

**From:** Juliet Partridge  
**Sent:** 9 Aug 2020 15:14:53 +1000  
**To:** Meander Valley Council Email;Juliet Partridge;leigh.cleghorn@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Fwd: STATEMENT BY KEN PARTRIDGE re PA\16\0005 Tuesday 13/10/2015

Hi Jo please acknowledge this email, thanks

Re: Your letter 12th June 2020 Your Ref 13047

Sorry we never got back to you re your offer to speak here... no takers!  
Many I spoke to said they weren't concerned at this stage because they could put their hand up at the Planning Permit stage, if they were concerned.

Today I came across this "STATEMENT etc..." when the original question on this matter was raised but was not resolved (at least, not within my hearing...) Can you now take this on board and get back to us asap?  
The section **Flawed Process?** with specific attention to **all the bold bits in 3.1 and 3.2** should do the trick .....

In my day, Building Permits would still be required but that does not allow for any public comment etc on why it should be happening in the first place.... ie **Planning concerns!**

Very best wishes Ken

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Juliet Partridge** <[partridgesjk@gmail.com](mailto:partridgesjk@gmail.com)>  
Date: Sat, 8 Aug 2020 at 19:48  
Subject: Fwd: STATEMENT BY KEN PARTRIDGE re PA\16\0005 Tuesday 13/10/2015  
To: Juliet Partridge <[partridgesjk@gmail.com](mailto:partridgesjk@gmail.com)>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ken Partridge** <[partridgesjk@gmail.com](mailto:partridgesjk@gmail.com)>  
Date: Sun, 11 Oct 2015 at 17:58  
Subject: Fwd: STATEMENT BY KEN PARTRIDGE re PA\16\0005 Tuesday 13/10/2015  
To: Susan Judge <[sjudge@internode.on.net](mailto:sjudge@internode.on.net)>

heretiz see u to - mo- oh keep safe moi x

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ken Partridge** <[partridgesjk@gmail.com](mailto:partridgesjk@gmail.com)>

Date: 11 October 2015 at 15:51

Subject: STATEMENT BY KEN PARTRIDGE re PA\16\0005 Tuesday 13/10/2015

To: Juliet Partridge <[partridgesjk@gmail.com](mailto:partridgesjk@gmail.com)>

## 1 **Pedestrian Safety**

1.1 I am advised that a footbridge - provisionally conceived as a cantilever alongside the S edge

of the Hadspen Road bridge- is already predicated and that money is already allocated for its construction.

1.2 This recognition (of pedestrian vulnerability on the road bridge) is reassuring but it will only

make proper sense if it happens BEFORE this proposed market is commissioned and traffic in

-creases accordingly!

1.3 I therefore suggest the following solution; that Mr Sherrard foregoes his proposed pedestrian

underpass of the Meander Valley Road (MVR) opposite the Lodge & Market in favour of steps

the level of the existing footpath below the road bridge at the W abutment and the money he

saves ( it will be substantial) is made available to Council NOW to provide a chain bridge over

the ford linking Lions Park with Entally Road.

( If Rob is not prepared to do this magnanimously I'm sure the service club will be happy to

persuade him!)

## 2 **A Circular Logic**

2.1 The adverse effects of increased traffic flow (not disputed) on access/egress onto/from MVR is

effectively put down in 2 documents, emails;

A. State Growth to MVC Planning 25th Aug 2015 11:23AM  
and

B Pitt & Sherry (P&S) to ditto 25th Sep 2015 3:16PM.

2.1A Garry Hills acknowledges that whilst the Rutherglen Road junction is "...in the range for

requiring channelised CHR and auxiliary AUL treatments ..." he **accepts** the TIA's suggested

reasons for not so doing but then immediately **questions their adequacy?**

(before closing on a note of sitting on the fence i.e. implying that State Growth will rely on

**TIA!** and stick to Govt policy and not demur on the side of caution and public safety!! )

2.1B Ian Abernethy then poses, exactly 1 month later, "...can the increase in traffic be safely

accommodated within the existing road network? The expert report and the comments from

State Growth **suggest** it can." (my emphasis, because that is **P&S' suggestion** i.e. the

firm that Ian speaks for **produced the TIA** and are now relying on its expertness to persuad

everybody, including - especially including - Justin!

2.2 So, the circle is complete; **B**, the expert, does the TIA. **A**, the State Authority follows suit

then **B** sums up using suggestion dressed in the expert report mantle as the ultimate advice

to MVC.

2.3 If we are completely informed i.e. if no other official communication took place, then we

must also assume that State Growth were never made aware of our concerns (**A** decision

above, was 25/8 whereas our representations closed 7/9! ). May we ask why our concerns

were, effectively, ignored ???

### 3 **Flawed Process?**

3.1 The combined - synergistic - effect of the extra traffic that will be generated by the revitalising

of Entally House both along the MVR, accessing and egressing the House (via the "Entally

Estate" gate at the brow of the hill) and coming and going to this proposed Market and

Entally Lodge via Rutherglen Road are seriously underscored by the planning principle that

Entally House is ***in the future....***

***But what if Entally doesn't have to apply for a Planning Permit?***

3.2 From my conversation with Mr Scherrard on Sunday 6th Sept between 3.30 -4.00 pm  
I

considered this a strong possibility ***i.e. he will not have to apply for a planning permit for what he is proposing...***

***In which case, what will trigger a more realistic traffic assessment?***

3.3 Notwithstanding the dismissal by all 3 controlling bodies of the significance of the AUSTRAL

GUIDE breaches it is ironical that Mr Scherrard did not disagree that the stretch of MVR - we

were looking at it from out front of the House - presented some difficult access problems for

his Market proposal.

So we even have the owner/developer adding weight to the concerns of an independent

forensic traffic collision expert!

3.4 I respectfully suggest as at least a partial solution, that Rob be asked to commit to access

to Entally House via the original route i.e. via Entally Road (once the remarketed Entally gains traction).

Thank you sincerely Ken Partridge