

**HOUSING & MAJOR PROJECTS POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY
PANEL 18th March 2013**

As you see on page 174 of your Planning documents, there are three components to the planning exercise for Radstock Railway Lands.

1. Firstly, the drafting of an Outline Planning applications, which we are told is underway. I hope that the quality of this will be much better than the previous, which constituted a Full application. This permits the use of planning which is not suitable for detail, but there is no other opportunity to object. We look forward to the completed document.
2. Secondly, the inclusion of the Road. This Authority consistently claims that it is needed to cope with the increased traffic from the new development even though it will destroy the heart of what is the “best preserved mining town in England”. So much has been planned “on the desk” and computer with no reference to the people who know the traffic best – the local inhabitants. There is also the question whether or not the road is part of the Application.
3. Finally, we come to the planning of the development itself. If it bears any resemblance to the previous plans, there will be too many dwellings, there will be insufficient consideration for climate change and no allowance for a future railway. I allow that the LDF shows “sustainable transport” but that could be foot or cycle. Both can easily be moved to one side whereas is railway depends on topological constraints.

Already we have seen that this Authority is willing to tear the heart out of Radstock perhaps to create housing for Bath: this is what caused the destruction of the Jubilee Oak. I would also ask: what proof has been shown that building houses will encourage regeneration?

George Bailey

Radstock Action Group