

Rosemary Naish statement

Clutton recently had a traffic calming scheme, designed & implemented by Highways, put in, which has proved excellent. However we are about to have more highways work-this time a junction on the main through road in the village is to be re-prioritise, to allow a developer to provide access to their proposed development. It is a difficult junction but there are no recorded accidents there, so it is essentially a safe junction. The only reason it is being done is to allow the access, so it is quite right and proper that the developer, pays for it. They have also designed it and will be doing the actual work. We see no problem with this as they are the beneficiaries. What is not right is that until very recently they were also doing their own safety audit. Judge, jury & executioner so to speak. The community have been very concerned by the proposed change and have had two independent highway safety experts look at the design. These experts have said that the proposed junction almost certainly be made to work, but as it is currently designed is actually more dangerous than the existing layout.

Gary Lewis of Highway said, in May 2015, and I quote

The reprioritisation of the junction of Station Road, Maynard Terrace and Clutton Hill does not achieve acceptable carriageway widths, alignment and pedestrian facilities to provide a safe means of access to serve the development, and existing development already served by Maynard Terrace, with consequent additional hazards to all users of the highway. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy T.24 of the Bath & North East Somerset Local Plan (including minerals and waste policies) Adopted October 2007.

But it is this design that is still going to be implemented.

We know that this junction will be re-prioritised, and we believe that with the correct design it can be done safely. What we can not accept is that a difficult junction should be made more dangerous – as a minimum it must be at a same level of safety as it is at present.

And finally, with the amount of development planned in B&NEs, more road works of this sort will be needed. This panel should make sure that in future no commercial developer, who may be influenced by their bottom-line, should be responsible for safety assessing their own work, and parish councils like our should not have to use our precepts to pay for safety audits.