



Minutes of the Aylsham Town Council Traffic Group Meeting held on Wednesday 31st August 2022 at Aylsham Town Hall

Present

Trevor Bennett (chairman)	David Faulkner
Clare Alban	David Harry
Paul Baker	Lynda Hartley
Maureen Burr	Barry Lancaster
Sue Catchpole	Richard Laxen
Gordon Clarke	Lindsay Little
Andy Christie	Richard Moore
Catherine Fletcher	Pat Prekopp
Mary Evans	

Sue Lake

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received and accepted from:

Ellie Baker	Nicholas Haag
Rebecca Davies	Arthur Rope

2 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 11th August were circulated with the agenda. The minutes were **AGREED**

3. Report on Meeting with Broadland District Council

Members of the Town Council met with three planning officers from the District Council to talk about the proposed developments. One condition of the GNLP is the creation of a safe crossing of the A140. It had previously been stated in writing and was re-emphasised at the meeting that a safe crossing would need to be a tunnel, bridge or lights. A traffic island in the middle of the road was not deemed safe by the Town Council.

A feasibility study had been commissioned on a crossing but the three officers were not fully aware of this. They will be looking into this and reporting back. A further reminder will be sent to them in early September. A request for a meeting with Highways has also been made and this will also be followed up in early September once most holidays will have been completed.

4. Traffic Strategy – Areas in Agreement

The meeting agenda had been split into three sections. This first section consists of areas where the group is in agreement with the draft strategy. These consist of the items relating to;-

- Wayfinder signage
- Transport hubs
- Pedestrian crossings

- Improvements to Marriott's Way
- Bure Valley School
- Footpaths
- Car Parks

5. Traffic Strategy – Areas in Dispute

a) Failure to look at the impact of the developments

The chairman still felt this was a missed opportunity but acknowledged this was not detailed in the brief given to the consultants. The main issue with the developments will be the location of the school. It was suggested we ask ttc how much (and long) it would be to model the traffic implications.

b) Red Lion Street

See item 6

c) Burgh Road

See item 7

6 Red Lion Street

Paul Baker and Arthur Rope had consulted with residents and businesses on Red Lion Street and had written a report that was circulated with the agenda.

It has been generally acknowledged by the group that although it would be good if Red Lion Street was pedestrianised or made one-way the implications on other roads make this impractical.

The report stated that the area of issue was from Peggs Yard through to the junction of White Hart Street. This is the narrowest part of the road and is the limit of visibility when entering Red Lion Street from the north.

The proposals were as follows:

- Different colour tarmac possibly with pedestrian silhouettes added to show this is a high pedestrian area
- Declare the street a pedestrian priority area (but not exclude vehicle)
- Provide appropriate signage
- Introduce a yellow box but with no priority stated

The coloured tarmac was considered favourable as was the signage. However, there was a dislike for the introduction of a yellow box as it would not be aesthetically pleasing and could be in issue with the conservation officer.

After discussion it was considered that white lines showing the road narrowing might be a better option.

This was agreed and will be communicated to ttc.

7. Burgh Road

Residents of Burgh Road had met to discuss the road issues and had prepared a report that was circulated to members.

This report detailed the problems identified by residents

- Speeding

- Safety for all road users
 - Narrowness of road causing blockages
 - Road rage at Oakfield Road junction
 - High level of children crossing road
 - Vehicles too wide meaning pavements have to be used and therefore drivers are breaking the Highway Code
 - Narrow pavements
 - Noise
 - Erosion of green space
 - Poor visibility exiting Burgh Road
 - Lack of consultation
 - Proof that people adapt as when the road was closed for gas works
 - Current proposals are not radical enough
- i) That the speed check (SAM2) equipment is installed to establish the actual speed of vehicles travelling along Burgh Road at various points. That the data collected is shared with the local police in order to encourage speed checks if found to be appropriate.
This has been put in place and the results will be ready for the next meeting
- ii) That the signs at the A140 roundabout are altered to encourage traffic wishing to enter Aylsham to use the Norwich Road entrance to the town.
See agenda item 8f
- iii) That vehicle weight limits of 7.5t are introduced as per Millgate (except busses and refuse collection vehicles) to reduce the number of heavy vehicles using the road.
The regulations for imposing weights would need to be checked
- iv) That four new traffic-calming platform crossings are installed at:
 - the end of Forster Way across to the Recreation Ground
 - where the footpath emerges from Parmeter Close
 - across the top (town) end of the road
 - across to the bus stop/M&S at the roundabout end (as part of the new development).*Traffic calming points would encourage both pedestrians and motorists to take care. Suggestion of a zebra or pelican crossing to be included*
- v) That a cycleway is marked clearly along the length of the road.
Possible cycle stencils in road to make drivers of motorised vehicles more aware of other users
- vi) That Burgh Road be made one-way, with traffic moving away from town towards Forster Way, then two-way from Forster Way to the roundabout.
The issue of the car park was raised and therefore the one-way would need to start at the Oakfield Road junction. This will be suggested to ttc who could speak to highways
- vii) That Burgh Road be made 20mph along its full length and that 'Check your speed' signs are installed.
The concept was for permanent lit signs similar to the SAM2 but possible bespoke

viii) That the non-present residents of the Forster Way Estate, Burgh Road and Aegel Gardens be consulted on the changes proposed for the longer term.
This will happen naturally when the strategy is completed.

ix) That construction vehicles of any size are only allowed to enter the development site via A140.
This needs to be a planning condition

8. Traffic Strategy – Areas Requiring further discussion

a) Penfold Street

The Fire Service are concerned regarding the proposal for shared use. Some members felt this was unjustified so will need to be re-discussed

b) Cycle routes

Arthur Rope has prepared some alternative ideas and these will be put forward

c) Vehicle Speeds - linked to 20mph zone possibly being changed.

The current boundaries seem correct

d) Expansion of roads with double yellow lines, possible areas to consider

Members were asked to advise the Town Council of any areas they feel would benefit from the introduction of yellow lines

e) One way systems are any possible?

This was not thought possible

f) Signage on A140

Gordon Clarke had prepared a report on possible signage for the entrances at Dunkirk, Burgh Road, Norwich Road and Cawston Road. This was universally welcomed and Gordon will add more detail for the next meeting

9. To summarise failures and successes of the project

This was originally added in March as an anniversary of the project. The idea is to see if what the group has done is adequate and positive. This will be placed earlier in the agenda next meeting.

10 To note any items for future discussion

Whether part of the Market Place could be closed to traffic

11. To note date of next meeting Wednesday September 28th 2022

The meeting closed at 9.35pm