

## **B&NES Cabinet Meeting Wednesday 11 January 2012**

### **Amanda Leon: Radstock Action Group**

*In support of 'the best preserved mining town centre in the country'.*

Under the cloak of self-congratulation induced by deciding not to close the Frome Road, you are ushering in a set of proposals which are marred by inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the supporting paperwork and which fail to convince that there is anything in the alleged revisions which really puts the people of Radstock at the centre of the plan.

What started out as a plan to close the Frome Road as an essential part of housing development has transformed into 'Road Upgrade' (B&NES Press Release) via 'Tackling congestion in Radstock and kick-starting the economy' (B&NES document).

Unfortunately, there is nothing in the current proposals which will upgrade the roads, let alone benefit those who visit, work and/or live in the town. What is the real reason behind all of this?

I wish to draw your attention to the following clarifications of the 'truth' as presented by B&NES. They are just selected examples, there are many more:

1. The 7.5 tonne weight limit applies only to limited parts of the new scheme and there is no indication of how it will be policed.
2. Even 7.5 tonne trucks are permitted to be 12 metres long – the manoeuvres required under the new scheme will result in congestion as large vehicles try to negotiate ill-thought out turns and traffic junctions; ultimately people will give up coming to the town.
3. Your consultation fails to ask the questions which would have given you answers you didn't want to hear. We didn't want the new road, so you said, 'OK we've heard what you say, but now tell us what you think of the finer details about the new road which you're getting anyway'.
4. B&NES claims variously a net loss of between 24 (Glen Chipp) and 17 (latest press release) parking spaces. According to B&NES, the new housing will have no parking and residents will have to park on the public highway. So more houses with no parking and, in addition, the elimination of at least 70 other parking spaces, only partially replaced.

As a cabinet, and as individuals, you need to be able to answer the following questions, and many more, before any further decisions are made:

1. Why have you not asked whether people want the new road, the traffic flow in Fortescue Road reversed or the Street made two way?
2. Where are the 40 new jobs coming from and how long will they last?
3. Why is the traffic modelling based on 2009 rather than current data and how do you explain the discrepancies between what is shown and the regular observations of those who live in Radstock?
4. How can traffic flow be reduced by turning a one way road into a two way?

5. Why do the 'improved' journey times cited in support of the scheme include breaking the new 20mph speed limit which is being proposed?
6. How is the large amount of money (£1.6m) cited going to be generated for the Somer Valley and how much of it will Radstock get?
7. Why have out of date maps been used in documentation?
8. It has been argued that this matter needs to be speeded up in order to get the £800K grant for the road from the Homes and Communities Agency. Is it not the case that if you don't build the road, you don't need the money?
9. Cllr Crossley has stated very clearly that there will be no road if there is no housing development. Why are plans for the road going ahead as there is no 'live' housing plan in existence?
10. What are the reasons for ignoring requests made for a moratorium until an integrated and sustainable strategic plan for Radstock is drawn up?
11. What is in any of this for Radstock?