

Dear Anthony Okereke,

17<sup>th</sup> January 2020

### **North Taunton Development – West end**

Thank you for your emailed letter dated 13<sup>th</sup> January 2020 and I will respond to each item below, hopefully in a manner that is clear.

However, it is important for us to know if there is a date yet for your replies and actions to be made available to answer the queries raised by attendees at your exhibition held 24<sup>th</sup> October 2019, which you say will be on a website and by community newsletters. These answers are needed before we can hold a public meeting, which we have to do before we can officially send in the Parish Council's own full comments.

Referring to your letter on:

Page 1. We certainly had no intention of increasing the size of the existing roundabout at Silk Mills junction and agree that it should become a signalised junction and hence, what we are proposing is that it should become a cross roads. As I say in my letter the change would require a revised planning application and while this is an unfortunate chore there would appear to be no time difficulty in arranging this as Redrow propose to start building the Northern Link Road at its centre and you tell me that it is envisaged that it will be quite some time before it is completed. Therefore, this will not have any *'significant impacts upon the delivery of the scheme'*.

The strong objection to the proposal you are currently planning to build is the requirement of a third, heavily trafficked, junction to be made so close to Silk Mills Road and Cross Keys. This will also have to be signal controlled. Synchronising the many necessary light phases at three junctions is never successful and requires many stop/start movements, leading to delay and increased pollution. Also, there is the safety issue resulting from the need for some to change traffic lanes as they pass through the different junctions, for example, those travelling north on Silk Mills Road and wishing to continue on the Link/ spine road might find that the appropriate lane would not always be available. This could be due to the closeness of the two junctions, with just 60m storage length available between the junctions, and with all the lanes being occupied by traffic from Cross Keys wishing to go straight on into town. There would be no such problems with a cross road.

Pedestrians would cross under the same safe facilities provided for those wishing to cross to the other roads.

Lorries leaving Mill Lane and turning right between these two junctions on to the A358 are not safely catered for. They would be safer doing so on to the fourth arm of the Link road.

The Highway Authority tell me they agreed to this location because that was where the Promoters wanted the connection with the A358 to be, with, one rather gathered, very little in the way of examination.

Page 2,3 & 4. We don't understand why Redrow require a reserved period of 5 years or 250 units to retain the use of the drop-down road, particularly when you

consider the increased danger that your building work during this period will inflict on cyclists and walkers using what is currently the only existing northern ring road to Taunton.

Why would right turning traffic from (I assume you are referring to the temporary use of Mill Lane as access to the construction of the Link Road) not have appropriate space? If you are referring to the fourth arm, then why can this not be provided?

The suggested new arm would, of course, be signalised.

The fourth arm would be angled but this need not present any complications at the junction.

The land required for the arrangement would be on land within the area shown on the drawings as being under Redrow control.

It is not accepted that the slight increased length of the changed alignment of the Link Road will have any harmful effect on the Habitat Regulation Assessment.

Why will the arrangement not facilitate the development of future traffic growth and how does the third junction do this?

This arrangement presents the opportunity for an appropriate North Western Gateway as called for in 'The Vision for Our Garden Town' to be properly considered and creatively explored with *'its appearance and function improved by landscape design, art, lighting, signage etc'*.

Only some slight adjustment might be necessary to the shape of the two attenuation ponds to retain the same volume with, perhaps some movement northwards of the ponds along the contour lines.

The fourth arm, from the cross roads, not a roundabout, would be provided with the same safe pedestrian crossing as for the other three arms.

There would be little effect, if any, on the attenuation ponds (see above), and the crossing of the gas main would be the same detail as will be necessary where the Link Road has to cross the gas main at Rag Hill.

It is likely that many cars from the 250 houses would turn round at Whitmore Lane and come back towards the village rather than make the lengthy detour round to the village. Hopefully, many would walk or cycle.

You make no comment with regard to the importance we see of the need for the provision of a footway to the northside of the blind double bend by Orchard Cottage, to improve the safety of walkers and cyclists. TAU 2 requires the closure of this road other than for local access, together with measures to achieve good cycle and walking connections and with a 20-mph limit, once the Link Road is open and this element of commitment must be provided at the same time as the drop-down road.

Page 5                    Where in the documents is this temporary access to Redrow's sales area explained and why are you instigating increased traffic through the village for up to 5years? This sales office access should and must, be from the drop-down road.

Where in the documents is there mention of the need for a pumping station? What is its purpose. Is it a building above ground or is it buried? If above ground then the building would be contrary to the decision of the Government Inspector who ruled that this field should be keep clear of buildings so as not to damage Staplegrove Conservation Area and Village Green. It is also noted that houses are now shown extending well down from the north of this field which also contravenes his decision and is not acceptable.

From the above replies to your responses you will gather that we do not accept that there is any justifiable reason to stay with this location obtained by the Promoters and ask you seriously to undertake the unfortunate requirement for a revised planning application. This will be a little inconvenient but it will achieve cost and time savings to you by a much simpler construction of the Link Road. But more important to the travelling public, it will remove a third junction which would raise safety, congestion and pollution issues which will continue well into the future, long after you have left the site. Please consider not damaging the wellbeing of those who live in the neighbourhood by inflicting building the third junction on us just because you can't be bothered.

I am very happy to meet and talk this through.

Yours sincerely

Michael Clark  
Chairman, Staplegrove Parish Council

**Sent:** 28 December 2019 17:42  
**To:** [elaine.olphert@redrow.co.uk](mailto:elaine.olphert@redrow.co.uk)  
**Cc:** [Sheila Talbot](#); [Staplegrove Parish Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** Staplegrove West.

Dear Elaine,

Thank you for the drawings you have sent which were received yesterday together with the Design and Access Statement. These will certainly be appreciated by many and will enable them to understand your proposals with greater clarity.

I have gone through the lists and wonder if perhaps you could also send copies of Richards drawings 18-47-PL-205, 206, 207 and 208. You did send 201 to 204. They would be very helpful. I have printed off two or three of the others at A4.

There is one detail that I think I should raise now and which the Parish Council would consider should be provided at the same time as the drop-down road is constructed and that is the provision of a footway through the double bend where Manor Road and Corkscrew Lane join. SCC produced a scheme to cover this in 2012 (reference SCC/T1004050/002v01) recognising the complete lack of visibility for walkers and cyclists that exists here. With the increase in road traffic since then, plus the

further growth coming with the development, it has become even more hazardous and the hedge removal and a footway on the northside are the essential recommended solution. It does require land from the front garden of Orchard Cottage which I understand the owner is willing to lose. The scheme would appear to interfere with the shape of your planned SUD at this point and hence some modification would be necessary.

Looking through the drawings I have identified a few queries which we are likely to be asked about and it would be helpful if you could provide the correct answer for us to give.

1. On Banners Gate Section 38 Agreement Plan – 1000 ( and on – 4002) there seems to be an access from Manor Road over the position of the above mentioned SUD. It is not shown on any other drawings. What is its purpose?
2. On the same drawing, what is indicated by the purple coloured rectangles and circles north of the SUD in the field above the Grove and alongside the West Deane Way PRow?
3. The extent of the slopes of the cutting necessary to provide the Spine Road connection to the A358 are not shown on the drawings but am I correct in assuming that the green lines on Banners Gate drawing No – 4001 are the top of the slopes?
4. Are you happy with the ability of the Slaughter House lorries to turn right safely when leaving Mill Lane?

No doubt there will be other queries raised but in the meantime many thanks for sending these helpful drawings.

With kind regards

Michael Clark  
Chairman, Staplegrove Parish Council

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10