

**The TRO's for the new road layout in Radstock. Cabinet, 11 January**

First, I have to thank Cabinet for listening to my exhortations in September to defer their decision until they had the right information, such as the analysis of the 2009 traffic flow survey, and had considered the wider implications of the new scheme. I appreciate the amount of effort which has gone into the consultation, and I only wish that the breadth and depth of the responses had been made available on the B&NES website for ordinary people to read. We are now much further forward, and I am glad that it appears that B&NES are listening at least some of the time to some of the things Radstock people say.

New councillors ought to study, 'Yes, Minister' and in particular the episode where Bernard explains that to get the answers you want, you have to make sure you have the right suggestive questions. If one compares this consultation with the June 2007 exercise, (and those 166 answers ought to be available, too) the question and answer are the same, the result inevitable. The NRR scheme was better than the 1981 'Brand's Hatch option', these orders lead to a considerable improvement on the NRR scheme. Yet having gone so far to meet the objections and keep the Frome Road open, one wonders why it is not possible to drop the whole scheme and save B&NES at least £400,000, and the traders considerable loss of earnings during the roadworks.

Yesterday I heard the arguments on Radio 4, only it concerned the Chiltern high speed railway. One might call it Concorde 4. Or the Rapid Transport Package 2. Why spend so much money to knock a few minutes' journey time off for those travelling *through* Radstock? We want to make it a vibrant local centre and a tourist destination. Lorries hurtling through the Street will ruin it. I am strongly in favour of speed limits and axle weights, but Adrian Clarke and his colleagues admitted they were unenforceable. We want to encourage existing businesses –and that means proper parking, accessible and free, and not congested space shared with flat dwellers and RADCO's clients.

The Methodist Church have asked to say that reversing Fortescue Road with no right turn on exit will cause enormous difficulties for weddings and funerals, and their elderly congregation need places nearby. If you are minded to allow these TROs, please place a condition that adequate parking for the traders be provided on the site or around it when the planning application is submitted.

More to the point, Cllr Crossley has twice publically stated, that without the housing development, there will be no changes to the road system. I believe him to be a man of integrity and request him now to renew that pledge. No houses= no road scheme. Perhaps add too, no reduction in parking as well.

Eleanor Jackson (Ward Councillor)