

Radstock Regeneration TRO Responses

No.	Name	Date	Opinion		Comments	Specific Objection	Summary points											
			For	Against			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9			
1	Dawn Milsom	08/07/11		✓	Objecting. Locals have always objected strongly to the scheme, but the Council seems determined to proceed. Realises we think we are revitalising the area, we will actually kill it.	It will kill off local trade as vehicles can no longer stop to shop. She also pointed out that Wells Hill is already congested at rush hour, and the proposal will only add to these problems.	✓	✓										
2	Deborah Porter	10/07/11			Asked for conformation and explanation of the legal wording of the proposal, and how it would affect deliveries to the local businesses.	Not Applicable.												
3	Malcolm Stanbridge	14/07/11			Enjoys cycling, and has asked questions about how the changes will affect his preferred routes.	Not Applicable.												
4	Simon Allen (Ward Cllr)	18/07/11	✓		Totally in support of the current scheme.	Not Applicable.												
5	Tim Jennings Somerbus	18/07/11		✓	Thinks new layout will damage trade, and increase the volume of traffic in the town, specifically The Street.	Thinks new layout will damage trade, and increase the volume of traffic in the town. Doesn't think the buses will be able to do the required turning moves required. The increased turning loop will also affect the timing of the buses, which will need to be rescheduled.	✓	✓	✓									
6	Don Morris Co-Operative Society	15/07/11		✓	There is no reliable available information for the Council to confirm or deny how the proposals will affect delays/congestion in the town, as the modelling took each element in isolation, and not combined.	Citing DMRB 2007, he objects to how dangerous the u-turning traffic will be to the other vehicles. Also, he thinks that the design does not take into account how each bit will have a knock-on affect to the next.			✓									
7	Mr W.C. Chivers	15/07/11		✓	He has sent a couple of petitions in. First is in support of repositioning the sub-station and conversion of the mini roundabouts into one larger one. The second is in opposition to the creation of the new road by diverting the Frome Road.	No need to relocate the crossing as the main route is moving over to the Frome Road. No need to make The Street one way if it isn't being altered. No need to make part of Frome Road one way, just move the road over to coincide it with the new large roundabout. No requirement to ban turning into Victoria Square, Radstock should be left as a small town, and not a through road.		✓										

Radstock Regeneration TRO Responses

No.	Name	Date	Opinion		Comments	Specific Objection	Summary points											
			For	Against			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9			
8	Mr C.J. Chivers	15/07/11		✓	Copy of a letter sent to the local press. Sent the same information/petition as above. Building more houses will create more traffic, which the locals do not need or want. Current councillors will implement this and then leave office, leaving the town messed up beyond repair.	See above comments.		✓										
9	D. Russell Radstock Town Council	15/07/11			Asked for information on the consultation.	Not Applicable.												
10	M. Boulton	15/07/11		✓	Objecting as the proposed works are at variance to sections in the Local Plan.	Proposal does not comply with sections T13, T15, T16(i), T16(ii), T16(v), T16(vi), T16(x), T20, D9(1), D9(2) of the Local plan, 2007.												✓
11	Diana Walker	17/07/11		✓	Doesn't think that the Council will listen to her objections, but thought that she should voice them anyway.	The proposed layout makes shopping in Radstock a lot harder, while also hampering the flow of traffic in a serious way, instead of helping it. Traffic will come to a complete standstill while people try to negotiate the roundabouts. The NRR land should have been kept as a natural habitat and play area, and used to encourage wildlife.	✓	✓	✓									
12	Amanda Leon Radstock Action Group	19/07/11			Asked for information on how the consultation responses are processed.	Not Applicable.												
13	Catherine Whybrow	19/07/11		✓	Made comment on various things, including cyclist and pedestrian safety, short-term parking problems, and the fragility of the Victoria Hall.	The new bus stop impedes people crossing the road. Disabled residents need a dedicated crossing point.		✓										
14	Elizabeth Button	20/07/11		✓	Changes will have a detrimental effect on the older part of the town and will not improve the traffic flow. Realises that more houses are needed.	Two way traffic along The Street will make it harder to cross for pedestrians. Parking will also be harder outside the chemist and doctors.	✓	✓										
15	Emily Gregory	20/07/11		✓	Generally not against change, and thinks that something needs to be done to alleviate the problems, but doesn't think this is the answer. She does approve of replacing the double mini-roundabout with one large one though.	Changes to Frome Road will not work for HGV's, because of the amount of room needed to turn. Cars from Haydon will also cause hold-ups for the same reason. Reducing parking will badly affect passing trade.		✓										

No.	Name	Date	Opinion		Comments	Specific Objection	Summary points											
			For	Against			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9			
16	Jeffrey Blake	20/07/11		✓	Objects to the proposal for several reasons.	The proposal will: threaten or remove the livelihood of trader in The Street and Fortescue Road; will not improve traffic flow; will increase local journey times; and is impassable for large vehicles at one point, and doesn't explain itself well enough for those who want to turn right from Fortescue Road into Church Street. There is also no traffic study available for the public to have a look at.	✓	✓										
17	Ray Conneely Massey Wilcox	20/07/11		✓	Considers the proposal to be bad for Radstock.	Accessing Haydon Industrial Estate from the Frome Road would mean having to perform a U turn, which would be made more dangerous with the heavy traffic; two-way traffic along The Street would increase the danger to pedestrians; and also that the bus lane should allow use from HGV's, which would solve the problem of the U turn previously mentioned.		✓	✓									
18	Tony Marion	20/07/11		✓	He is worried about the safety of local children who walk to school.	Children going to St. Nicholas Primary School would have to cross two-way traffic along The Street, with no pedestrian crossing point.	✓											
19	Deborah Porter	21/07/11		✓	The objection is submitted on behalf of the Somer Valley Friends of the Earth	She has submitted a large number of objections. They range from the proposal not complying with the requirements of the Local Plan; lack of consideration of the sheer volume of traffic that will use the new layout, and the knock-on effects this will have; increased pollution in the area due to the increased amount of traffic; to the lack of on-street parking in the proposed layout.	✓	✓		✓								✓
20	Phil Martin	21/07/11		✓	The orders need to be stopped until a more coherent approach has been agreed with local residents.	Buses will have problems turning right for Bath, how do you intend to sort this out. Also, how do cars accessing Frome Road turn around if they cant exit through the bus lane - why isn't the whole road a bus lane? If HGV's are being forced to perform a 360° turn, what is going to make the queuing traffic clear enough space to enable it to do it.				✓								

Radstock Regeneration TRO Responses

No.	Name	Date	Opinion		Comments	Specific Objection	Summary points										
			For	Against			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
21	Hayley & Simon Arter	21/07/11		✓	Strongly objects to the changes.	The Arters' have sent in a very long list of objects, which is split into four categories.	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓					
22	Caroline Green	21/07/11		✓	She is concerned that the proposal will bring danger to pedestrians, kill off the local shops and destroy the heart of Radstock.	Objects to the proposed two-way traffic on The Street, as it will cause congestion, make crossing the road impossible, and makes using the rear access to the shops impossible. Also the proposed turning manoeuvre will bring traffic to a standstill, and could cause damage to the historic buildings. Most places are changing to divert traffic away from town centres, so why is Radstock going the other way.	✓	✓	✓			✓					
23	Amanda Leon Radstock Action Group	21/07/11		✓	Strongly objects to the changes.	The Action Group have submitted a very long list of objects, split into each individual TRO.	✓	✓	✓			✓			✓		
24	John Spratley	21/07/11		✓	Totally opposed to the scheme; its design, ideology, funding and lack of local in-put.	He thinks the scheme has been drawn up by those who have no knowledge of Radstock, its physical infrastructure, or its traffic patterns and pedestrian usage. Because of this, it is ill conceived, without any consultation to local residents, traders and road user businesses. He also objects to the cost of the scheme, and relies on considerable public subsidy.	✓	✓									
25	Andrew Jolliffe	21/07/11		✓	Objection to increasing the waiting limit on the parking spaces.	Objects to extending the permitted parking from 30 minutes to 2 hours. There is currently not enough parking, and this will only make the situation worse.	✓										
26	Andrew Jolliffe	21/07/11		✓	Objections to the two-way proposal for The Street.	The Street isn't wide enough to accommodate two-way traffic, and the turning manoeuvre will make things very difficult for all vehicles, and a more difficult trading environment in the town.		✓	✓								
27	Andrew Jolliffe	21/07/11		✓	Objection to relocating the Wells Road pedestrian crossing.	Doesn't appear to add anything to the scheme, only increased journey time and driver frustration.	✓										

No.	Name	Date	Opinion		Comments	Specific Objection	Summary points										
			For	Against			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
28	Nigel Cook Demonic Dermagraphic	21/07/11		✓	Objects to the reversal of the one-way system on Fortescue Road as it will affect his business.	Reversing the flow of traffic will affect businesses on Fortescue Road. When people can't find a parking space, they go on and park in the Victoria Hall car park. With the new proposal, they would just carry on and go somewhere else.	✓									✓	
29	J Davison	21/07/11		✓	A feature of the NRR plan is to promote it as a major cycle route (NCN 24), but this seems to have been overlooked.	Relocating the pedestrian crossing makes things even harder for pedestrians than at present. More thought needs to be put into making the area more walker friendly than it is now. There is also no provision for cycle parking to cope with the expected increase in cycle traffic to the area.	✓									✓	
30	Doug Benson	21/07/11		✓	Mr Benson has submitted a large number of objections and observations to all parts of the scheme.	Various points raised, including - The Street - the proposed two-way traffic will increase the risks to pedestrians and cyclist; the road isn't wide enough to safely let two larger vehicle pass; delivery vehicles servicing the Working Men's Club will struggle to get out onto the road; the camber of the road isn't designed to be used in both directions; the buildings are not designed to withstand the extra traffic vibrations. Fortescue Road - cars going to Bath are forced to turn left, go through the pedestrian crossing, perform a 360° turn, and then go through the crossing again, which will cause mass congestion. General points (including, but not limited to) - lots of standing traffic causes greater air pollution; no-one can explain how this road proposal will benefit the people of Radstock.	✓	✓	✓				✓			✓	
31	George Bailey	21/07/11		✓	Mr Bailey has submitted a large number of objections and observations to all parts of the scheme.	Mr Bailey has submitted exactly the same list of objections and observations as Mr Benson.	✓	✓	✓				✓			✓	

No.	Name	Date	Opinion		Comments	Specific Objection	Summary points											
			For	Against			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9			
32	Jenny Hutton	21/07/11		✓	Resident of Haydon objecting to various knock-on effects from the scheme.	Objects to the increase in traffic onto The Street, making it dangerous for pedestrians and drivers trying to access the A367. Objects to the removal of the Jubilee Oak. Objects to the right turn ban on Church Lane/The Street, as it will mean those existing Church Lane will have to turn around on the A367 and come back along The Street in order to go down Fortescue Road.		✓	✓		✓							
33	Rupert Bevan	21/07/11		✓	Mr & Mrs Bevan are objecting principally to the environmental effects that the scheme would have on local residents, but also the effect on pedestrians.	Objects to the increase in air pollution that the double roundabouts will cause, due to the standing traffic. Also objects to the reduction in on-street parking, which will help to kill off the town centre.	✓			✓								
34	Rebecca Owen	21/07/11		✓	The majority of people living in Radstock have opposed the scheme. Please do not ignore the views of the people who live in the town.	Objects to turning the centre of town into a giant roundabout. The proposal will also affect the activities which go on throughout the day due to the reduction in on-street parking. The Victoria Hall and the underground cellars in the vicinity will also be compromised structurally with the increase in HGV traffic driving past it.	✓					✓						
35	Sue Burchell (on behalf of) Irene Burchell	21/07/11		✓	Objection to the Bus Lane	The bus lane blocks off the road for everyone else's, causing road blocks due to the volume of traffic going elsewhere. If there was another emergency like the Writhlington School fire, the emergency services would struggle to get through.		✓										
36	Sue Burchell (on behalf of) Irene Burchell	21/07/11		✓	Objection to pedestrian crossing alterations	New location will increase the walking distance for the disabled to cross the road into Radco. The new turning manoeuvre will make it very dangerous for pedestrians standing on the pavement if an HGV is trying to turn. The crossing time on the current set-up does not give an adequate time for the elderly to cross the road; if there are tailbacks caused by the new roundabouts, pedestrians will never get across the road safely.	✓		✓									

No.	Name	Date	Opinion		Comments	Specific Objection	Summary points										
			For	Against			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
37	Sue Burchell (on behalf of) Irene Burchell	21/07/11		✓	Objections to one-way order and also the prohibition of right hand turn order	Objects because removing the one-way restriction will create unnecessary dangers to pedestrians and school children using the areas, and the Victorian buildings were not designed to withstand all the extra heavy vehicles close by, and the cellars could also collapse under the added stresses; reversing the one-way on Fortescue Road seems to do nothing but slow down the traffic trying to go through Radstock, and for no apparent benefit - the ultimate result of which will be the killing off of the heart of the town.	✓						✓		✓		
38	Sue Burchell (on behalf of) Irene Burchell	21/07/11		✓	Objection to prohibition of waiting.	Objection is based on the fact that the number of spaces has been significantly reduced, so if you allow people to park longer in the ones that are left, where is everyone else meant to park?	✓										
39	Meadow View Residents' Action Group	22/07/11		✓	The objection letter contains extra information on pollution monitoring results for various local roads over the last 6 years.	Objects to: the dispersal of the bus stops (no longer possible to choose which bus to take); the removal of parking spaces (small shops need nearby parking to flourish); the removal of the 'Stag' oak tree (planted to mark the jubilee and also marks the place where a local man died); two-way traffic in The Street (its dangerous to pedestrians); the damage the extra traffic will cause to the buildings via traffic vibrations. Most of all they object to the way the scheme is being implemented without regard to existing traffic counts, common sense or academically accredited research.	✓	✓				✓	✓				

Radstock Regeneration TRO Responses

No.	Name	Date	Opinion		Comments	Specific Objection	Summary points										
			For	Against			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
40	Dr E.M. Jackson (Ward Cllr)	25/07/11		✓	States that the proposal is both 'unworkable and not fit for purpose'	Objects that the proposal is in breach of the agreed Local Plan. Objects that the revised layout will make deliveries to the shops on The Street impossible, and will ultimately kill off the businesses. Objects to the removal of the Jubilee Oak, and has suggested that it would be possible to relocate it in Jubilee Park. She has also made comment about the increase in air pollution in the area, which the stacking traffic will make worse.				✓	✓					✓	