

From: Steven Woodcock [mailto:SWoodcock@allmanwoodcock.com]
Sent: 30 August 2012 12:23
To: Heather Miller
Cc: alisonwoodcock@me.com
Subject: Planned removal of free parking on Trinity Street

Dear Heather Miller

I am recording my objection to the proposed removal of free parking outside Nos 17 – 19 Trinity Street. This proposal is contrary to the agreement I and other Trinity Street property owners formally reached with Suffolk County Council on 7 November 2011.

Mr Derek Oldham, East Area Highway Manager of Suffolk County Council is now aware of this matter. Please refer to attached email and attachments.

In view of the time remaining before the proposed experimental scheme is due to start, please treat this matter as urgent.

Yours sincerely

Steven Woodcock

Heather Miller 17, Trinity Street,
Bungay

01986
893744

SUFFOLK C.C.
ENDEAVOUR HOUSE

31 AUG 2012

NR 35 1EH

30th August 2012

Dear Ms Miller,

RE - Parking Regulations
Trinity Street, Bungay

We should be grateful if
you would ensure the existing parking
spots are retained outside numbers
eleven to thirteen Trinity Street.

There are a number of reasons
why the current arrangements are
more practical than the installation
of a pinch point by the church
yard path from St Mary's and
the removal of all parking places.

The first is that the cars

slow down to pass the parked vehicles and that will be all the more important when the traffic increases by four hundred percent.

Secondly, the parking spaces will allow for work to be carried out on the front of these properties and for builders' vans, scaffolding ladders etc to park without stopping the flow of traffic along Trinity Street. If the pinch point is built and partly stopped then any lorry or van parked for essential maintenance or deliveries will bring Burgay to a halt.

Thirdly, we were assured last November that these spaces would be retained. Given that

our quality of life and the value of our properties will be dramatically affected by the new one-way proposals, the existing parking arrangements would be some small compensation if retained.

We realize that time is short, but keep the parky rather than putting in place a pinch point would in no way stop the experimental one-way scheme from going ahead.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

Bhan + Arobie Robinson
(MR + MRS B. S. ROBINSON)

From: Debra Guterres [debrakdabra@yahoo.co.uk]
Sent: Wed 19/09/2012 12:57
To: ESE PDC Scheme Delivery
Subject: Bungay one way system. For the Attention of Mr. McGregor.

Dear Mr. McGregor,

I am writing to you about the Bungay one way system. The system has been in place for over a week now. I am so gutted for the people of Bungay. Out of the 79 shop keepers in Bungay, only 4 wanted this system. Now those 4 are saying they made a massive mistake. Every single shop without fail say the takings are down. The shops clearly cannot sustain these loses. So you have, as predicted by us, succeeded in destroying a lovely town.

We were told that the Catholic school wanted this system because there was too much traffic for the children. Well now it is even worse for several reasons and now vehicles are now forced to go on the pavement to get round lorries and busses. The cross walk at the Boots Chemist end of town has been switched off. The poor Elderly of Bungay don't know what's happening. There are frail and blind people in Bungay who now have no place to cross. What on earth is going on with the crosswalk lights? No one seems to know. It's all a shambles as predicted.

I said in my last correspondence with you that if the system was not working, I would shop elsewhere. I live 6 miles from Harleston, Halesworth and Bungay. So I have a choice. I have decided after getting caught in your nightmare, that Harleston is the way forward for me. It is friendly, has all the shops I need and more importantly is a lovely town with no bad vibes.

You have no doubt seen the postings of the town mayor's wife on Facebook. Her comments are so outrageous it beggars belief. I will attach a copy for you to read. This is exactly the bad vibes that permeate through the whole of Bungay. People are so angry. OAP's are driving the wrong way because they don't know what's going on.

I firmly believe that this situation is a tragedy waiting to happen. Roads cannot be accessed when they are blocked. When (not if) this happens, you can be sure that it will be brought to the attention of the powers be, that this was pointed out to you over and over. You will then Have to take responsibility. The town gets totally clogged up when there are 2 busses at the stop. No one can get passed any trucks that might be in the loading bay at Whitman's thus blocking up the street. No one can get passed the funeral cars at the church when there is a funeral thus blocking up the town. There was a tail back all the way to the swimming baths on the outskirts of Bungay last week. This has never before been seen. We are all convinced that this will settle down once people stop coming into town. It is already evident that this is happening. People are shopping elsewhere. So No traffic, no shops = ghost town.

Thank you for ruining what was a lovely town. You will be remembered Mr. McGregor as the man who destroyed Bungay Town.

Well Done.

Debra Guterres.

T, Ear 1

Councillor Guy McGregor

Suffolk County Council

8 Russell Road, Ipswich

IP1 2BX

24/09/12

Waveney Cottage

The Street Earsham

Bungay NR35 2TY

Dear Councillor McGregor

Copy

Since the implementation by Suffolk County Council's experimental order for Bungay under section 9 and 10 of the Road Traffic Act 1984 I am not aware of any improvement of the flow of traffic.

- 1) A greater volume of traffic is now forced down the very narrow Trinity Street.
- 2) The wider St Mary's Street has been artificially narrowed by chicanes. The width of the street previously easily accommodated two way traffic.
- 3) Wharton Street parking has been removed from outside the library removing a facility much used by people visiting the library.
- 4) The useful crossing by traffic lights outside St Mary's Church has ceased as the lights are now hooded.

Bungay was not built for the constant flow of large lorries and cars. While welcoming 20 mph in the centre of Bungay I would like to point out that the layout of the roads meant that this speed and lower was my experience before the 9th September.

Bungay is ^{ce}tourist town and as such the historic sites should be cherished not treated as traffic islands. ⁿ

I would suggest the more pressing problem is that huge lorries use Bungay as a rat run. Lorries should be banned except for delivery vehicles.

Yours sincerely

Susan McDonald

Susan McDonald

RESTRICTED

**SUFFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL
Leader's Office**

Endeavour House, Russell Road, Ipswich, IP1 2BX
Telephone: Ipswich (01473) 264012
Fax: 01473 216846

For The Attention Of: Susan Basted

From: Vicki Goldring
Date: 17th December 2012
CC Cabinet Member for Roads and Transport

Dear Sue,

Please find attached a letter from Mrs Lipscomb concerning the Bungay one-way trial system.

Please could this be looked into and a draft response be done for the Leader's approval by Thursday 27th December 2012.

Many thanks.

Vicki

**Vicki Goldring
PA to the Leader of Suffolk County Council
Floor 2, Gold Block
Ext 4012**

RESTRICTED

17 DEC 2012

19, Thomas Barwell Drive

Bungay

Suffolk

NR 35 1SQ

Ref:

Bungay ONE WAY
SYSTEM 'TRIAL'

December 1st, 2012.

Dear MR. Bee,

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the one way system in Bungay, as I have now had long enough to see all the pitfalls of the project.

Firstly the area down St. Mary's Street is ~~incorrectly~~ laid out. These loading & parking bays are in the wrong place. It is not necessary outside Coopers, who have a car park at the rear. Large lorries enclosed by the bus-stop bay & cause congestion, with buses, & other other lorries & cars cannot pass. Clearly this has not been thought through. There is no provision for cyclists at all; no disabled bays. Many of the workers at Clays Factory travel by cycle, as they live in Bungay, they have been completely overlooked. The shops along St. Mary's Street have closed or declined in takings, I understand are down between 15-20%. More closures will follow - Bungay is now dead because of the one-way system. Neighbourhoods will be lost & no one will open a business along there, if there is no footfall. Basically the signs given out by this scheme is "Bungay is closed for Business" drive through it quickly.

It certainly is not safer & the emissions

from Corner passing through is still high.
Free one hour parking will not revive Buzguy
steppy centre. We all go to Beules
or people now step online. That is a fact.
Perhaps the usage of empty commercial units
could be changed to residential, as has happened
before.

Money to Broad St, coming up off the A1423
you have congestion as traffic, comes off
Eastern St, from St. Mary's St to go down
Bridge St or everyone has to navigate
Trinity St & get round by the library.
It is utter chaos. Ambulances have been
held up there, the lovely bay by Highways
Store, is of course used as a parking bay
for NATWest customers for their hole in the wall.
The market on Thursday has declined to such
an extent, some traders do not come any more.

The crossing by the St. Edmunds School into
the ridiculous humps, is no safer & could
easily have been removed by a "lollypop person"
school hours only, for a minimal cost.

The lovely Georgian listed properties in Trinity
Street, will no doubt be structurally affected by
the volume of heavy traffic. Chaudhry by.

It is a massive over-reaction, by the
traffic department & expense, when only
a little tweaking was necessary.

Clearly lessons were not learnt from Bridge
St, when I understand, traffic calming bumps
had to be removed. Any heavy traffic coming
down from the 144 should be diverted along
the B1062, stay mostly below to Bernard Matthews

or although they might mean about diesel costs from repairing, they are slowly destroying Burying, & could easily absorb extra costs from their profits.

The area which needs attention is the following:

A144 to crossing Hillside Road East or 1062 - A major accident hot spot, going right towards the Coop store. The white lines & arrows need painting & better signage is required. Coming off the A143 by Clays up Broad St. The roadblock needs white line refreshment.

The new development under construction at 'Chicken Remount' will house about 150 people residing there, which will only add to the congestion in Burying in a few years time.

Some things are best left alone. Such a massive expenditure at the height of the recession is sheer folly. This scheme has clearly not been given any lateral thinking at all & should be scrapped with immediate effect.

Businesses do not have time, once the trade has gone elsewhere it will not return. The council would be thought highly of if they scrap it.

Yours sincerely

MRS. Nadine hipson

D.M.P.
(DISCOUNT MOTOR PARTS)
56 St. MARYS St., BUNGAY. SUFFOLK, NR35 1AX
TEL; (01986) 896656

9th December 2012

Guy McGregor
County Councillor
Portfolio Holder for Roads, Transport & Planning
Time House
Low Street
Hoxne
Eye
Suffolk IP21 5AR

BUNGAY ONE WAY TRAFFIC SYSTEM

Dear Sir,

I understand that you are the official responsible for the above system. I therefore wish to know what you propose to do to restore my level turnover to that it was prior to 9th September?

I had an immediate turn down of 30% and now after three months it is approx. 50%. Obviously at these levels I am not making any profit or even anywhere near covering my expences. In fact failure could be on the horizon. This is happening at a time of the year when based on previous figures I would expect turnover to be increasing, i.e. business in the winter is at a higher level than in the summer.

I have been established at this address for twenty years and had a thriving business with turnover rising year upon year and apparently generally unaffected by the recession.

The phase a "shopping experience" has been banded about by some supporters of the scheme, but this road which is the one mainly effected, is not one where customers come to browse the shops, they come to make specific purchases.

I believe my business has suffered more than any other as my premises were in full view of all traffic heading south. Now I am completely hidden from all through traffic as it is heading north and I can only be seen in

a rear view mirror. My shop is situated in the fork between Upper and Lower

Olland Streets with the frontage facing north along St Mary's Street.

I therefore wish to repeat my initial question, what do you propose to about it or what redress do I have?

Your faithfully



P S J PLUMLEY

Copies to: David Ritchie
Andrew Pearce
Mark Bee
Peter Aldous MP

SUFFOLK C.C.
ENDEAVOUR HOUSE
25 MAR 2013

D.M.P.

(DISCOUNT MOTOR PARTS)

**56 St. MARYS ST., BUNGAY.SUFFOLK, NR35 1AX
TEL; (01986) 896656**

20th March 2013

Heather Miller
Legal Department
Suffolk County Council
Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich IP1 2BX

BUNGAY ONE WAY TRAFFIC SYSTEM

Dear Madam

I enclose a copy of a letter I sent to County Councillor Guy McGregor regarding the above scheme on 9th December, after it had been running for three months.

I have now added a few further observations:-

The traffic is now travelling faster with more noise. Previously it was self calming and this coupled with the proposed shared surface scheme will make more dangerous for pedestrians and particularly for the disabled and blind.

Hold- ups are now more frequent as there is no alternative route.

Children from the school when being picked by coach, now have to board from the centre of the road or cross the road. Previously they could board directly from the footpath outside the school.

I believe the "footfall" of shoppers and visitors has been reduced, no doubt to the advantage of Beccles.

I also believe the diverting of southbound traffic through residential streets is not desirable.

Furthermore I understand the recent poll conducted by the "Beccles and Bungay" newspaper showed a majority in favour of returning to two-way traffic.

This view is also been supported by the few customers I have left.

Everyday some cars still drive the wrong way to save travelling further than necessary, which makes economic sense.

We also noted a police car on a non-emergency journey do the same.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'P S J Plumley', written in dark ink.

P S J PLUMLEY

From: judith.hellary@hotmail.co.uk
To: heather.millar@suffolk.gov.uk
Subject: Trial One Way System - Bungay
Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2013 13:28:05 +0000

Dear Ms Millar

I understand from Susan Broom that you are the person to address grievances to regarding the trial one way system in Bungay.

From the Sunday in September when the trial was launched, Bungay is not the same town it was, certainly not better. The centre resembles a race track and the 20 mph signs are ignored by the motorists who appear to be Kings now. I live in Trinity Street which was a quiet, residential street, now it's an A road with cars racing along passed the listed buildings and veering into Wharton Street.

Below are some observations -

- Motorists ignore the speed limit and there is no one to enforce it.
- Crossing by foot, Trinity Street & Wharton Street are dangerous. We need a crossing.
- What damage is being done to the listed buildings in Trinity Street? the ancient walls and churches?
- If I had not had secondary glazing installed my life would be intolerable with the noise and pollution due to the increase of traffic. At some times of the day and night there is a constant stream of traffic passing along Trinity Street. I know this is true because I live there.
- Lorries turning into Wharton Street frequently cross the white line which is supposedly a walk way for pedestrians.
- I understand that a member of the evaluation group was an instigator in the idea of the one way system, surely he cannot have an unbiased view?
- The views of the residents of Trinity Street/Wharton Street appear to have been ignored.
- There is less parking for residents in Wharton Street and Trinity Street.
- St. Mary's Street is now a mess with the islands which look untidy as they get hit regularly.

The volume of traffic has caused me to consider moving house but I fear at this moment in time this would not be an option.

I look forward to your response.

Kind regards

Judith Hellary

From: Derek Ward [mailto:eedraw@gmail.com] On Behalf Of derekward
Sent: 22 January 2013 12:02
To: Heather Miller
Subject: Bungay one way trial scheme

Dear Heather Miller

This email is to record our feelings about the trial one way system in Bungay. I would like my views to be noted before the final decision is made.

I have been in contact with Susan Broom, several times since the introduction of the trial one way scheme in Bungay and have also expressed our concerns to Mr McGregor and Bungay Town Council.

I have lived in Trinity St for over twelve years; most of our neighbours have lived here even longer. The houses are all listed and residents have always taken a pride in maintaining their properties. The street used to be a pleasant street to walk along, both for residents and visitors. However, since the introduction of the trial one way system on September 9th last year, we all feel that the quality of our lives has deteriorated considerably, with incessant noise and pollution. It is surely to the detriment of Bungay's heritage and has changed the character of the town. While many drivers will see a slightly speedier journey through the town as an advantage, there is a significant number of people, who are of the opinion that this is not the right solution to Bungay's traffic and commerce problems. The trial was launched on the strength of a marginally higher vote for this option. Only 251 took the opportunity to vote. Bungay Town Council reached their decision on the strength of advice to the traffic committee from an Earsham St trader, who had some experience of traffic management. I note that he was also present at the evaluation meeting in November, representing the Chamber of Trade. He gives the impression that all members of the Chamber of Trade were in favour of the new system, although many St Mary's St traders feared that traffic would simply drive straight past their shops.

The reality of the system is even worse than feared as, despite the 20 mph restriction, most drivers exceed the limit. Traffic is constant, from early morning until late at night. It feels like living on a new Bungay bypass. I live at the south end of Trinity St, where there are frequently two lanes of traffic turning into Staithe Road and Wharton St. Not only is it much more difficult for vehicular access, but it is dangerous for pedestrians in the roads affected. There are no safe crossing points in Trinity St, Wharton St and Staithe Road. Trinity St and Wharton St have narrow, uneven pavements, on one side only and there is a risk of being caught by the wing mirrors of wider vehicles.

Under the old system, St Mary's St at its narrowest point, near the old Angel, was potentially dangerous, but traffic was not able to travel at such a speed. I still maintain that the problem could have been overcome by giving priority to vehicles leaving the town, so that there were never two vehicles passing and we could even have had a railing on the eastern side of St Mary's St. There were always cars, which parked illegally outside the shops in St Mary's St and there were always lorries travelling the north-south route through the town, but we were told that there was not the money to enforce restrictions. Consequently traffic did not flow smoothly through the town.

Undoubtedly the traffic flow has now improved, but at what cost to others.

From my perspective, it seems that the problem has simply shifted from a mainly commercial road to the eastern part of the town, which is mainly residential. Drivers can now speed through and save a couple of minutes off their journey times. However, it is debatable whether many people stop to do their shopping in the deserted town centre, despite the free one hour parking. Before the one way trial, free parking and parking wardens were deemed unaffordable. I noted that we had two parking wardens, for several weeks after the trial was started. An expensive loading bay was provided outside Wightman's, at the north end of Trinity St, which has not made any significant change to ease of deliveries as the road is still narrow. People frequently park there. The expensive "gateway" crossing, close by, is confusing as drivers rarely see it as a crossing.

Now it would appear that the possible manual HGV count to supplement the traffic data collected from the traffic monitoring equipment, -which simply registers all vehicles, over 7.5 tonnes -may well be unaffordable. There is a desperate need for improved signage on the A143 before the roundabout, to avoid HGVs turning into Broad St and taking the illegal north south route through the town. This may happen "if funds allow".

We have recently been invited by the Town Council to volunteer in training to monitor HGVs taking this route. While I am not against volunteering, surely better signage is essential, first!

We are still waiting for SCC's presentation of the future lay out of the town centre.

I can only hope that SCC will not decide to implement the one way scheme, permanently. It is expensive and not the answer to Bungay's problems, particularly in times of austerity.

I would be grateful if you would acknowledge receipt of this email.

Yours sincerely

Lesley Ward

From: Derek Ward [wardee@btinternet.com]
Sent: Wed 24/04/2013 17:15
To: Susan Broom
Subject: Bungay one way system

Dear Ms Broom

I spoke to you about the above, when plans for the new one way system were displayed at the Fisher Theatre and expressed my opposition to it. I am not sure that I wrote comments in the book and should have done so. I did express verbal opposition to three members of the Town Council, who were in favour of the scheme and were unwilling to accept alternative views.

However, I have written to you before, together with my husband, to express our dismay at the fourfold increase in traffic, speeding down Trinity Street. The increased noise and pollution for residents in Trinity Street and Wharton Street are undeniable. These problems are likely to be exacerbated in the Summer months with open windows. I understand that SCC thinks that most of the population of Bungay is in favour of the scheme and am not sure how that conclusion has been reached. There

has been a marked deterioration in quality of life for those who live in these streets. Are emails to you included in the percentages of those for and against and has SCC also looked at the comments in the book in Bungay Library? Most of those are against the scheme and a poll in the EDP showed 59% against the scheme. I will also write again to Heather Miller to record my opposition.

The traffic flow has undoubtedly improved in St Mary's Street, which is largely deserted, although new points of congestion occasionally occur at both ends of Trinity Street. There are often tail backs at the junction of Wharton St and St John's Road and the parked cars in St John's Road cause hold ups similar to those previously experienced in St Mary's Street. Double yellow lines continue to be ignored, much as before and Wightman's loading bay is seen as parking for the cash point etc. Congestion has simply shifted around. There are problems of access and exit for residents cars and pedestrians have great difficulty crossing Trinity Street and Wharton Street.

Previously, I have expressed my concerns about the signage before Clay's roundabout. There are too many signs at the north end of Broad Street, which detract from the ban on 7.5 tonne vehicles signage. I think you told me that new signage may not be affordable. It is absolutely essential that clearer signs are in place, whatever the outcome of the one way system. We now see far too many HGVs which may well be using the route illegally; I am not sure that the Lorry Watch scheme can address the problem without proper signage and the backing of the police. I am sometimes awoken by lorries travelling down the street at 4.00 a.m.

As regards SCC's plans, which I saw at the Fisher, I was horrified to see that it will involve shared space and that the present lights and designated crossing points are to be removed. I trust that disability groups have been consulted and would be keen to see their responses. The plans seem uncertain about how much will be affordable and the plans of how St Mary's St may look, show no HGVs in sight! It seems amazing that pedestrians will have to negotiate with some 200 HGVs on a daily basis. I am not aware of any other towns, which have shared space and HGVs passing through.

This is not the solution to traffic management in Bungay. I urge SCC to think again about how Bungay can be helped, before spending such a disproportionate amount of money.

Finally, please can you assure me that this email will count in the number of opponents to the scheme?

Regards
Lesley Ward

From: Mel in Suffolk [mailto:mel-in-suffolk@hotmail.com]
Sent: 21 February 2013 22:32
To: Heather Miller
Subject: Formal Objection to Bungay One-Way Scheme

Dear Madam.

I am writing to formally object at the proposals to make the Bungay one-way system permanent.

There are a number of issues that do not appear to have been considered:-

1. Traffic is pushed towards the entrance to St Edmund's RC Primary School on St Mary's Street (the "wrong" side of the road) - this is dangerous
2. Currently traffic approaching from Lower Olland Street cannot see people using the Zebra crossing - I have personally nearly been hit twice and have seen the same thing happen on at least 4 other occasions. Can you please explain why you think drivers will stop there once the Zebra crossing markings are removed?
3. On numerous occasions the bus stop is blocked by delivery lorries, cars parked illegally, or two buses trying to sit there at the same time - when this happens the road becomes gridlocked
4. There is still a large amount of illegal parking on the yellow lines (including parking on the double yellow lines on the roundabout outside Wightmans) - I would like somebody to explain to me how the removal of yellow lines in the "no waiting at any time" zones will stop illegal parking? Surely when people ignore obvious signs that they should not park there (yellow lines) they will certainly not think twice parking somewhere where it will look like they CAN park?
5. It is proposed to remove the traffic island at the entrance to Earsham Street - how are pedestrians now going to safely cross that road?
6. What is the purpose of the "over-run areas"? I can envisage that they will just be used as additional parking bays
7. The removal of the traffic island at the entrance to Earsham Street could cause accidents as lorries coming through town can (and will) swing wide on the the opposite side of the road, with the increased risk of hitting oncoming vehicles
8. The granite setts at the junction of Upper and Lower Olland Street - if they are proposed to discourage illegal right turn from Upper to Lower - then cars legally turning left from Lower to Upper will be forced to swing round on a wider line to avoid running over these with the increased possibility of collisions - your response would be appreciated.
9. Has the noise effect of large lorries going up and down the raised road areas been considered? I can't imagine that an empty Bernard Matthews lorry will be quiet bumping up and down those during the night! Also the effect of HGVs damaging the raised areas?
10. The proposed "school bus drop-off point" will block the visibility splay for traffic trying to exit Priory Lane. I also envisage this being used as an additional parking area - as this already happens with cars parked between the temporary blocks in the road.
11. The "one hour only" restricted parking bays on Upper Olland Street are so poorly signed that the Police are unable to place parking tickets on any of the cars. There was a gold coloured Saab convertible parked in one of these bays when the road lines were renewed last year (I think around June) - it was still parked in exactly the same place up until about a fortnight ago - IT

- HAD NOT MOVED IN ALL THAT TIME!! I e-mailed Suffolk County Council to complain about these signs last year and did not even receive a reply!
12. The "No parking between 8am and 6pm" on Upper Olland Street is often flouted by residents and/or business owners - especially on a Sunday.

I would appreciate responses to all of these points I have raised.
Thank you in anticipation of your help.

Yours Faithfully
Mrs Melanie Taylor

From: Sandie Flatt [mailto:sandie@transamtrucking.com]
Sent: 21 February 2013 15:37
To: Heather Miller
Subject: Bungay One Way System

Dear Ms. Miller,

I have today been to the Fisher Theatre in Bungay to attend the exhibition of the proposed one way system in Bungay.

The first thing that surprised me was that the middle section of St. Mary's Street was not going to be 'improved' because of a likely lack of funds. This section of the road is where most of the shops are, I thought that this was why the shared-space concept was being created – to make the shopping experience a more pleasant one for the pedestrians.

The computer generated pictures of what St. Mary's St will look like didn't appear to have much traffic in them. Where has it gone?

It all looks very pretty but not very practical, all at the cost of Trinity Street too. Trinity St has now inherited all the flaws that were once in St. Mary's Street and more before Trinity St took all the traffic. There seem to be no plans to cater for the changes that have happened in Trinity St. It is now dangerous to cross the road at both ends, 'courtesy crossings' don't seem to work the same way that designated pedestrian crossings do and they need to for the safety of the pedestrians.

The access from properties in Trinity St onto the road has now become difficult, visibility of the oncoming traffic is impaired and now there is so much more of it it is dangerous pulling out into it.

Mr. McGregor 'hope(s) the scheme will improve the town for residents, businesses and people visiting' we need more than hope. Hoping implies that it may not happen.

We all know that not enough information and consultation was given and obtained at the very start of this process. I don't understand why the Council continually ignore the concerns of the people who have businesses and homes actually in Bungay.

Yours sincerely,

Sandra Flatt

From: Sandie Flatt [mailto:sandie@transamtrucking.com]

Sent: Wed 15/05/2013 10:54

To: Susan Broom

Subject: BUNGAY

Dear Ms Broom,

It is obvious to me, and has been for some time, that the new one way system in Bungay has nothing to do with what the people and businesses in Bungay want or need but its sole purpose is to fuel the inflated ego of Guy MacGregor and his 'vision' of shared space schemes. What he is trying to achieve I haven't yet understood except maybe glory of some kind. I hope this is unlikely.

You produce figures that seem to imply that there are more people in Bungay in favour of the one way system. I am resident here in Bungay, I spend my time there and I talk to a lot of people in the streets whilst shopping and I know that the majority are not for this scheme.

Unfortunately the average man on the street doesn't know the mechanics of how government or councils work, but why should he have to? They are there to represent the people working for the benefit of us all. Isn't that what a democracy is? I know this scheme will go ahead but I just cannot understand why the few are so determined to have their way without proper and meaningful consultation.

I walked along St. Mary's Street today where an old gentleman had had the misfortune to collapse. I could see something had happened and stopped to ask a pedestrian what had happened. She didn't know but had seen the ambulance turn up at the wrong end of St. Mary's Street. The ambulance still had not arrived at the scene by the time I had got to the other end of St. Mary's Street having stopped to talk to several people on the way. The time that the ambulance took to arrive at the wrong place was lengthy enough but then to have the added time (the driver obviously didn't know which way to go to get round to the right end of St. Mary's St may well have been detrimental to the man who had collapsed. I do hope that gentleman hasn't suffered because of the late arrival of the ambulance.

I object to this scheme on the grounds that the noise and air pollution in Trinity Street have increased to unacceptable levels, access to and from my property is now restricted to an unacceptable level due to the increase in traffic and that safety issues have not been addressed to a satisfactory conclusion either in implementation or planning. The speed at which vehicles are travelling is significantly faster than it used to be, crossing the road at the end of Trinity Street is extremely difficult. You have to step out into the road to be able to see the oncoming traffic (as this is the only point at which there is a pavement on the other side) and continually have to jump back onto the pavement to avoid speeding traffic.

Yours sincerely,

Sandra Flatt

Susan Broom

From: Heather Miller
Sent: 25 February 2013 09:11
To: 'Shirley Russell'
Cc: Susan Broom
Subject: Bungay One-way scheme
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Purple

Dear Ms Russell

Thank you for your message. Your concerns about the experimental one-way have been noted and will, if not resolved by the scheme manager, in due course be included in any report made to the Rights of Way Committee. This Committee considers both rights of way and traffic management proposals that are contested. The Committee's recommendations are then reported to the Portfolio Holder for Roads and Transport for the Council's final decision on the proposals, and in that case I will contact you again after the decision.

As there are local government elections in May, the date of the next committee meeting when these proposals are likely to be considered is 19 June this year. The meeting agenda can be found at the appropriate time on the SCC website on the following link, together with the procedure for those wishing to speak at the meeting:

<http://www.suffolk.gov.uk/your-council/decision-making/committees/rights-of-way-committee/>

In the meantime I am forwarding your message to the scheme manager for her attention.

Kind Regards

Heather Miller
Senior Legal Officer

Suffolk Legal, Suffolk County Council, Endeavour House, Russell Road, Ipswich, IP1 2BX
DX 87951 Ipswich Tel (01473) 264184 Fax (01473) 216825

 www.suffolklegal.co.uk

The contents of this email are subject to legal privilege and must not be disclosed without the permission of the author.

From: Shirley Russell [mailto:shirley_russell@talktalk.net]
Sent: 21 February 2013 10:55
To: Heather Miller
Subject: Bungay One-way scheme

Dear Ms Miller,

Having viewed the exhibition re: Bungay Town Centre alterations, I am left with the opinion I have had all along, that this is yet another piecemeal attempt to 'improve' Bungay, by throwing a bit of money at it, without addressing its real problem which is heavy through traffic and HGVs. The new scheme does nothing more than window dress St.Mary's St with a bit of fancy paving, whilst sacrificing Trinity and Wharton Streets as the southbound 'bypass'.

Bungay town centre as a whole is at present a mess, with broken pavements, worn out road surfaces and a jumble out of date signage. Parking restrictions are not enforced in the town, except on the car parks, and I gather that this will not change if the scheme goes ahead. The town centre looks dirty and neglected and already has a

mish mash of paving styles and surfaces which do nothing to enhance it, just add to its rather chaotic visual appearance. The scheme will do nothing to address this, merely throw a bit of money at our poor old high street (rapidly being taken over by charity shops), which would have been better spent on a general audit of highways in the town and some kind of cohesive action to improve the whole town centre.

Given that the scheme seems destined to go ahead despite the wishes of many Bungay residents and business people, I would also like to express my concern at the removal of the Pelican crossing at the north end of St.Mary's Street and it's replacement with a so called courtesy crossing. St.Mary's Street is an A road with over 6000 vehicle movements a day (SCC figure) including an average of 300+ HGV. Many elderly, disabled and visually impaired people rely on this crossing and will be severely disadvantaged by its removal.

I am also concerned about the noise implications of the various ramps and change of road surfaces included in the scheme, which will be a nuisance to residents especially at night.

I appreciate that SCC traffic engineers have done their very best to come up with a workable scheme, and I do not intend this to be a criticism of them. I think they have been asked to do the impossible. Bungay needs a proper bypass not an experimental traffic management scheme.



A legitimately parked delivery lorry in the loading bay on St.Mary's street illustrates the scale of the problem.

I write this as a resident of Upper Olland Street, Bungay, probably the street that has gained the most from the trial scheme, in as much as we have substantially less traffic since its inception.

Yours Faithfully,

Shirley Russell

From: Simon Taylor [mailto:sy.avatar@btinternet.com]
Sent: 22 February 2013 23:45
To: Heather Miller
Subject: Formal Objection to Bungay One-Way Scheme

Dear Madam.

I am writing to formally object at the proposals to make the Bungay one-way system permanent.

There are a number of issues that do not appear to have been considered:-

1. Traffic is pushed towards the entrance to St Edmund's RC Primary School on St Mary's Street (the "wrong" side of the road) - this is dangerous
2. Currently traffic approaching from Lower Olland Street cannot see people using the Zebra crossing - I have personally nearly been hit twice and have seen the same thing happen on at least 4 other occasions. Can you please explain why you think drivers will stop there once the Zebra crossing markings are removed?
3. On numerous occasions the bus stop is blocked by delivery lorries, cars parked illegally, or two buses trying to sit there at the same time - when this happens the road becomes gridlocked
4. There is still a large amount of illegal parking on the yellow lines (including parking on the double yellow lines on the roundabout outside Wightmans) - I would like somebody to explain to me how the removal of yellow lines in the "no waiting at any time" zones will stop illegal parking? Surely when people ignore obvious signs that they should not park there (yellow lines) they will certainly not think twice parking somewhere where it will look like they CAN park?
5. It is proposed to remove the traffic island at the entrance to Earsham Street - how are pedestrians now going to safely cross that road?
6. What is the purpose of the "over-run areas"? I can envisage that they will just be used as additional parking bays
7. The removal of the traffic island at the entrance to Earsham Street could cause accidents as lorries coming through town can (and will) swing wide on the the opposite side of the road, with the increased risk of hitting oncoming vehicles
8. The granite setts at the junction of Upper and Lower Olland Street - if they are proposed to discourage illegal right turn from Upper to Lower - then cars legally turning left from Lower to Upper will be forced to swing round on a wider line to avoid running over these with the increased possibility of collisions - your response would be appreciated.
9. Has the noise effect of large lorries going up and down the raised road areas been considered? I can't imagine that an empty Bernard Matthews lorry will be quiet bumping up and down those during the night! Also the effect of HGVs damaging the raised areas?
10. The proposed "school bus drop-off point" will block the visibility splay for traffic trying to exit Priory Lane. I also envisage this being used as an additional parking area - as this already happens with cars parked between the temporary blocks in the road.
11. The "one hour only" restricted parking bays on Upper Olland Street are so poorly signed that the Police are unable to place parking tickets on any of the cars.
12. The "No parking between 8am and 6pm" on Upper Olland Street is often flouted by residents and/or business owners - especially on a Sunday.

13. Today (22nd Feb) I overheard a lorry driver saying how he couldn't see pedestrians on the right hand side as he came around the corner from lower olland street towards the primary school.
14. With my job I'm required to drive in and around town for up to 2.5 hours per day, the one way system is costing me time on most days, especially when Trinity Street gets blocked and I have no way through. I've been held up in queues from Trinity Street for up to 20 minutes! I don't have this time frame built into my duty times!
15. On one occasion I witnessed a traffic jam from Trinity Street that caused the delay of an Ambulance which was on an emergency call! This is totally unacceptable, this system has the potential to put peoples lives at risk!

I would appreciate responses to all of these points I have raised.

Yours Faithfully
Mr Simon Taylor

From: Jean Testro [mailto:j.testro@xlnbb.co.uk]
Sent: 21 February 2013 19:16
To: Heather Miller
Subject: Bungay One Way System

I have just been to see the plans for the next stage of this badly thought out scheme. Although it looks good on paper it is my opinion that it is a dangerous concept, for the following reasons – in no particular order apart from the first.

Since the one way system was put into place, traffic in Trinity Street has come to a standstill on many occasions. On one of these we were stationary for more than 25 minutes because an ambulance had been called to a house opposite Holy Trinity Church and traffic could not pass. Eventually the cars at the junction with Bridge Street and Broad Street reversed, allowing everyone else to do so and try and find a way to their destination. I have seen stationary backed into St.Mary's Street causing a gridlock until the obstruction in Trinity Street had moved. When the busses are at the bus stop, or when the dustbin lorries are at work, again the traffic comes to a halt. How are Fire Engines and Ambulances supposed to get to their emergencies when there is no other route from north to south? This is a tragedy waiting to happen.

What will happen if the utilities services have to deal with a problem, such as a burst water main, or there is a big funeral and the road needs to be closed as has happened in the past? Also, does this mean that the Black Dog Runners can no longer run safely during their marathon and the Bungay Festival parade be discontinued? Both of these events needed Trinity Street to be closed to traffic for a while.

With regard to Lower Olland Street, whose bright idea is it to remove the barrier in front of Turnstile Lane? This is essential to stop children, particularly, from running into the road and into the traffic. Again a tragedy waiting to happen.

The idea of a flat 'shared' area between the shops and church walls looks good on paper, but how are blind people expected to know where the edge of the 'road' is and where it is safe to cross. You are removing both crossings, which won't help them. I agree that the zebra crossing should be moved as it is in the wrong place, with traffic coming from the Halesworth direction being upon it immediately after rounding a bend. It should have been situated outside the Original Factory Shop, which would be a safer spot for the children to cross to their school.

At the moment children are taught to know that they must not step off the kerb into the road as it is dangerous. When there are just different coloured areas, and a child steps into the 'road colour' and there is an accident, whose fault would it be? I can envisage children enjoying themselves jumping from one colour or texture to another.

The plans show pavement widening at the junction of St. Mary's Street and Upper Olland Street, with a bench seat and planter. Who in their right mind would want to sit there in the exhaust fumes and watch the lorries go by? Likewise the widening of the pavement and installation of a seat outside the photographers. There are seats around the Cenotaph and in St. Mary's Churchyard for people to sit and enjoy the ambience, away from the traffic.

Surely with the widening of the pavement outside the Original Factory Shop it could cause problems for the lorries returning from their deliveries to Boots, Coopers and other shops when re-entering St. Mary's Street.

It would appear from the plans that the pavement and road would be one level by the 5 way roundabout and seems to indicate that it would be mostly for pedestrians. However, lorries delivering to Earsham Street would have to negotiate this, or is it the council's intention that they also go up Trinity Street and around the houses before getting to their destination?

Removing the central road island from the top of Earsham Street between the Three Tuns and Kings Head could also prove lethal since it is needed to cross that busy junction.

Taxpayers' money has been wasted on the current system of chicanes (which have also caused accidents – my granddaughter picked up a blind woman who tripped over a raised area), which will all be taken away if this new system is put in place. Money has also been wasted on putting down new double yellow lines a few weeks ago, which have now been chipped off ready for more new ones to be painted in the same places on Monday.

Trinity Street is the location of the oldest building in the town, Holy Trinity Church, but with the increased traffic flow it is more difficult for people to cross the road to get to it. Also, how is the vibration affecting its foundations? Has anyone from your office been to look over the wall at the back of the church? There is a slope away from the church of about 40 degrees. Nobody has bothered to come and see my wall alongside the church, which is not in a very good state. Will the council pay for its repair should it get worse with the vibrations? Has anybody considered the integrity of the buildings in Trinity Street, which are all listed?

I look forward to hearing from you.

Regards,
Jean Testro

From: Jenny Hyams [mailto:jenny.a.hyams@gmail.com]
Sent: 26 February 2013 17:12
To: Heather Miller
Subject: Bungay one-way system

Dear Ms Miller

I have just been into Bungay Library to view what Suffolk CC somewhat optimistically calls an exhibition and I should like to comment on the proposals for what is quite obviously now going to be a permanent scheme.

Firstly, I am bewildered that the plans do not seem to bear much relationship to the original proposals. And why is St Mary's Street in the 'now' picture shrouded in gloom, whereas in the 'how it will be' picture it is bathed in glorious sunshine ?

Secondly, and more importantly, it is not clear whether the proposed 20 mph speed limit for the one-way system is mandatory or voluntary. Either way it is unlikely that 20 mph will be adhered to, unless this is 'policed'. Vehicles are currently travelling at speeds far in excess of 20 mph down the one-way system, and it is extremely dangerous for pedestrians attempting to cross Trinity Street itself and on the junction of Trinity Street/Wharton Street. This in turn has a knock-on effect on Staithe Road, where vehicles coming from Trinity Street continue to travel at speeds in excess of 30 mph, let alone 20 mph. I understand that when the CC was asked about the speeding traffic on Trinity Street, and what was going to be done about it, the response was that nothing would be done because 'the coffers are empty'.

It is difficult to understand who exactly is going to benefit from a permanent one-way system, apart from through traffic in St Mary's Street, where - as I am sure you are aware - there are now four charity shops, the Factory Shop, two convenience shops, a pub, a photographic equipment shop, Coopers, and not a lot else.

Yours sincerely

Jenny Hyams

From: Ruth Lewis-Smith [mailto:rlewis-smith@live.co.uk]
Sent: 26 February 2013 10:36
To: Heather Miller
Cc: Andrew Pearce; Guy McGregor; Peter Aldous
Subject: Bungay one-way scheme

Dear Ms Miller

As residents of Bungay we would like to make some observations arising from our visit to the recent exhibition concerning the one-way scheme.

1 The "shared space/shared surface" proposals for St Mary's Street are flawed. The present chicane-crazed appearance of the street at least provides some traffic-calming measures. However, removing the distinction between pavement and road will endanger pedestrians, especially children, the elderly and those with some form of disability. No wonder the RNIB is vehemently opposed to such schemes which

rely on visual interaction between pedestrian and driver; the removal of safe crossing places beggars belief.

Furthermore, the shared space scheme will encourage vehicles to travel more quickly along St Mary's Street when fewer pedestrians are in evidence and the propensity for some drivers to accelerate around the "track" which the one-way scheme has provided will be increased. At present the situation is particularly acute at night; the proposed scheme will only exacerbate this.

2 Trinity Street is now effectively the southern by-pass. Your own SCC traffic measurement statistics indicate a fourfold increase in all traffic using this residential street in a conservation area. Your figures indicate approximately a 400 per cent increase in HGVs which self-evidently add to the negative effect upon the human and built environment. The exponential increase in noise, speed, emissions and vibrations is significant. Your statistics underestimate the average speed of vehicles and the consequent risks to pedestrians occasioned by the explosion in traffic, particularly at peak times, which your findings do not acknowledge. There is no safe place to cross.

The reasonable concerns of Trinity Street residents are being ignored. St Mary's Street is commercial; Trinity Street is not.

We look forward to hearing your comments.

Yours sincerely

Ruth Lewis-Smith and David Lewis Smith

From: Robert Prior [mailto:bungay.capow@gmail.com]
Sent: 01 March 2013 17:43
To: Heather Miller
Subject: Objection to the Proposed New Traffic Scheme

Dear Ms Miller

I should like to lodge my strong objections to the proposed Bungay traffic scheme as shown in the Fisher Theatre recently for the following reasons:

1. The scheme does not resemble the original proposals as supported by the Town Council (June 2011) or indeed look anything like the disastrous one-way trial scheme that the town has had to endure over the past 6 months or so. Any lessons learned or information gained from the trial will be worthless because the schemes are so different.
2. .The artist's impressions shown of St Mary's Street are deliberately designed to be misleading. They are shown to be in bright sunshine with only light traffic and with little or nothing to do with reality. This was compare to the photograph taken on a particularly dull and drab day which was full of traffic and showed the ugliness of the town that SCC has created during the trial

period. Therefore I am saying that the exhibition was not a fair reflection of what is likely to happen if the proposals are approved. As far as I can ascertain, there has been little or no consultation with disability groups apart from Guide Dogs for the Blind (GDB), They offered suggestions but have largely been ignored. It is a legal requirement that disability groups are widely consulted regarding these schemes before the design stage – this has simply not happened. For example, the only group to be consulted, GDB, advised that SCC should maintain current Zebra and controlled crossing points within new scheme, include tactile warning (on the pavement) at the entrance and exit of the pay and display Wharton Street car park, install tactile paving on down and up kerb on Cross Street/St Mary's Street junction, install tactile paving at flat kerb edge where St Mary's Street enters roundabout. Currently a blind or partially sighted pedestrian could potentially veer/walk into the road without warning, improve pedestrian crossing point at the junction of Trinity Street - currently unsatisfactory for Blind and Partially Sighted people. Possibly include change to road surface and raised areas to encourage vehicles to slow down, install a safe and identifiable crossing point for pedestrians in Trinity Street near junction of Wharton Street and school. I could not see any of these suggestions incorporated in the plans.

3. The 20mph speed limited has not been adhered to during the trial, so it is unlikely that this will be effective if the proposals are implemented.
4. Since an increase of 400% of traffic along its length, Trinity Street has become extremely dangerous for pedestrian, cyclists, children and residents as well as those who fall into the category of the aforementioned disability groups, and yet I was told that there was no budget to make any improvements whatsoever.
5. The concept of 'Shared Space' is not appropriate for towns like Bungay that has a major route running through its heart. These were conceived in Germany in the early 1990's to be used where pedestrian usage far exceeded motor vehicle use. In many parts of Europe where 'Shared Space' was used in 'appropriate' towns the success rate has been, at best, mixed and have lead to some being removed – obviously at great cost to the authorities.
6. The road markings and surface textures are supposed to define the zones for pedestrians and traffic etc, but become useless if no-one understands this, or if it snows!
7. The ramps in the scheme will create noise an vibration issues. Has SCC not learnt from the Hillside Road East fiasco which wasted around £100, 000? In spite of warnings prior to installation, SCC still went ahead with the installation and were subsequently forced to remove to at great cost to the tax/ratepayer.

Overall, this scheme is a colossal waste of money that could be spent in much better ways if the Councillors were to listen to the people of Bungay.

This scheme will not benefit anyone apart from the through traffic and no account has been taken of the views of the majority of affected traders and residents. This is a thoroughly bad idea with no positive outcome for this once beautiful market town.

Yours sincerely

Robert J Prior

Dear Ms Miller

I write this because of my objection to the proposed one-way system in Bungay.

When I learned that a 'one way' system was to be introduced, my immediate reaction was to think – why? I understand that the idea came from a single Bungay Town councilor who made the initial approach to Suffolk County Council. A circular was then apparently sent out in respect of the one way system but to whom I have no idea - I certainly did not receive a copy. It is thought that it consisted of a few vague questions relating to the 'one-way' system. Of the approximate 300 people who responded, only about 60% were in favour. On this basis alone, the 'go ahead' seems to have been given – not exactly representative of the population!

The next step was to put a temporary scheme in place, which has proved totally inconclusive and has provoked much comment. I have seen no improvement whatsoever and it is felt that it has done nothing at all to improve the plight of Bungay.

Recently the plans for the scheme were on public display at the Fisher theatre. On inspection, it was noted that they bore no resemblance whatsoever to the original. I approached a Suffolk County Councillor and asked him what benefits I would gain from the one-way system and he was unable to give any constructive reasons. A comment from Guy McGregor a few months back was it (the one way) would be hugely beneficial to Bungay - how? Another comment was that if the money was not spent, it would be lost – lost to what?

Free parking as been introduced and yet it has had little or no impact on the foot-fall. On Thursday the 28th February – market day – I counted only four cars parked in the car park off St Mary's Street at 2pm.

Who with any common sense would think it a good idea to remove two controlled crossings with two 'courtesy crossings' on an 'A' road? St Mary's street is a main road that HGV's and very large agricultural vehicles use on a regular basis. The blind, the disabled, wheel chair users, children etc. would be at extreme risk were these to be implemented!

(It should be noted that St Mary's street is not a shopper's paradise. There is nothing at all to attract visitors or shoppers alike as it mainly comprises charity shops and 'take-aways.' These have replaced what were once thriving shops.)

The whole saga, which involves a cost of about £500,000, has been handled so very badly by those concerned. They appear intent on spending the money with no interest whatsoever in the outcome. Bungay town council has failed to have an open debate on the matter. This should have taken place long before any money had been wasted. (Yes there was a meeting held at the Staithe building of which only a selected few were made aware.)

Apparently there will be no money left to police the scheme, no money to spend on Trinity Street where the traffic flow has increased some four fold and apparently there is insufficient money to complete the project.

My involvement with Bungay covers some 70 years including schooling and also as a resident, so I trust that you appreciate my concerns and I so wish the matter should have been handled in a far more professional and democratic manner.

Keith Kerrison

SUFFOLK C.C.
ENDEAVOUR HOUSE
11 MAR 2013

38 INGATE
BEECHES,
SUFFOLK,
NR34 9RZ.
6TH MARCH 2013

DEAR MADAM,
I WAS BORN IN BUNGAY & LIVED THERE FOR MANY YEARS, I VISIT BUNGAY REGULARLY (AT LEAST TWICE A WEEK). UNFORTUNATELY I HAVE NOT SEEN THE PLANS FOR THE NEW ONE WAY SCHEME, BUT AS I DRIVE THROUGH THE TOWN, I KEEP THINKING "HOW DANGEROUS NO CROSSING, THE CHILDREN BUS STOP ON THE OPPOSITE SIDE OF THE ROAD. I THINK ITS MOST DANGEROUS ESPECIALLY FOR BLIND PEOPLE. I HAVE A BLIND FRIEND, A LADY FROM NORWICH WHO VISITS HER

B.

HUSBANDS GRAVE AT THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, SHE TRAVELS ALONE ON THE BUS & I AM JUST WAITING TO HEAR ABOUT AN ACCIDENT - I REALLY HOPE NOT. ST MARYS STREET IS RUINED.

ALL THAT NEEDS TO BE DONE IS TO PUT DOUBLE YELLOW LINES IN ST MARYS STREET & STOP PARKING THERE IN PLACE THE CROSSING. AT THE MOMENT IT IS NOT SAFE. I CAN ONLY THINK THAT WHOEVER DESIGNED THIS SCHEME, DOES NOT LIVE IN BUNGAY & HAVE TO PUT UP WITH THE CONSEQUENCES. I EXPECT THEY SIT IN THEIR OFFICE & THINK "WHAT CAN WE DO TO UPSET BUNGAY PEOPLE." I SINCERELY HATE THIS SCHEME DOES NOT GO AHEAD.

YOURS FAITHFULLY,
Janet Reed (Miss)

Susan Broom

From: Derek Ward [wardee@btinternet.com]

Sent: 25 April 2013 17:07

To: Susan Broom

Cc: Heather Miller

Subject: Bungay one way scheme

BUNGAY ONE WAY SCHEME - OBJECTION

25 April 2013

Dear Ms. Broom

I understand that Suffolk County Council believes that there are few objections to the proposed Bungay one way scheme, with the overwhelming proportion of respondents viewing it favourably. I have corresponded frequently with you and others at Suffolk County Council and have tried to make clear my objections to the scheme. Because of this I did not complete the questionnaire after viewing the exhibition at the Fisher Theatre several weeks ago. (This was mainly because we had a lengthy journey to make after viewing the exhibition so were unable to stay very long).

I would like to reiterate the reasons for my objection to the scheme. Trinity Street, in which I live, is no longer the attractive street I moved to thirteen years ago as a result of the recent fourfold increase in road traffic. The resulting noise, pollution and congestion have had a very detrimental effect on our quality of life here.

The proposed shared space scheme for St. Mary's Street is a cause for concern. While some communities have adjusted and eventually accepted such schemes, many have preferred to revert to their original layout. I am not aware of any schemes where pedestrians share a linear space with 350 HGVs each day. While the new layout would, without doubt, look more attractive, I am very concerned about the safety implications for the elderly, visually-impaired or people with young children. Several months experience of the courtesy pedestrian crossing at the north end of Trinity Street have not inspired any confidence. No driver has ever stopped to let me cross - unless I took a chance and stepped out into the road. There was usually very little "courtesy" on display.

I am happy to complete a questionnaire if this is the only way to register my objection. Otherwise I hope that this and my other correspondence will serve that purpose. Please can you confirm that my objection has been officially noted and registered by Suffolk County Council.

Many thanks

Derek Ward
(18A Trinity Street, Bungay NR351EH)

BUNGAY TOWN CENTRE IMPROVEMENT SCHEME

EXHIBITION FEEDBACK

Having visited the recent exhibition at the Fisher Theatre on Broad Street, Bungay I am writing to register my thoughts on the implementation, under an experimental traffic order since September 2012, and if made permanent, then a number of changes that will transpire regarding the Bungay Town Centre Scheme.

It is important to remember that the purpose behind the One Way Experimental Scheme is to provide evidence to support, or not, the Town Centre Scheme.

- 0 -

Bungay Town Council – Scheme Working Group

Provided by Neil Mayhew

Vision

The vision is to improve the Town Centre. In particular St Mary's Street, Trinity Street, Wharton Street and the Olland Streets to provide an inclusive, attractive street environment that reflects the historic quality of the town.

Purpose

By achieving better integration of vehicle movements within the town centre, the purpose of the scheme is to help stimulate economic and social benefits.

Action

To assist the scheme in providing a high quality of place to the benefit of all users, the project should establish a Quality Audit (QA) process as recommended by the Department for Transport.

- 0 -

St Mary's Street

This is the focus area for the scheme and introduces speed-calming measures, new surfacing, new crossing areas, various changes in road height levels, street furniture and planting.

The intention is to create an attractive streetscape, to compliment the Georgian architecture and encourage pedestrian footfall by providing equal rights between vehicles and pedestrians in a shared place.

An improved shopping experience and a reduction of Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) is also envisioned.

It is considered that the One Way Experimental System (OWES) goes some way to support this **Vision & Purpose** or does it miss the mark?

-

Despite road calming measures and 20 mph signage there has been no real reduction in speed and usage. The 85%ile speed remaining doggedly as before the One Way Experimental System (OWES) and well above the new 20 mph speed limit. **So no improvement here.**

Unfortunately the traffic survey is inadequate, lacking data for HGV's prior to the scheme and limited data after. No significant reduction in number of vehicles has been recorded.

St Mary's Street remains on the Borough's recommended routes for HGV's travelling north (not south). The OWES has done nothing to prove that there will be a reduction in usage after implementation. **So it has failed to deliver here.**

-

On a personal note I welcome the reduction of road markings (that in my opinion are unsightly and ineffective) and the introduction of different natural materials would be a great improvement.

As an **historic town** it might be forward thinking to request that the Conservation Officers together with the Planning Department formally List the new paving and road materials so that they will be protected in the future from uninterested company workmen performing road and pavement work. All too soon these poorly

regulated activities will result in inferior repairs and the introduction of lesser quality and different materials.

-

The new road has various new levels, some as existing with curbs, some flat through out and various types of crossings. Only different materials provide a guide as to who should be where and only a guide as shared use is the order of the day.

A lovely idea but ambitious in this location. Surely the potential for an accident / incident to happen is extremely high.

If there was an alternative road option for HGV's perhaps it could work but there is not. So HGV will share with pedestrian, school children, invalid and other. Hhmmm?

The OWES has 20 mph signage together with the road calming measures but there is no evidence this has reduced the 85%ile speed (mph). In fact there has been no reduction in HGV usage (other than perhaps travelling south) and no reduction in 85%ile speed (mph) recorded between 23-25 that is in fact greater than the 20 mph speed limit. **So the OWES is not working here.**

-

Sadly the initial Vision *to' improve the Town Centre and in particular St Mary's Street'* has been forgotten. The stretch of St Mary's street that most needs money spending on it is the section directly opposite St Mary's Church and I understand that nothing is currently planned.

No improvement work to the pavement area in front of the shops on St Mary's street (Opposite the church) is planned only marked for future funding / development.

In these difficult economic times I would be nervous of anticipating future funding but this scheme relies on this uncertainty.

Trinity Street A3090



I should start by saying that I am a resident of Trinity Street and despite this road receiving the worst effects of the OWES I would happily forgo any personal hardship for an overall benefit for the town and community.

Trinity Street has one of the most noteworthy Queen Anne terraces in Suffolk after which is a beautiful round towered Saxon church set in a picturesque churchyard a popular location for Weddings.

Before the OWES Eastbound flow

July 12-18th 2012

5 day average was 1666 with 85thile speed 27 mph.

Speed limit 30 mph

HGV flow (anything over 7.5 tonnes) 62 (This includes buses).

During the OWES Eastbound - Traffic Survey Data

Oct - Dec 2012

5 day average was 5814 with 85thile speed 27 mph.

Speed limit 20 mph

HGV flow (anything over 7.5 tonnes) 197 (This includes buses).

So I would expect an increase in traffic. Well there is one and its over three times. Where does this fit into the "Town Vision"?

Surprisingly, despite signs clearly indicating a 20 mph speed limit there is no reduction in 85thile speed. In fact the actual flow data shows that more than 60% of the vehicles exceed the 20 mph limit.

So the OWES is not working here.

Signs have been erected on all the access roads into Bungay from Norwich, Beccles and Diss (A143) informing that there is a 7.5t restriction in town and there are other signs in town but the HGV vehicle flow (anything over 7.5 tonnes) has increased three fold. **So the OWES is not working here.**

My guess is that the increase in HGV's on Trinity Street since the OWES is accountable by HGV's disregarding the North / South rule on St Mary's street (before the OWES) and travelling south regardless.

So given the choice, before the OWES, HGV's travelling south preferred St Mary Street to Trinity Street. **So the OWES is not working here.**

- 0 -

The OWES is the perfect solution if Bungay needs a One Way Scheme.

But this is not a reason for having one.

The **Vision, Purpose and Action** could be just as effective without the OWS and better integration of vehicle movement within the town centre would be achieved by maintaining St Mary's Street as two-way.

- 0 -

So what would I recommend?

- Maintain the 20 mph limit through-out the town centre.
- Reinstate St Mary's Street to two-way
- Introduce the new road and pavement materials / road calming measures / pedestrian crossings as proposed but through-out St Mary's Street so no break in continuity
- Increase the width of the pavement on Cross Street as it enters the Butter Cross and place old-style bollards to remove the congestion here from illegal parking
- Reinstate metal railings and gates on the Trinity Street side of St Mary's churchyard and so making the churchyard children safe

And with a magic wand.....

- Ban HGV's from travelling either South or North through Bungay unless delivering.

- 0 -

I believe that the initial Vision and Purpose for the scheme delivers to some degree in a positive manner and in particular on streetscape design.

The evidence against implementing a One Way Scheme is overwhelming and I can see little to support it.

Bungay **does not** require a One Way Scheme and is far better without and I hope that my observations go some way to support this view.

James Hartcup

13 Trinity Street
Bungay.

[SCC Home](#) > [Decision Making](#) > [Petitions](#) > [Against the One Way System in Bungay](#)

[Decision Making](#) | [Web Accessibility](#) | [A-Z of Services](#) | [Contact us](#) |

Against the One Way System in Bungay

ResolutionThere was not enough support for this petition

Sponsors Name:Mr Robert Prior

Start date:19/10/12

Close date:18/03/13

Description:

We the undersigned no longer have confidence in Suffolk County Council's ability to design and implement traffic management schemes in towns in Suffolk. We do not believe that recent schemes are value for money, improve the living environment, encourage local commerce and industry, enhance sustainability or improve road safety. We would like experimental traffic management schemes removed. This petition refers particularly to the experimental One Way System in Bungay.

Signature count:64

View signatures:[View Signatures](#)

Log in

Email Address:

Password:

- Registration is easy and only takes a few seconds. Go to [Registration](#)
- [Problems logging in?](#)

[Contact us](#) [Freedom of Information](#) [Site Help](#) [Website Feedback](#)

POWERED BY 

[Online petitions software by web labs](#)