gardens do – you can only get there by car or by bus – and people still visit.

There are more than enough tourist attractions in and around Bath. Residents need to have some respite from the traffic and queues and pollution that they generate.

I hope the Bathwick Estate ensures a majority voice is heard – and an unbiased one. Unlike the letter accompanying this survey.

If the CPINs scheme is adopted, there must be some form of water feature on the site.

I have thought for many years some kind of sunken garden would be the way forward but all the architecture must be kept.

Forester Avenue

1.Should Pools be Restored?

YES	NO
<p>Broadly in favour of heritage. Beautifully situated they should be usable in a minor way. Only restored to the previous good condition. It was used, as far as I can understand, until the 70's. I think it would be an asset. But not CPT plan. But not CPT Plan. But not CPT Plan. But not at any cost. Whatever "outcome" is agreed must be financially sustainable in the longer term and cause no friction in the neighbourhood on noise, traffic, or other grounds. Very much looking forward to having a pool as per CPT's plans. Not only should it be – but it must. As a local resource. To original status. The Pools are a special place and must be restored. As a Heritage Visitor Centre open to the public (on a small scale) not to intrude on local residents and their homes. Love outdoor swimming. Be a wonderful natural history restoration.</p>	<p>But if have to, CPIN plan is better. In a time of funding cuts the money could be better spent.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN

Not really sure.

I would like to see access to the site- but am against it being a public lido.

2.Is CPT's plan a good way of restoring Pools?

YES	NO
<p>Restoring the pools for swimming would be great. Although closing Beckford Gardens is not idea it is difficult to redevelop without inconvenience. Absolutely yes. Keep the pools open. Only if we have residents parking extended to Sundays. CPT's plans are sensitive, well thought out, and viable.</p>	<p>Far too ambitious and heedless of impact on the Bathwick Estate. Too big, grand and noisy for residents. Hot water unnecessary. Cold water pool fashionable and healthy and historic. Not financial(ly) viable. Not financially viable likely to be rejected by lottery fund. They might be if scaled back significantly. A pool would be nice, but 36,000 planned visits is far too much for traffic, disruption etc.</p>

<p>I do however think Bathwick Estate should have FREE access.</p>	<p>No parking, safety for children, waste of money, not good value for money. The idea of an outside pool is great, but the site is small, inaccessible, and overshadowed by trees – not great! Access to the site is too limited to support a development on the scale proposed in the CPT plans. Far too ambitious for this quiet residential area. Insane to heat an outdoor pool!! Too disruptive for the immediate neighbourhood. It is a small site and although the changing rooms have a nice feature (?) I am not especially impressed by the pools themselves. Perhaps for private hire rather than big tourist attraction.</p>
--	---

<p>NO INDICATION GIVEN</p>
<p>Don't know enough about it.</p>

3. Is CPT's plan good for residential community?

YES	NO
<p>Provided opening hours are strictly monitored to protect residents. Boat trips encouraged. Residents can use the pools for swimming and the CPT have plans to mitigate traffic etc with use of boats, cycles, walking. Even if CPT do not develop the site someone has to as important historic site that must be developed to be saved. Absolutely yes. The Pools would be a great asset for local people. Free access for Estate. Great for kids and adults.</p>	<p>The only business is the Boatman- everything else is residential. Thousands of visitors, cars, coaches – ruinous effect on residents. It would be mostly outside visitors who would come. Traffic, lack of parking. It would have a major impact on parking, pollution, and the peace of the neighbourhood. Due to smallness of estate and narrowness of roads 36,000 extra people would be a detriment to residents. Probably not. Parking on Sunday a concern. Too many visitors planned. We can't cope with existing traffic – it will ruin the quiet(?) atmosphere of our estate. Parking, people, noise, pollution too much!</p>

<p>NO INDICATION GIVEN</p>
<p>Impact could be mitigated by conditions on access. I think they are too ambitious and ignore the views of close neighbours who should be prime stakeholders in any agreed solution. Traffic parking issues.</p>

4. Is CPIN's plan good way of restoring Pools?

YES	NO
<p>Much more reasonable and thoughtful. Much more user friendly for families. These appear to be much more realistic but without a pool will disappoint many from the wider area and some local residents too. Much preferable and sensible. I think they are a better alternative. CPIN's plans are on a more appropriate scale given limited access to the site. A very good way of restoring this historic site. More commensurate with the scale of surroundings. Bath is for all more resource (?) for the city (?) Free access for Estate. Great for community.</p>	<p>It's a poor back up plan. Nice idea, funding would be a problem I think; too limited. Installing heating is not restoring it's improving/updating. We have good local parks already and we want to be able to use the pools for swimming which the CPINs plans do not allow. There are no plans – only ideas. These are not viable. There is no financial backing, planning permission. Boring.... It is a Lido not a garden. It should be a pool for all ages. Not viable, no funding or planning consent.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN
I would need more information.

5. Is CPIN's plan good for residential community?

YES	NO
<p>Would be better. A tentative "yes" depending on numbers of people and cars. Local residents would use the restored area. Many families on the Bathwick Estate would use it but it is far from the original Lido. Seems much more reasonable, but the lack of a pool (for swimming) will disappoint some. The kids paddling pool is a reasonable solution, however. It is a more organic plan which restores the pools but respects the practicalities of the neighbourhood. CPINs plans would provide a positive resource for residents of the Bathwick Estate. I certainly do agree with this. Free access for Estate. Good out ways bad (??), free for estate.</p>	<p>Better by far than CPT plan, though. I don't think any increased traffic or parking impact is a good thing. I do not believe a water garden/heritage centre would be well used. If it is the same problems with traffic presumably arise as complained about with the CPT option. Not in favour of CPIN's plans. Waste of time and money. In my view they are not viable.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN
I would need more information.

6. Which plan do you prefer?

CPT	CPIN
<p>With agreement of BERA. Closed by 9pm. A local swimming pool would be a fabulous amenity in the summer. The HLF have clearly stated that they will only support the plans proposed by CPT; no other “plans” are in play. I would prefer a swimming pool. Personally, I would prefer a pool for use by a wider user population. It’s a pool for all. CPT Plans are excellent – and viable.</p>	<p>Provided it is sensitively handled. I prefer the CPIN option i.e. no swimming pool on the grounds that it will cause less friction in a peaceable neighbourhood. Over commercialisation could be disastrous. By a long way. CPIN is preferable. Boat taxis required. Parking is hard enough (Boat taxis required)</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN
<p>I object to CPT plan alternative options needed. CPT if parking for residents extended to Sunday. CPT if residents parking extended to Sunday – otherwise CPIN.</p>

7. Anything else?

Access should be by boat only.

Keep it simple.

A lido would be amazing. As a thankyou to the Bathwick Estate I suggest heavily discounted entry as this increase in thoroughfare is likely to be adverse for property and cars.

River access would be useful to ease pressure on roads.

CPIN would be like before when residents visited with their families.

With the recent weather I imagine many local families would have used it.

A halfway house between the two proposals would seem reasonable but it appears that boat has sailed in as much as the CPT seem incapable of consultation with the neighbours. I hope the National Lottery see sense here and withhold any funding until an agreed workable solution can be agreed.

If any development, why not do all works via river for transporting materials and equipment. If (it) goes ahead why not have access via river only and not road, so entry via boat from Pulteney Weir in disabled access boats.

The outside swimming space would be a lovely addition to Bath but located somewhere like Kensington meadows where there is space, access and parking.

As residents, we would use the pools if restored as a swimming pool.

Love the idea of restoration but it must be a sustainable solution.

I am very much in favour of CPT's plans.

Very much hoping that CPT's plans will not go ahead.

Of the 2, I prefer CPIN, but not really sure if there is enough "street presence" for the scheme. It is tucked away.

Yes. This questionnaire is misleading so potentially is of little value as it suggests that the CPIN model is a viable alternative. It is not.

Perhaps parking limitation should be extended to Sundays.

Either scheme has similar issues ie access, transport.

It seems inappropriate to try to establish a resource which would bring traffic – human and car- to a residential area, and which if successful would limit local use of a local resource.

It would be good for the city to have an open- air Lido ...not another garden.

It should be a pool for all ages like when I was a child who lived on the estate then and now.

There is only 1 viable proposal – it is CPT's. It is a good proposal and I support it fully.

I have visited and can see the work carried out – I'm just against a major tourist attraction in our quiet community alas. We don't have the infrastructure or room to accommodate this.

36,000 visitors is an average of 692 a week and more in the peak weeks. This is not acceptable in a residential area.

Free access/boat taxis essential.

Boat taxi essential/free access for Bathwick.

Beckford Road and Beckford Gardens

1.Should Pools be Restored?

YES	NO
<p>I think that it can be put back into use but the impact on the Bathwick Estate must be key to the proposals. Bathwick Estate could not support an extra 36,000 visitors.</p> <p>But first and foremost consideration of the implications to Bathwick Estate must be the priority. Parking is an issue today so the 36,000 would be impossible to support.</p> <p>Would be a shame not to.</p> <p>This is a National Treasure – part of our Heritage.</p> <p>Returned to use as a pool suitable for adult and child swimming.</p> <p>It's a unique opportunity, probably nationally.</p> <p>There are not enough natural swimming pools in Bath.</p>	<p>Not desirable, or commercially viable-would greatly increase traffic.</p> <p>Traffic problems.</p> <p>No- in the current problems already with tourism locally from the Chinese restaurant.</p> <p>Will not pay, waste of money. More traffic jams in Bathwick.</p> <p>Access – big problem.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN

2.Is CPT's plan a good way of restoring Pools?

YES	NO
<p>Thrilled at the prospect of the pool returning to use – can't wait.</p> <p>Ambitious, respect its original use but modernise to make sure it gets used.</p>	<p>More of a business plan, less of a restoration.</p> <p>Hardly "Georgian", would it be?</p> <p>We do not need a swimming pool of any type in this location.</p> <p>Access poor – traffic problems.</p> <p>It wouldn't work.</p> <p>Too invasive and heavy handed.</p> <p>Seems over the top to me, too busy.</p> <p>No, absolutely not – Tourists- we have problems enough with the RUI Chinese restaurant.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN

3. Is CPT's plan good for residential community?

YES	NO
<p>A terrific venue and facility on our doorstep. Fantastic asset for our community, revitalise Bathwick St (café,shops) something to draw people here alongside Holburne. What a great local amenity – fantastic.</p>	<p>Increased traffic not good; this plan is far too grandiose. This is a quiet residential estate – not a suitable place for a tourist attraction. Absolutely not. Neither in building phase nor as finished project. I agree too much traffic and business. No – madness.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN

4. Is CPIN's plan good way of restoring Pools?

YES	NO
<p>Yes, a much more realistic and appropriate plan. If we want to maintain the Pool heritage the small park is a much more sensible idea in this location. I prefer this idea, a nice way to use the space.</p>	<p>It's a NIMBY plan. Not sustainably viable – financially. Pools should be restored for swimming and local amenity. We have parks and gardens – we want a pool to swim in. Cynical attempt to design to fail, and thus to reduce use.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN
A better alternative, but not ideal. Possibly.

5. Is CPIN's plan good for residential community?

YES	NO
<p>It sounds like it would be a nice tranquil retreat. This will significantly reduce the potential impact. Better than CPT – but traffic must be managed. I think this would be fine, used but more quietly. Yes, but it only benefits local people.</p>	<p>Of limited value or interest. Waste of a fantastic opportunity and a disservice to the true heritage value/connection with the water. There would be too much traffic everywhere.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN
Of course but the same problems apply -traffic/footfall/nuisance/damage. Not really – there is too much tourism locally as it is!

6. Which plan do you prefer?

CPT	CPIN
CPT provides a workable future for the site. The Pools should be pools – for swimming and recreation, not just looking at. No comparison- one is a thorough, progressive effort.	Certainly the better option. Would provide a quiet oasis of calm for locals and visitors with minimal impact on the environment. Lower impact.

NO INDICATION GIVEN
Ideally even less development.

7. Anything else?

The CPT plan would be unworkable and a disaster for the Bathwick Estate.

The lottery money could be put to much better use than the CPT's plan.

Anyone who lives here will know the impact on parking traffic of a Rugby match in town (people are desperate to park). This plan would make this an everyday issue for local residents.

Homeowners in Beckford Gardens are already dealing with parking problems in this narrow road; parking from other streets is already taking place and makes this road blocked already!!

There is already far too much disruption locally by the RUI Chinese restaurant. This restaurant brings far too many problems to the immediate area – and the Council has not done enough to curb the problems. Any further incursion of tourists will add to the local problems of too many tourists.

It's a National Treasure, the CPT have worked hard to restore it and the sooner it's done, the better.

Whilst there may be concerns for increased traffic, I am certain this would reduce once it was well known there is no parking available.

I am an immediate neighbour who would be significantly impacted by the pools and I am happy with the CPT's proposal. Bring it on! And hurry up. I do not think the information in this form has been presented in a very balanced way.

I've worked in market research for 20+ years. The notes over are blatantly designed to influence respondents and should never have formed part of this exercise.

Big problem to access – parking more traffic problems.

Extra traffic will affect me most – including more as ex-MOD site fills.

Rockliffe Road

1.Should Pools be Restored?

YES	NO
<p>Within limits. This would be a great asset to the area either in CPT or CPIN form. Whatever happens, it is good to prevent further degradation. Only with the right development plan emphasis on use for residents sadly probably not economically viable. Let the people, especially the children, swim. A wonderful extension to Bath's heritage. I strongly support the project. We are strong supporters of the project. Fantastic project and boost to Bath's heritage offering.</p>	<p>Absolutely not. Completely wrong area. We cannot sustain up to 36,000 visitors each year. We do not want to endure the nightmare of trying to park and the influx of people. No infra for new public facility. Restoration should be limited to using the area as a small park and heritage visitor centre with the main pool used as a water garden and maybe paddling for small children in the summer. Restoration should be limited to using area as a small park and heritage visitor centre, with the main pool area used as a water garden and paddling for small children in the summer.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN

2.Is CPT's plan a good way of restoring Pools?

YES	NO
<p>If at all possible, it should be used as a swimming pool.</p>	<p>Unbelievable idea. Unbelievable idea. There are ample swimming pools and spas already in Bath. This could be dangerous. Unrealistic. Too much impact on local and residential area- no infrastructure to support it. Need too many visitors to make viable. CPT plans are costly and impractical. Plans are costly and impractical. Too large and ambitious. Projected visitor numbers are too high and the pool opening hours are too long. You can't have 36000 visitors and not expect a huge noise/pollution impact.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN

Yes and No!

3. Is CPT's plan good for residential community?

YES	NO
<p>It is not going to attract the numbers (36,000) noted on this letter due to location/situation so yes, it will be a fun local asset.</p> <p>On the whole.</p> <p>Short term impact, long term benefit to residents who would have access.</p> <p>Yes – the positives outweigh the negatives.</p> <p>I take a wider view and that the benefits far outweigh any downsides.</p> <p>YES and for Bath as a whole.</p> <p>On balance yes, though traffic increase is undesirable. I don't believe predicted visitor numbers.</p>	<p>No way.</p> <p>This would be disastrous.</p> <p>Unless adequate parking provided.</p> <p>Absolutely not – we don't want it.</p> <p>These plans would bring in too much traffic to this quiet area; too much noise and disruption to local residents; serious problems for residents who have to pay for residents' parking.</p> <p>Will bring traffic and noise to the estate. Access is not suitable via road or into the Pools.</p> <p>Building works will impact hugely.</p> <p>Too many issues- noise, parking, traffic.</p> <p>Far too many people/impact on local residents/parking congestion etc.</p> <p>There will be far too many additional vehicles visiting the estate.</p> <p>Unless they ban bringing cars/coaches onto the Estate and reduce visitor numbers to a few 1000 only.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN

This would be dependent on hours of opening, use of the pools for swimming only. No alcohol. No private party bookings. A reasonable summer closing time.

4. Is CPIN's plan good way of restoring Pools?

YES	NO
<p>But how to cover the cost of maintaining it, once done?</p> <p>Only if CPT can't restore pools for ORIGINAL swimming use. Very much second choice – funding is very vague.</p> <p>Better idea – more in line with size of facility.</p> <p>Realistic, simple, relatively cheap and enhances the environment and peoples' lives.</p> <p>Much better and in keeping with the area /considerate to residents.</p> <p>The plan is lower key and more appropriate to its surroundings.</p> <p>But I'd rather there was one voice and rather than negative self-interest.</p> <p>Will encourage nature/wildlife back onto the Estate – more important than bringing in people etc.</p>	<p>Complete waste of money.</p> <p>Either plan would not work – therefore a waste of money.</p> <p>Leave the pools in the past, [?] a garden and limit visitor numbers.</p> <p>Wishy-washy, neither one thing nor the other.</p> <p>Don't really believe there would be long term interest by CPIN.</p> <p>NO – filling in the pool would be an act of historical architectural vandalism.</p> <p>I would worry that CPIN's plans don't go far enough and may have limited, local appeal only.</p>
NO INDICATION GIVEN	
Not sure	

5. Is CPIN's plan good for residential community?

YES	NO
<p>Too many people – disruption of our relative tranquillity. Provide local service – lower impact. Communities are in decline and are underestimated in their value and impact on society as a whole – we have something unique. Let's nurture it. Because there would be little impact.....but I think Bath deserves better and although I am very sympathetic to "IN'S" I think we should be prepared to accommodate within reason. Perhaps a joint venture with the boating station re boat access. Probably but see above. I support the CPT proposal. As above, good for local residents, but limited local appeal may not be viable in the long term.</p>	<p>Not at all. This would also be disastrous. No – waste of money, wouldn't be used. I have no problem with visitors coming by boat, bike, bus or foot – the residential parking could be extended to Sunday as well.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN
<p>Restoration of any kind is a good idea for this asset. It will have limited appeal whatever is done because of location – too far from town centre. So it will/could be a nice local/neighbourhood asset. The plans are so vague and funding issues so unclear it's impossible to comment.</p>

6. Which plan do you prefer?

CPT	CPIN
<p>I think it's an excellent idea. I think it is a wonderful thing to do and CPIN should be careful about undermining it. CPT's proposals feel closer to an appropriate "restoration" of the Pools. Exciting scheme, great asset to the neighbourhood.</p>	<p>On the basis that it seems impossible to have a public swimming pool in a residential area without a serious impact on the immediate local environment. Much safer and less impactful. Much more reasonable for the site. It is critically important that immediate neighbours are on board with any plans to develop this site.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN
<p>Neither Neither Both proposals seem similar. Café good idea, CPIN proposals- what do you mean by a water-garden? With flowers? Or for swimming? Or a Bio-Pool? Neither, but definitely not CPT.</p>

7. Anything else?

How could the CPIN plan be funded in a sustainable way?

This will cause parking problems.

This is already a very congested area.

People walk to the boating station all summer without causing massive parking issues.

How many visitors does the Boatman have and it is not a problem?

Very pleased that the opinion of the whole ESTATE is being sought. BERA AGM is mainly attended by 50+ age group (myself included).

I would love to have a swimming pool on the Estate, and it would not have an immediate impact on me, but I understand how CPT's plans would adversely affect neighbours near the Pools.

Please do not agree this.

We are a small residential Estate – not Disneyland.

How do you get here - by boat.

It is a real shame that CPT did not work with local and immediate neighbours on the Estate to find a better way forward. However personally though it would be lovely to pop in for a swim it has to be sympathetic with its location. I fear it will not be economically viable – if the Pools were for local people – they would have to be much more modest. Thank you!

I would be happy for the pools to be in use again for swimming. It would be very unfair for the people living close by if the pools are hired out for events. This would be too much noise.

Think CPT proposal would be a disaster.

Thank you for your work on this.

The CPT plan is primarily driven by the developers who will profit from it rather than the needs of the local community.

I fully support the project and hope the Estate will give it full support.

CPIN proposals would be a much better option.

I thought the last BERA incredibly biased and one sided. The CPT should have been invited to speak. I hope this survey will be independently collated.

The pools would be a great asset for the city.

CPT plans will impact on house prices locally in a negative way and will not benefit Bath residents.

This letter is entitled with the word "consultation" which is misleading as extensive consultation has already occurred for the CPT scheme – chance to speak has been afforded many times already.

Forester Road, including Frankcom House

1.Should Pools be Restored?

YES	NO
<p>Yes, if it can be made financially viable and available for local people to use cheaply as well as offered as a tourist attraction.</p> <p>It is a wasted space otherwise in a lovely position.</p> <p>For historic interest/significance.</p> <p>Should be restored for historic interest, but not promoted as a visitor attraction.</p> <p>It would be wonderful to see it restored in a modern way for its original purpose.</p> <p>Climate change – warmer summers – outside swimming is popular. Sustainable location, it was an outside pool before.</p> <p>Would use regularly as would 3 children.</p> <p>Our family are keen swimmers – and would use it.</p> <p>Please let's keep something for Bath people.</p> <p>The baths belong to the Bathonians.</p> <p>A fantastic opportunity to bring this historic site back to life in a way that enhances the City for both local residents and the wider community.</p> <p>Access makes it very difficult and parking issues plus noise.</p> <p>The alternative would be?</p>	<p>Not for public use. OK to restore for architectural/historical restoration.</p> <p>Negative impact on Bathwick Estate, especially increased traffic, congestion and parking problems.</p> <p>Not for public use but should be restored to a level which preserves the architecture.</p> <p>If it were commercially viable it would already be so.</p> <p>Parking and Traffic.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN

Perhaps in a limited way.

No if the result is a swimming pool for up to 36,000 visitors. Maybe if the result is a financially viable site of genuine historical interest.

Not sure.

Not sure.

2. Is CPT's plan a good way of restoring Pools?

YES	NO
<p>It seems a nice idea, <u>but</u> I can see why close neighbours are concerned about the impact. Let us reminisce. Please maintain our past pleasures and fun times.</p> <p>Considerate scheme. Folks will walk, bus, or come by boat – parking restrictions apply. It was a swimming pool before!!!</p> <p>Popularity of winter sessions very unlikely. Heated so year-round use – needs café.</p> <p>It is a safe place for our children to swim- rather than the river.</p> <p>But no cars.</p> <p>But cars should be kept out of the Estate like at Prior Park.</p> <p>This has the potential to be a tremendous asset and destination for the people of Bath.</p> <p>Grand idea which would look good on tourist website.</p>	<p>Public footfall in estate very significant aspect. No, I do not believe it will be financially viable as it is unlikely that visitors will choose Cleveland Pools instead of Thermae Bath. Definitely NOT.</p> <p>Far too expensive and very ambitious. The site is not suitable for the high number of visitors that it would be likely to attract. I think their plan is on too grand a scale. Their plans are not financially viable as they require an unrealistically high number of visitors.</p> <p><u>NO</u>. The pools will require ongoing maintenance which will be costly; it will flood water when contaminated (?)</p> <p>Is the estimate of up to 36,000 visitors a year realistic? What is it based on? What numbers are needed to make the site financially viable over, say, a 10 or 20-year period?</p> <p>Expensive – will be loss making.</p> <p>No. I don't think the scheme is viable commercially sadly.</p> <p>Too grandiose – and hot water inappropriate. The area could not accommodate the proposed numbers or the work required to bring it up to standard.</p> <p>No there would be too much traffic. The plans require too many visitors. The area cannot accommodate so many. Traffic and parking problems would be increased.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN
Don't know.

3. Is CPT's plan good for residential community?

YES	NO
<p>We have not all “just” moved into the area. As long as a plan is in place to address parking. Outside swimming pool gets kids and adults active. Socially good, too. As above would use weekly. The community has to adjust. It was for Bath people before. Yes, but cars must be kept out -walking cycling and bus on A36 only. Maybe a little local bus. We will benefit from access to a facility in the CPT plans. The estate has so many families for whom this development will provide a fantastic outdoor summer facility.</p>	<p><u>Very</u> detrimental – Noise, pollution, traffic, safety, parking. No, it will encourage too much traffic causing air and noise pollution, if it does attract the numbers required to make it financially viable. Too much traffic would be generated as people won't walk. Parking is already a problem for those residents without driveways. Definitely NOT. We would be overwhelmed by the numbers of visitors either by car or on foot. Certainly not. I think the local impact would be too great. Absolutely not! The impact of such numbers will be awful. <u>NO.</u> Thousands of people and cars -noise pollution, traffic problems affect road safety; very dangerous. Our homes will not be our homes as we will live in the middle of a major attraction eg Roman Baths or Rec. 36,000 visitors over a period of, say, 12 weeks (“the summer months”) means up to 3000 visitors a week, week in, week out. That's without any parking facilities... Is that realistic these days? Would that number walk to the baths? Even bus services, as well as being undesirable, are unable to cope, or be suitable. I sympathise with neighbours concerned about the noise. Personally, I would welcome a dip in a local pool. Parking issues. Probably not. Access+ traffic needs to be sorted+local interest not ignored. Parking and traffic. No consideration of lack of parking or noise impact on community. Traffic, traffic,traffic in an otherwise quiet estate which is, in effect a cul-de-sac; nightmare. Construction will be a nightmare, and traffic from planned visitor numbers very unwelcome. Parking is already problematic on Sundays when permit restrictions are lifted – to add extra need is surely not possible. This is a quite residential area, unsuited to large-scale visitor through-put.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN

4. Is CPIN's plan good way of restoring Pools?

YES	NO
<p>Yes, seems a good idea – not too ambitious and more community based.</p> <p>Yes, this is a more modest plan which would be sensitive to the historic and neighbourhood interest.</p> <p>Far superior to CPT proposal.</p> <p>Make it a small neighbourhood resource for people to walk to.</p> <p>In as much as they are better than CPT's, but still concerned.</p> <p>But it is unclear how they would be paid for.</p> <p>CPIN's plans are sketchy and over-optimistic.</p>	<p>NO. Just allowing limited use to start with will inevitably end up with it being open (?) as original plans.</p> <p>It's not a plan – it's an idea.</p> <p>Totally selfish and negative. "Forget young people"</p> <p>CPT's plans are a better use of the space.</p> <p>Bring back previous use, enhanced for 21st century. Scheme is okay, but will not attract many visitors.</p> <p>Not financially viable.</p> <p>I prefer a pool-not a garden. I don't think anyone would visit a garden (water garden)</p> <p>But better than decay.</p> <p>It would become a museum and lose its character.</p> <p>I am concerned that the alternative plans will distract attention and potentially derail the superior CPT plan. Longer term, I fear the space will not be used sufficiently.</p> <p>Expensive – although less expensive than CPT scheme. Much more worthy causes out there.</p> <p>Possibly but similar scenarios. Safety issues with kids near water. Not likely to be used enough.</p> <p>A good way of building on the history of this peaceful riverside site.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN
<p>I think to restore cold water swimming as in the past is preferable, but it would require supervision, maintenance etc which would be costly.</p> <p>Maybe. Not convinced a heritage visitor centre will have a great deal to offer. The site is hardly central – not convinced many would trouble to visit.</p>

5. Is CPIN's plan good for residential community?

YES	NO
<p>Yes, local people are likely to use the facilities described. I play in a band and we would be happy to provide music for community event days.</p> <p>There will still be visitors but I believe there won't be as many.</p> <p>In so much as it would restore what has become a semi-derelict area.</p> <p>I think they would be, but we need plans for traffic.</p> <p>They possibly may minimise change/disruption but change can also be good.</p> <p>Better than nothing.</p> <p>Subject to careful monitoring/control of parking traffic for the pools.</p> <p>Compared to the alternative as presently proposed.</p>	<p>Still increased traffic.</p> <p>No reason why it should benefit the local community.</p> <p>This is a quiet community with lots of small children. Any increase in traffic of any kind to the estate will change its nature and have a negative effect on families here.</p> <p>It still will attract large numbers of people and traffic.</p> <p>Hard to see how the plans could actually be good for the community. Only less damaging (if it were successful) than CPT.</p> <p>NO – Selfish</p> <p>But CPT plan better.</p> <p>Little impact positive or negative?</p> <p>Likely not to be viable and close down.</p> <p>I think the “transformation” won't be sustainable financially – but would then be difficult to reverse and create a pool.</p> <p>Makes little difference.</p> <p>As above, I struggle to imagine the space being used sufficiently to warrant the expenditure.</p> <p>Parking and traffic – though to lesser extent than CPT scheme.</p> <p>Not enough parking and access restricted.</p> <p>It should attract a lot of practical local support.</p> <p>We think it would cause a nightmare with parking and traffic. It would also make the area noisy, especially at weekends.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN
<p>Unless there is swimming I think the benefits would be negligible – except to immediate neighbours.</p>

6. Which plan do you prefer?

CPT	CPIN
<p>CPIN is not a proposal. It would maintain for those who want an outdoor facility what we had. There are plenty of parks. Go to Sydney Gardens. As long as parking solutions can be found for visitors to the area. CPT bring back previous swimming use. I would like to see the lido be used for its original purpose and design. CPT but there is no room for a big town attraction. CPT appears to be a more sustainable long-term plan with benefits for the people of Bath and the estate that outweigh CPIN by a large order of magnitude.</p>	<p>Prefer CPIN but would prefer neither. CPIN definitely. Very concerned about the impact of the CPT plans. CPIN most certainly. Might mean fewer extra cars and people coming to Bathwick. But neither satisfactory. CPIN, though reservations about both. Concerned about both. CPIN, provided feasibility is confirmed/affordable.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN
<p>NEITHER. Neither. Neither. Neither. Both will have a negative impact in a peaceful environment. Neither. But CPIN would have less of an impact on residents.</p>

7. Anything else?

Do not want this. Will affect locality. CPT being driven by non-residents.

I don't think CPT have given enough detailed info on how their project would work. The people most likely to use an outdoor bathing facility are youngsters, who would prefer to bathe at Warleigh Weir free of charge, rather than pay £5 or so to go to the pools.

The scheme is not suitable due to the lack of parking, access to the site, and the disruption to the neighbourhood with all the traffic that will be generated. If people can't drive to it they won't use it.

As a member of the community, we should be VERY mindful of the impact on the estate and supportive of the immediate neighbours.

I think we have to be very careful of the impact upon close neighbours of the pool, and protect them as much as we can.

I agree with CPIN that minimal preservation should occur but if it is to be open to public it would need to be insured, supervised, maintained. I don't really think opening hours from 10-4 would really be adequate – schoolchildren? -people at work?

The people pushing for this do not live on the estate and don't care about the impact on Bathwick residents. NIMBYS. If this was on their doorstep – different story. This will affect us 7 days a week for approx. 13 hours a day! Could reduce house prices. Council will put parking meters up.

If either of these plans might lead to some undesirable one-way system round the estate to “facilitate” extra traffic, then this would be totally unacceptable.

This questionnaire is very biased.

I think the noise and disruption of the CPT plan would turn what appears to be an attractive facility into a nuisance. Consider the disruption at Warleigh weir this summer!

Bias(ed) questionnaire. This is full of bias and holds no weight at all – shame – opportunity wasted.

Care for the city's group gathering young people. Meet their needs.

Parking would be main issue. Possibly extend controlled zone to include Sunday but add extra visitor permits for residents.

Happy to help or volunteer if needed, patrol for parking etc. Scheme will get people involved.

Residents parking extended to Sunday as minimum.

Access +traffic seems to be the biggest problem. CPT needs to find a workable answer before being able to move forward.

Encourage use of river to access baths.

It would be great to see this corner of the estate benefit from this sort of renovation and interest. It sometimes feels a bit run down at present.

A point about traffic – presumably parking restrictions would continue to apply and I do not see any intrinsic problem with there being more people passing through the Estate. I understand that there will be disruption during the development phase, though this short- term pain will be worthwhile.

The CPT and Council have never put (in) a realistic solution for parking.

The CPT visitor numbers seem far too high and therefore not financially viable.

The increase(d) traffic both for the development and use in primarily a family/quiet residential area could be dangerous. Also the roads are not wide enough to allow such an increase in traffic. Noise will also be a concern.

The roads are too narrow, it would make the area noisy.

A revised CPT plan, based on much lower visitor numbers, could be acceptable.

Rockliffe Avenue and Forester Lane.

1.Should Pools be Restored?

YES	NO
<p>It is a shame it closed in the first place. But only if low-scale – in keeping with (the) Estate. It would be lovely to be able to see it up and running again – as it was originally. If small. Subject to limited opening hours. Only on a small scale. I think restoration is a great proposal and we would use the site (as a pool or a park). My concern is that the infrastructure of our Estate cannot cope with the increased use. This would be an excellent facility, at a time when we are told how important exercise is for good health. This is a unique opportunity for a “world first” pool and a chance to restore a piece of Bath’s Georgian heritage. Also, swimming is good exercise for all ages. Yes it would be nice, but clients should be dropped by a waterbus on the river (from the city centre).</p>	<p>Times have changed since the 60s. It would be very unfair to have such a major impact on our way of life. I am not of the opinion that the restoration of historic sites is always a good thing. Personally, I like ruins and the ability to use my imagination. I believe it is immoral to spend so much money on these sites, when we have homelessness, food banks, and a failing economy. Hampton Row is a quiet backwater, we would like it to remain peaceful. I do not believe all old things should be renovated.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN

2.Is CPT’s plan a good way of restoring Pools?

YES	NO
<p>I would like to see it brought back to life within a sustainable business plan. You only have to look at Warleigh Weir to see how popular this idea could be... but also the associated parking and litter chaos. They retain much of the original design while adding heated water, which most swimmers expect today. They have kept the main pool and changing rooms. Additions of a pontoon for river access and a refreshment room are a good idea. But the pool could only be opened in spring and summer when the weather was warm.</p>	<p>Not enough thought into the public transport to the Baths. I also believe the planned restoration will cost even more than anticipated. Too ambitious a plan. This would be a major attraction down a tiny street. Unworkable. Too big, too ugly. It is far too ambitious and will look awful with the large loos along the river. Completely out of character. Too many people expected – 36,000? The site is too small to sustain the number of visitors that CPT require in order to make their</p>

	<p>proposal a success. The impact of the CPT proposals in the local community has not been taken into account.</p> <p>Would be vastly expensive to restore and maintain and would be abandoned after a year or 2.</p> <p>Too much destruction – cutting down trees, filling in historic pools, ugly toilet block on riverbank.</p> <p>Too complex and too much new building.</p> <p>Too ambiguous a business plan.</p>
--	--

NO INDICATION GIVEN
<p>I would prefer a simpler, cold water option.</p> <p>They are over intensive and too commercial but have some good points.</p>

3. Is CPT's plan good for residential community?

YES	NO
<p>Restoring the pools for swimming would be a good focus and amenity for the residential community.</p> <p>I believe a lot of traffic will be on the river.</p> <p>What better way to bond as a community than having fun at a fabulous open-air swimming pool!</p> <p>A swimming pool within walking distance.</p> <p>We can swim, meet our neighbours who are swimming, and chat over coffee afterwards.</p> <p>The green travel plan with encourage people from outside the area not to come by car as will the fact that they cannot park.</p>	<p>Our peace and quiet would be gone forever.</p> <p>There would be parking chaos.</p> <p>I see no positives in this plan for the local community but I do see lots of negatives.</p> <p>The building traffic will be horrendous. It is bad enough when someone builds an extension.</p> <p>36,000 people walking/driving on to the estate is a joke.</p> <p>So many people driving /illegally parking. They will come in cars – look at Warleigh Weir.</p> <p>It will make living on the Estate for 6 months unbearable. So much traffic on the Estate, noise and upheaval in what is a very quiet few streets. It will never be the same again.</p> <p>It will be just awful – the building traffic, then endless traffic and noise.</p> <p>The noise and additional traffic which their proposals would generate would have a hugely negative impact on the Bathwick Estate.</p> <p>The inevitable increase in traffic and the dearth of parking spaces would be problematic.</p> <p>Concerns about access arrangements, parking, safety of streets during construction and financial viability.</p> <p>Unless significant changes to parking restrictions are made, and vehicles cannot access the Estate for the site, I think it will quickly become difficult for residents to access their homes. CPT need to address this in their plans.</p>

	<p>The local impact would be terrible. The CPT have always been indifferent to local concerns. Far too many visitors envisaged. Impossible to close Beckford Gardens and endanger public health and safety.</p> <p>Much too difficult access to the site. Just not viable. Closing Beckford Gardens would preclude access to Emergency Vehicles.</p> <p>Too optimistic a business plan. There will be huge opposition to closing Beckford Gardens. Because there will be more traffic within the estate and parking problems.</p> <p>I think the volumes of users to make it viable are too great.</p>
--	--

NO INDICATION GIVEN
Depends on access/opening times which will impact noise etc.

4. Is CPIN's plan good way of restoring Pools?

YES	NO
<p>Better than CPT's</p> <p>A better way for the Pools but only if there has to be a restoration in the first place.</p> <p>Looks more workable and will still restore the heritage of the site.</p> <p>Sounds good.</p> <p>More in keeping with the original site and use/heritage.</p> <p>Sounds more in keeping with the way it was.</p> <p>A sensitive restoration preserving the history of the pools would be a fantastic benefit to the residents of Bath.</p> <p>Yes, it would cut out the need to maintain the big pool which would be an ongoing expense.</p> <p>I think the lower key approach is more likely to be sustainable.</p> <p>I like the way the CPIN's plans would have a low impact – in spite of the wording of the question, plans can't be good or bad without considering their impact.</p> <p>Reservation on funding.</p> <p>It would mean the Pools would be used all year round.</p>	<p>Sad not to see the pools restored for swimming.</p> <p>It's not making good use of the site.</p> <p>No- we want an open- air swimming pool.</p> <p>We already have TWO parks within ten minutes' walk, one with a water-garden. Would visit a museum about a former swimming pool?</p> <p>Surely their plan misses the point. It is a swimming pool.</p> <p>Access is still an issue.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN

5. Is CPIN's plan good for residential community?

YES	NO
<p>Better than that of the CPT. Much less disruption, noise, extra traffic. It would be a lovely amenity for the Estate and canal walkers/travellers. After building work (is) done it will be great for local community and beyond on small scale. It will still be disruptive during building but will not be the major nuisance in the long run. Building will still be a pain but not for so long or so dramatic. They are more sensitive to the neighbours. If the use of the area was limited to Bathonians arriving on foot (it) would be an asset. I think it would be enjoyed by us and other residents. The building/restoration phase inevitably would cause some disruption. Prior Park NT site has no parking – I think this development would attract similar use. We already have local parks. Why miss the opportunity to have a Georgian swimming pool? Yes I think I would use the park more than the swimming pool.</p>	<p>I think most of the residents would not be interested in visiting it if it were a park and heritage centre. We already have Sydney Gardens which is easier to access. We have very limited access. Whatever happens there will be an impact. No – I don't think local people are interested in "shallow water gardens", jumble sales or folk music. They constitute a missed opportunity. Volume of users is the issue.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN

6. Which plan do you prefer?

CPT	CPIN
<p>No contest.</p>	<p>The noise impact should be lower. Far more realistic. BUT WOULD RATHER HAVE A NEITHER AS MY OPTION. A much more sympathetic plan giving the residents of Bath a quiet contemplative space by the river. Less impact than the CPT proposal. CPIN if kept low-key could preserve the area. This decision is based on the fact that I cannot see how the CPT plans could be sustainable without severely disrupting the local area. CPIN if it has to be something.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN
I am not sure really – both projects have their pros and cons.

7. Anything else?

It would affect house prices and the noise.

I believe there would be a dramatic impact on house prices. More noise, more litter, more security risks and a major impact on parking.

If there are all these thousands of pounds available to spend, then we are duty bound to spend it where it is most needed and directly on people who need it rather than on heritage sites.

There won't be an impact on parking as we live in a CPZ. Much of the travel to the river will be by river so won't increase much pressure on the streets. It won't impact any more than the boating base does at the moment.

The Estate is currently quiet and I would like to live here in the same way, thank you.

This survey has no value as a fair way of assessing local opinion. The questions may be "neutral" but it is accompanied by a partisan opening statement on the reverse.

We want to object in the strongest possible terms to this type of propaganda- the opening statement is certainly not fair.

Please consider our views seriously.

The Council have done great things with the Friends of Sydney Gardens – it can be done again with the Pools.

It is in the wrong location to be a major attraction.

I'm hugely supportive of the restoration of the pools, but it must be an appropriate restoration which can be enjoyed by residents and visitors alike and which does not have a negative impact on local residents.

This is about Bath as a city, not just the Bathwick Estate.

CPT's figure of 36,000 seems totally unrealistic and undesirable for a small site.

If the CPT plans go ahead, I'd hope we could lobby for more water-taxi access and combined boat/swim tickets to try to reduce the number of people using the Estate to access the site.

The CPT is the worst thing that has happened to Hampton Row since the Buchanan Plan.

It is important to respect the heritage as a place of natural beauty and to encourage wildlife as a place of life enhancing resource for the local community – not a tourist attraction! I think it is important to preserve the history, make it a place to encourage community and wildlife, instead of making it a tourist attraction.

CPIN is trying to frighten people with a big number, 36,000. Even spread over 4 months, eight hours a day, this is fewer than 40 per hour. Some would come by river, on foot, by bicycle. How is this "a lot of new traffic"?

Whatever happens, the Pools need saving.

First and foremost, a restored swimming pool is a fantastic facility for us, the local residents. We shouldn't be frightened by the idea of people outside the area using it. They won't all come at once,

they won't all come by car, and I don't think people swimming in the open make much noise anyway.

Whatever happens the pools have to be saved.

This is very difficult. Everyone wants to save the pools, but how to fund it?

Hampton Row and Cleveland Row.

1.Should Pools be Restored?

YES	NO
<p>Only sympathetically! To both the context of the area and residents of the Estate.</p> <p>A sympathetic restoration or, better, preservation of the crescent and low-impact community use of the site is to be encouraged.</p> <p>Yes, but in the “correct way”.</p> <p>But not necessarily for swimming.</p> <p>Yes, but it is totally wrong to be spending the amount of public money that the CPT are asking for.</p> <p>For art events and cold -water swimming.</p> <p>The public should be able to see the Pools.</p> <p>But not as a commercial swimming pool.</p> <p>But not if that means a bad scheme like the CPT one.</p> <p>Sensitively, not for “profit”.</p>	<p>I like its quaintness as it is. Cold water swimming would be nice.</p> <p>The disruption given current infrastructure would be unacceptable.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN
Not sure

2.Is CPT’s plan a good way of restoring Pools?

YES	NO
	<p>The CPT plans are focused on business and in the process doesn’t preserve the oldest pool in the country e.g ladies pool. Nor are they considerate of the local community.</p> <p>They were never large or well situated enough to be a year-round, heated pool or tourist attraction.</p> <p>Have to consider all aspects of “restoration” and visitor numbers to Pools.</p> <p>Over development, loss of important features, destruction of essence of this site – it’s reconstruction, not restoration.</p> <p>No – access is very poor for a large business. Certainly not. Too huge a corporate concern.</p> <p>Far too ambitious. More completely changed than restored.</p> <p>They are far too complex, and spoil the site and surroundings.</p>

	<p>Far too grand, destroying parts, obscuring others.</p> <p>They are unsustainable as well as unsuitable for the site, it's not a restoration and the site floods.</p> <p>The site not suitable for hot water swimming. Much better sites elsewhere in Bath for Lido project.</p>
--	--

NO INDICATION GIVEN

3. Is CPT's plan good for residential community?

YES	NO
	<p>35000 visitors a year! Will completely change the area and have a detrimental effect on our community.</p> <p>The plans are ill-thought through, lack impact assessment and will have a hugely detrimental effect on the community. A disgrace.</p> <p>Plans too ambitious at the moment.</p> <p>Excess traffic, noise, disruption – during building phase and after.</p> <p>Definitely not- massive impact on local community, traffic, parking, noise in a dead - end road.</p> <p>The lack of site access would make for a huge impact on the estate re building materials.</p> <p>It sounds like an intrusive disaster.</p> <p>Not al all, traffic, noise, threat to security of a quiet corner.</p> <p>Far too many people with all that that entails.</p> <p>It would be too noisy and the area can't handle the traffic that it will bring.</p> <p>No. Terrible plans for neighbours. Unacceptable numbers and opening hours plus terrible access problems.</p> <p>They would be hugely disruptive, permanently.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN

4. Is CPIN's plan a good way of restoring Pools?

YES	NO
<p>I would also like to see the house restored for social housing, for someone to live in. Low-impact, community focussed, suited to the scale and location of the site. Low risk financially. CPIN's better option in long run. Essential features would be preserved and hopefully it would still be a beautiful and relatively peaceful spot. And without huge expense. Taking heritage into account and aimed more at the locals – rather than tourists. I like the sound of a small amount of tidying up being done and someone to live in the building. Everyone can enjoy it without the serious negative impact on local people and wildlife. Yes because they preserve the fabric and the atmosphere. Much more modest and suitable. Less disruption? Much less money. Will attract sustainable numbers. More for locals and less for visitors.</p>	
NO INDICATION GIVEN	

5. Is CPIN's plan good for residential community?

YES	NO
<p>The local community can be proud of and involved with such a plan. The impact is positive and low level.</p> <p>It would protect it from the devastating effects of over development while providing access for more limited numbers of people.</p> <p>More low- key and fit in with local community.</p> <p>There would be no big vehicle impact, and there would be a good low key feel good factor.</p> <p>We'll be able to preserve our local flora and fauna and peacefulness.</p> <p>Yes because of the lack of negatives – and this way would actually connect with local people and activities.</p> <p>Could be nice little meeting place/local focus.</p> <p>Many children on the Estate would benefit.</p> <p>Impact will be less, will be a community focal point that's needed.</p>	

NO INDICATION GIVEN
Any major changes will negatively impact our community, but CPIN's or similar are the least intrusive, disruptive, and the most sympathetic to the area!

6. Which plan do you prefer?

CPT	CPIN
	<p>CPIN or similar proposals. Either this is for the community...in which case don't expect it to fund itself – or IT ISN'T?</p> <p>It has community support, is low risk financially and suits the site, scale and environment. It doesn't require hugely risky and expensive building work.</p> <p>Has to fit in with local people's views.</p> <p>No contest!</p> <p>Sounds like a much- needed respite for nature and a lovely place to visit.</p> <p>CPT is a waste of public money to create a white elephant business which will fail.</p> <p>It is the logical proposal.</p> <p>CPT plan is a disaster for area. Waste of public money, totally unrealistic plan. No construction plan yet.</p>

NO INDICATION GIVEN

7. Anything else?

Although rare that listed historic buildings are moved, there are examples of this happening country-wide. Why has this not been seriously considered.

Restore Pools but in a sensitive approach.

CPT plans would ruin both the pools and this estate for ever.

The amount of money CPT have already spent could have renovated the building 3x over. It is shocking; this is all PUBLIC money.

Thankyou BERA for gathering this information.

I am saddened by the increase in the eradication of nature and trees all over the Bath area. Humans aren't the only residents. If CPIN project goes ahead, I would enjoy being able to use the small pool myself (68 years old 😊)

It's a scandal that the neighbours weren't consulted.

It shouldn't be about commercial success.

CPT have wasted enough money so far. Stop this plan now, Council.

It should only be cream tea Monday-Friday 12 – 3pm served by (a) nice old lady.

On days when the pools are open to the public for fund raising or for days for the public to come and see the site for themselves our little piece of heaven here on Cleveland Row changes from a quiet, tranquil and beautiful place to live into an absolute living nightmare. Visitors park on the row even though the marshals employed by the pools ask them not to, noise is absolutely horrific and there is no empathy from the trust as to the chaos they are bringing. I am sure if 100's of people arrived en-mass in their neighbourhoods regularly throughout the year they would stamp on it and not just live with it! Curo moving the boundary wall has been bad enough. NOISE, contractors parking all over the place and an absolute disregard to the local people and their way of life. I fully support the water garden proposal and I will be writing directly to Camelot to lodge my disagreement with the CPT plan. I will not sit by and have my home and environment destroyed by 36,000 visitors a year...all over the good weather months which is potentially just 6 months of the year...That's 6,000 visitors a month or 1,500 visitors a week or 214 visitors a day or at minimum 53 cars to find parking a day, assuming they are carrying 4 passengers each. COMPLETELY unviable!!! This project simply CANNOT go ahead.