



## Minutes of the Aylsham Town Council Traffic Group Meeting held on Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> May 2022 via Zoom

### Present

Trevor Bennett	Clare Alban
Mary Evans	Sue Catchpole
Pat Prekopp	Arthur Rope
Nicholas Haag	
James McGavin	
Luke Ford	
Sue Lake	

### 1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received and accepted from:

David Faulkner  
Catherine Fletcher  
Richard Laxen  
Ellie Baker  
Paul Baker  
Gordon Clarke  
Andy Christie

### 2 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> April were circulated with the agenda. The minutes were **AGREED**

### 3/4. Traffic Strategy

The chairman opened the meeting by stating that the draft strategy did not appear to take into account the proposed developments. Building time is likely to be set back due to the Nutrient Neutrality issue.

James then talked to a presentation and a draft strategy response. The consultants main impetus was about protecting the town centre. He would go through all the points and how they would propose these be addressed.

#### Issue 1 – 20mph speed limit area

20mph only works if the traffic is only travelling at below 25mph. The lack of enforcement is also a key issue. The survey responses referenced speeding as an issue.

The measures available to combat this are

**Increased enforcement** – this depends on the police and is unlikely to be increased

**Community speed watch** – this works well in many areas. The local police have tried to instigate a new Community speed watch team but there are no volunteers for this.

**20mph zones** - Instead of 20mph limits introduce 20mph zones. Zones tend to be more effective than limits as it they are concentrated on a smaller area. 20mph works better in a smaller area

Speed watch would be the preference.

Also need to look at the actual speeds as perception and reality are different so issue needs to be quantified. More data will be available when the SAM2 is working again. It was suggesting depict the hazards with pictures of school children or elderly people in the most vulnerable areas.

Speeding is possibly more of an issue on the outer roads

Crashmap.co.uk has data for crashes in a defines area.

#### **Issue 2 – Penfold Street**

There was some confusion over this – ttc agree with the Town Council that the priority should be for the traffic leaving the town and they are not sure why the County Council chose this priority.

The second proposal here was to block the spur road from Penfold Street through to Cawston Road and give back areas of highway back to pedestrians. This would give better access to the pump, would create an area that could be managed as public realm space and also make the transition into the give way section of Penfold Street safer. There was also discussion as to whether a one-way system could be created effectively using the pimp as a roundabout. This would increase some of the pedestrian space but would still cause issues, albeit not as pronounced, for pedestrians crossing the road

#### **Issue 3 – Mill Road/Cawston Road**

Due to cost of TRO suggest removing from report. It is acknowledged that this will still be an issue for the Council. A large expenditure that may not prove successful.

#### **Issue 4 – Buses in Market Place Issue 6 – Red Lion Street**

Point of clarification the proposal was for buses both ways with timetable amendments to ensure they do not meet. Red Lion Street is a busy road with narrow footpaths and the concept was to remove as much traffic as possible.

This would disperse traffic onto other roads and although projected numbers are high the roads can accommodate them.

A one-way system had been looked at but rejected as it was so excessive. Any changes to Red Lion Street to make it one-way would not affect the width of the road as in places it only just meets the current criteria for a one-way street. The consultants were not aware that the new school on Burgh Road was actually a replacement for St Michaels. It was thought that Burgh Road would be more of an

issue than Red Lion Street once the school and houses are built and a long discussion on this matter took place,

The prospect of lights was discussed but the consultant advised this was against design principles and would create queues at either end.

Any reduction in traffic on Red Lion street will have an effect on other roads and the restrictions put in place during Covid showed that these were in the main adverse and increased traffic on roads that were not suitable for any additional traffic i.e Oakfield Road, Petersons Lane and Rawlinsons Lane

The consultant stated that the brief was about catering for more than the car and to make the town centre better for pedestrians. This can only be achieved by removing some vehicle movements. There are options for modelling of impacts should a one-way system be introduced.

It was stated that discussions are needed with Highways regarding the issues that the developments, especially the Burgh Road one, will have on the town.

A Transport Assessment and Travel Plan will be written by the developer but is not yet available and there is no indication when it will be a public document and this may be received too late to really challenge and make a difference.

This is an ongoing issue that is partly outside the Traffic Group remit but will be followed up by the Town Council

#### **Market Place –**

Basically this is a car park and parking is everywhere. The plan is to try and regulate the parking and then make the Market Place better for pedestrians. This would result in a loss of five spaces. However, the car parks should be able to accommodate this shortfall. It is hoped this will lead to an increase in footfall in both the Market place and Red Lion Street. The overall emphasis is to try and return the town centre to what it is for – leisure/shopping – rather than a car park.

The Market Place is a no parking area on Mondays and Fridays and this does not prove insurmountable.

Members were happy with the proposals for the Market Place but there may be an issue with the traders. Also there may be a need for more disabled spaces. It was also felt this would give more room for pushchairs, wheelchairs and mobility scooters

#### **Issue 5 – Burgh Road Give Way**

No issue

#### **Issue 7 Red Lion Street/White Hart Street Crossing**

No issues with this proposal

#### **Issue 8 – Wayfinder Signage**

No issue with this proposal

#### **Transport Hubs – clarification**

These are areas where green transport measures meet i.e. cycleways with bus stops to enable people to have an alternative to getting in the car. The current proposals

for the land at Norwich Road development will also allow for this type of installation. There is also the Community bus but this has not been advertised very widely.

#### **A140 Crossing**

When the consultants spoke to BVR they advised that the funding was in place. The Town Council feel that only one of three options should be installed – lights, bridge or tunnel – anything else would not be deemed as safe.

There is also a suggestion of a lay-by on the A140 to allow buses to stop to offer a further route for residents.

#### **Cycle Routes**

The idea was to have a safe route to Blickling avoiding the Blickling Route but they understand the points made and are happy to change this but felt the addition of a safe crossing point would be useful.

#### **Car Parks**

Noted the preference for two hours free parking.

#### **Signs and signage**

These would need to be approved by the conservation officer.

#### **Northern Bypass**

This was not considered as the costs would be excessive but is extremely unlikely to come to fruition so was removed.

The consultants will now update the strategy following this feedback meeting. This will be sent to the Town Council for discussion. Aspects of the one-way system will be included but the data may not be conclusive.

#### **Keys Yard**

No further information at the moment.

#### **6. To summarise failures and successes of our 1st year ( to 30 March )**

It was questioned whether the group need to form sub-groups to discuss issues in depth prior to the next meeting. This was felt unnecessary at the moment.

#### **7. To note any items for future discussion**

Nothing raised

#### **8. To note date of next meeting Wednesday June 29<sup>th</sup> 2022**

The meeting closed at 9.55pm