

Town Clerk | Swaffham Town Council

From: James Dean <jamesdean@uwclub.net>
Sent: 31 October 2018 14:29
To: Parkes, Ian; Grimley, Andrew; Colman, Ed
Cc: Town Clerk | Swaffham Town Council; Les Scott; Jill Skinner; Kate Gordon; Stan Sole; JUDY ANSCOMBE
Subject: Re: Swaffham AQMA / Swaffham Relief Road meeting
Attachments: Comments on BDC AQAP May 2018 2 July 2018.docx

Hi all

Thanks very much for the responses. We have booked the Council Chamber in the Town Hall for 2 pm on Thursday, November 8th. We would like the agenda to cover;

1. Situation on inclusion of A1065 in MRN
2. Progress on the AQAP and any obs on comments sent in by TAFG on 2nd July (copy attached for easy reference)
3. Results of traffic surveys in connection with future possible N / S Relief Road
4. Pollution measuring equipment problems
5. Development planning and the cumulative effects of pollution arising therefrom
6. Progress on the feasibility study to improve access to Theatre Street car park including improvements to signage.

Hope that's OK. We look forward to seeing you again next Thursday.

Regards

JAMES (Sec, Swaffham TAFG)

From: [Parkes, Ian](#)
Sent: Wednesday, October 31, 2018 9:19 AM
To: [James Dean](#) ; [Grimley, Andrew](#) ; [Colman, Ed](#)
Cc: [Richard Bishop](#) ; [Les Scott](#) ; [Jill Skinner](#) ; [Kate Gordon](#) ; [Stan Sole](#) ; [JUDY ANSCOMBE](#)
Subject: RE: Swaffham AQMA / Swaffham Relief Road meeting

James,

Thanks. This is fine for me.

Regards, Ian.

From: James Dean <jamesdean@uwclub.net>
Sent: 31 October 2018 09:10
To: Parkes, Ian <ian.parkes@norfolk.gov.uk>; Grimley, Andrew <andrew.grimley@breckland.gov.uk>; Colman, Ed <ed.colman.cllr@norfolk.gov.uk>
Cc: Richard Bishop <townclerk@swaffhamtowncouncil.gov.uk>; Les Scott <lesbscott@yahoo.co.uk>; Jill Skinner <jill.skinner@me.com>; Kate Gordon <kate.gordon2@btinternet.com>; Stan Sole <stan.sole@oxford239.plus.com>; JUDY ANSCOMBE <judy.anscombe@btinternet.com>
Subject: Re: Swaffham AQMA / Swaffham Relief Road meeting

Hi All

Further to this earlier corres, can we hold the meeting on **Thursday, 8th November, at 2 pm** in the Town Hall council chamber? Please confirm this is OK and we will send round an agenda.

JAMES (Sec, Swaffham Transport & Access Focus Group)

From: [Parkes, Ian](#)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 11:58 AM
To: [Grimley, Andrew](#) ; lesbscott@yahoo.co.uk ; [James Dean](#) ; [Colman, Ed](#)
Cc: [Robert Walker](#) ; [Xu, Ninan](#) ; [Cumming, David](#)
Subject: RE: Swaffham AQMA

Dear Les, James and Andrew,

Sorry I have not been in touch sooner. We have made a start on the Swaffham AQAP feasibility work and have some feedback from our consultants WSP on the traffic surveys for the Swaffham Network Improvement Strategy to investigate levels of traffic passing through the town without stopping. We have had no formal feedback on the DfT Major Road Network yet but I can update you on what I know to date.

As James suggested in his earlier email, I would be happy to meet with you all week commencing 5 November. I can make anytime except the afternoon of Monday 5 November. Please let me know a convenient time. Thanks.

Regards, Ian.
Ian Parkes CEng MICE
Infrastructure Development
Tel: 01603 223288



From: Grimley, Andrew <Andrew.Grimley@breckland.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 October 2018 15:20
To: lesbscott@yahoo.co.uk; James Dean <jamesdean@uwclub.net>
Cc: Robert Walker <robert.walker@breckland-sholland.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Swaffham AQMA

Dear Mr Scott

I refer to your email to Anna Graves Chief Executive the details of which are noted. I am sorry that I have not replied to your colleague Mr Dean but I have been involved with the final stages of getting approval for the release of the Air Quality Action Plan to Defra, the final step of which I am involved in this week.

I would point out that the plan needs to be approved by Defra and it is unclear how long this process takes.

Once the plan has been accepted by Defra we can move towards examining how the actions can be examined and taken forward.

Norfolk County Council are undertaking investigations into the feasibility of road improvements, Improved access to the Theatre Street car park including signing , Reconfiguring the traffic signal junction to reduce

queuing and emissions on Station Street and Addressing parking issues on Station Street that are causing queuing so the much of the update will need to come from Ian Parkes.

Sadly there has been no progress with the localised air pollution monitoring equipment as the provided unit has not proven to be sufficiently reliable or accurate as promised by the manufacturers. I have not been party to the conversations about a relief road - can you advise who you have discussed this with and I will discuss this them as to any developments.

In terms of attending a meeting with you next week I am free apart from Monday 5 November or the mornings of Tuesday 6 or Wednesday 7 November.

With thanks

Andrew Grimley | Team Leader Environmental Protection | Breckland Council

Office: 01362 656870 | DDI: 01362 656241

www.breckland.gov.uk

In order to sign up for regular newsletters and items of interest relating to Food, Health & Safety, Licensing and Environmental Protection matters [Sign up to our newsletter](#)

From: Les Scott [<mailto:lesbscott@yahoo.co.uk>]

Sent: 25 October 2018 13:37

To: Chief Executive <chief.executive@breckland-sholland.gov.uk>

Subject: swaffham AQMA

This message originated from outside your organization

Hi Anna,

I hope you don't mind my contacting you directly. I have tried unsuccessfully to call you but I guess you are constantly busy.

My reason for contacting you is that I am a member of a focus group constituted to report back to the TC and made up of councillors, residents and businesses. Our purpose is to continue work started through our NP process in relation to Traffic and pollution.

Our work has led to contact with Andrew Gormley and Ian Parkes at NCC but we are now at the point of needing a meeting with both to clarify the situation and gain answers to some questions we have posed but so far have been unable to elicit any response. We are aware of how busy officers are but would respectfully remind Breckland that this is a very important issue to the Town and that BDC have indicated in our NP response that they would value a further meeting with us. Could I ask you to have a look at this please and also assure you that we are a small group and our members are not looking to pillory any BDC officers, just discussion to allow us to understand what can and cannot be achieved.

Hoping you can help,

Les

Disclaimer: If you are not the intended recipient of the email please do not disclose, copy or distribute the information held within. If you have received this email in error please reply informing the sender then delete the email. Any views expressed by the sender of this message are not necessarily those expressed by the local Authority. Communications may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal reasons.

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

--

To see our email disclaimer click here <http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer>

--

To see our email disclaimer click here <http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer>

Comments on BDC's draft Air Quality Action Plan report dated May 2018

by Swaffham Highways and Access Focus Group

Para 3.3 at the end. There appears to be something missing in the text. We would like to see this para having more detail about the counts taken by Swaffham Traffic Group and suggest the following:

"Vehicle counts organised by the Swaffham Traffic Group on the 4th and 8th September, 2017 covered the period 7am to 7 pm on each day and recorded all vehicle types northbound and southbound passing either side of the Buttercross. There were 13,585 vehicles northbound and 13,864 southbound over the two days giving a total figure of 27,449. HGV figures were 1240, 4.5% of the total. Of these HGV's, 64% were 5 and 6 axle vehicles (326) on the A1065 route (east side) and those passing on the west side of Market Place totalled 183, (40%)."

Our other comments concentrate mainly on examining the 22 Action Points listed in Table 5.1 of the AQAP report but add in additional ideas. The numbers below refer to those in the Table. We believe that selecting proposals which reduce pollution, benefit the town in other ways, offer good value for money and are relatively easy to implement **should be considered first in a Priority List.**

A general point - a reduction in "up to 1" in NO₂ has been applied to all measures proposed, which we don't find credible. Is there any basis in fact?

Suggested Priority List

POLICY ACTIONS

1, 2, 3 4 and 5, especially 4. We think these actions should be strengthened so there is a **mandatory requirement** that planning applications deal properly with the impact of development proposals on air quality. Investment in more accurate measuring devices is also needed.

6. It is understood that a new enforcement regime is about to start in the central (Breckland owned) parking areas which should increase turnover of spaces and reduce the number of cars cruising round looking for empty spaces.

On the remaining measures proposed, we suggest below **those which should be progressed immediately** as probably offering the best value for money and are relatively easy to implement. Those which in our view should not be pursued or dealt with later are listed at the end, with reasons.

TRANSPORT MEASURES

8. **Theatre Street, reassess original proposal to revert to two-way in existing one – way section.** This will reduce pollution by giving cars more direct access from the south into the car park. It is understood funding for this review is available.

9. **Town centre parking space removal.** Supported, as this will also offer a reduction in pollution and also improve the attractiveness of the town centre.

12. **HGV Ban in Station Street.** We feel this is worth while pursuing as it will have a marked effect in reducing pollution in Station Street. Mandatory signs would be "no HGV's over 7.5 tonnes ,except for access" This would be a relatively inexpensive scheme which

could go in as a traffic experiment with proper monitoring of the effects. Access to premises would need to be allowed. In parallel with this proposal, we would like to see an **advisory scheme being developed to encourage long distance HGV's to divert onto the A10 / A148 route via King's Lynn**. This would require signs at Fakenham for southbound lorries and for northbound lorries at Junction 9 on the M11 to request drivers to continue along the M11 and then take the A14 and A10 route to north Norfolk via King's Lynn.

Alternatively, drivers are already advised by signage at the Mildenhall roundabout "for Swaffham take A11 and A134". At the Mundford roundabout they could be advised "For North Norfolk, use A134 and then A10 / A148".

13. **N – S Relief Road**, all necessary survey work to establish the feasibility of a route either to the east or west of the town should be put in hand as soon as possible. This longer term measure will have a marked effect on pollution levels in the town generally, not just in the declared area.

18 and 22. Electric car points and green space initiatives (especially tree planting) are supported.

The remaining Action Items are not supported for the reasons given:-

7. **Improvements at Station Street / Mangate Street traffic signals**. It is understood the settings have already been altered to longer green times for the N / S traffic. A more radical scheme which might involve removing the signals is likely to be expensive and offer poor value for money especially when pedestrian movements are taken into account.

10. Consider options for **new car parks**. Not needed at present as there is spare capacity in the system.

11. Review **illegal and bad parking in Station Street**. The single yellow lines (8 am to 6 pm) on the west side only go as far as Spinners Lane. It would be possible to extend them further along the stretch where Station Street is particularly narrow, but the properties have no off street parking land so this could prove difficult.

14. Public Transport, 15. Walking and Cycling, 16 Travel to Schools and Car Sharing. 17, Car Clubs all worthy but unlikely to have much effect on pollution.

EMISSIONS ACTIONS

19 Low Emission buses, 20 Public transport - unlikely to have much effect on local pollution.

PUBLIC HEALTH MEASURES

21 – Promotion of Road safety, Eco Driving – not much local effect on pollution.

JDD

2 July 2018