

Bath & North East Somerset Council

MEETING:	Cabinet	
MEETING DATE:	14 th September 2011	EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN REFERENCE:
		E 2291
TITLE:	Norton Radstock Regeneration TROs	
WARD:	Radstock	
AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM		
List of attachments to this report: “Consult Breakdown” “Equality Impact Assess” “Reply Details”		

1 THE ISSUE

- 1.1 To consider the Traffic Regulation Orders required for the proposed highway improvement works associated with the Norton Radstock Regeneration Project, and either agree, alter, or remove some of the proposed elements.

2 RECOMMENDATION

The Cabinet agrees that:

- 2.1 The TRO's be implemented as proposed.

3 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1 Funding for the Highway works have been secured through a grant from the Homes & Communities Agency. The grant is conditional on works being completed within the current financial year, therefore any delay in implementing the works may prejudice receipt of the grant.

4 CORPORATE PRIORITIES

- *Building communities where people feel safe and secure*
- *Sustainable growth*
- *Improving the availability of Affordable Housing*
- *Improving transport and the public realm*

5 THE REPORT

- 5.1 The statutory Traffic Regulation Order consultation process for all the various elements of the regeneration works was carried out over June and July. The attachments contain a combined breakdown of the points raised in the objections. Using the reference numbers in the "Consultation Breakdown.doc" document, we can reply as follows:
1. Proposal will kill off local trade.
 - A. Access to local shops will be retained, therefore local trading will not be affected.
 2. Proposal will add to congestion in the town centre.
 - A. A traffic impact assessment has been undertaken which indicates that there will be no additional congestion in the vicinity of the town centre.
 3. The proposed 360° turning manoeuvres will be dangerous to other road users and pedestrians.
 - A. The Road Safety Audit undertaken has not raised concerns with these manoeuvres.
 4. It will produce greater air pollution in an already polluted town centre.
 - A. A significant change in air quality is not expected.
 5. The proposal will mean the loss of the Jubilee oak tree, a significant local monument.
 - A. Thorough consideration has been given to how the oak tree could be retained as part of the scheme. Unfortunately, this is not possible because a roundabout at this location is required which is essential to the scheme. However, a replacement tree/s in an appropriate location selected in consultation with the local community will be provided. Arboricultural advice indicates that relocation of the tree is not a viable option.

- 6. Increased vibrations from extra vehicles could damage the historic buildings and cellars in the area.
 - A. Road construction details will be employed in accordance with current design guidance. There is no evidence that vibrations from vehicles cause structural damage to buildings.
 - 7. No provisions have been made to include the expected increase in cyclists using the NCN 24 cycle route through the area.
 - A. Completion of the development will include a more direct access to NCN 24.
 - 8. No-one can explain how the proposals will be of benefit to the residents and businesses.
 - A. Residents will benefit from the expected economic improvements associated with the regeneration proposals. Access to the shops will be maintained at all times. There will be clear signage to ensure that people are aware that it is business as usual.
 - 9. The proposals are in breach of the Local Plan.
 - A. The scheme has planning consent. As part of the planning process, consideration would have been given to the Local Plan.
- 5.2 As part of the responses, we also received a petition opposing the diversion of the Frome Road through the middle of Radstock, and another one in support of the removal of the two mini-roundabouts to replace them with one big one. They also showed support for an idea to move the electricity sub-station, which has been suggested by Radstock Action Group as needed in order to install a single larger roundabout.
- A. The suggested layout would not facilitate the envisaged redevelopment and public realm improvements.

6 RISK MANAGEMENT

- 6.1 The report author and Lead Cabinet member have fully reviewed the risk assessment (WIP) related to the issue and recommendations, in compliance with the Council's decision making risk management guidance.

7 EQUALITIES

- 7.1 A proportionate equalities impact assessment has been carried out and is attached to this report.

8 RATIONALE

- 8.1 Adopt the current highway layout for the regeneration works because it will complement the proposed redevelopment of the area and the public realm improvements.

9 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 9.1 A number of alternative options were evaluated as part of the planning process, the result of which concluded that the current proposal achieved the greatest benefit.

10 CONSULTATION

- 10.1 *Ward Councillor; Cabinet members; Parish Council; Town Council; Local Residents; Staff; Other B&NES Services; Community Interest Groups; Other Public Sector Bodies*
- 10.2 Consultation was carried out as part of the planning process (application 06/02880/EOUT) and via e-mail and public notices for the TRO advertisement process.

11 ISSUES TO CONSIDER IN REACHING THE DECISION

- 11.1 Social Inclusion; Customer Focus; Sustainability; Human Resources; Property; Health & Safety.

12 ADVICE SOUGHT

- 12.1 The Council's Monitoring Officer (Divisional Director – Legal and Democratic Services) and Section 151 Officer (Divisional Director - Finance) have had the opportunity to input to this report and have cleared it for publication.

Contact person	Andy Coles - (01225) 394208
Sponsoring Cabinet Member	Councillor Roger Symonds
Background papers	
Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format	