

## **Tut Hill – finalisation of the options for traffic and the consultation process**

Everyone has been frustrated that the issue has not been able to be finalised and the parish council share that frustration. What we are trying to do, on behalf of the residents, is to agree the best solution, as voted for by you and to help to implement it as soon as possible. The purpose of this note is to explain what happens next and to try and answer questions that you might have.

### **The timetable**

Our next Parish meeting is on 5 May and will be held via Zoom. At that meeting this paper will be discussed by Councillors for approval and distribution as the amended consultation options and the arrangements for the final public consultation. At the same time dates will be agreed for the Public Consultation Meeting and the Vote.

The final public consultation will be the main opportunity for residents to hear from the Parish Council, to ask questions and to air views. West Suffolk Council's planning officer and Suffolk County Council's highways' representative will be present to offer support and answer questions. It will be a public meeting for all to attend when restrictions allow. It will be dedicated to this issue only and we hope that it will be a way of answering questions and helping people to make up their minds.

Before the meeting we will circulate this note and a ballot paper to every resident. Immediately after the meeting there will be a vote using ballot papers provided. Each voter votes and puts the ballot paper in the ballot box. Voting will be possible from 5pm on the date of the consultation through to 9pm. If you are unable or unwilling to attend to vote you can ask someone to deliver the vote for you or you can contact either Hugo Greer-Walker or Don Lynch and we are happy to come to you and collect your vote. Hugo – 07309 045 130, [highways2@fornhamallsaintspsc.org.uk](mailto:highways2@fornhamallsaintspsc.org.uk); Don – 07557 277067 [highways1@fornhamallsaintspsc.org.uk](mailto:highways1@fornhamallsaintspsc.org.uk);

Each adult resident of Fornham All Saints will have a single vote and the solution with the most votes will be put forward to SCC Highways and WSC for implementation.

### **The options**

There is £45,000 available to fund the chosen option. Each of the two options are affordable within the budget. There are two options to vote for:-

#### **1 An HGV ban and traffic calming measures on Tut Hill**

An HGV ban and traffic calming requires a Traffic Regulation Order . Some traffic calming measures are in place already. It is anticipated that three table top speed ramps would be installed with associated works and signage. Total estimated cost as at November 2019 - £33,000. Any surplus can be used to improve safety measures.

#### **2 Close Tut Hill to through traffic.**

This would involve the installation of two gates at the Marham Park end of Tut Hill. They would be capable of being used by the emergency services and would ultimately be reversible. Access to Tut Hill would be prevented from Marham Parkway and there would be a gate next to the Service access

(which would serve as a turning head). It also requires a Traffic Regulation Order. Total budget as of November 2019 - £32,500 (including turning head).

<p><b>Option 1 - An HGV ban and traffic calming measures on Tut Hill</b></p>	
<p><b>Pros</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removes HGVs from Tut Hill (except for access).</li> <li>• Less noise, vibration and pollution.</li> <li>• Traffic calming should reduce speeds.</li> <li>• Could discourage through movements by HGVs to further destinations etc B1106.</li> <li>• Passing trade would not be diverted away from businesses.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Cons</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weight restriction and some traffic calming has a poor record of compliance and police low priority.</li> <li>• HGVs would be redirected to A1101 along the Mildenhall Road past the community centre, playing fields and allotments .</li> <li>• Traffic calming itself leads to noise, vibration and pollution.</li> <li>• No material enhancement of walking, cycling, pram or disabled access to Marham Park and beyond.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Option 2 - Close Tut Hill to through traffic</b></p>	
<p><b>Pros</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less noise, vibration and pollution.</li> <li>• Much better environment for cycles, pedestrians and disabled/buggy access .</li> <li>• Removes illegal manoeuvres form Tut Hill/ Marham Parkway junction.</li> <li>• Removes sign clutter.</li> <li>• It is hoped that traffic volumes in FAS generally will drop if closure of Tut Hill makes FAS a less attractive cut through option for traffic to and from the surrounding area.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Cons</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No longer on priority 1 gritting route.</li> <li>• Possible risk that a cul-de-sac may lead to anti-social behaviour, illegal encampment and/or fly-tipping</li> <li>• Increased traffic volumes on A1101 roundabouts and past community centre, playing fields and allotments for residents and businesses due to increased vehicle trips from diverted traffic onto the relief road.</li> <li>• Residents would have a slight increase on journeys to and from the A14 direction via the parkway.</li> <li>• Removes passing trade for businesses</li> <li>• The stopped-up road may need a turning head to meet SCC standards. See diagram.</li> </ul>

## Questions and answers

### 1 I thought there were four options ?

We had also previously considered a “do nothing” option and a “close Tut Hill one way option”. These have been dropped on the grounds that the projected cost of the one way option means we can’t be certain it will be delivered if voted for and Suffolk Highways have expressed some concerns about road safety for that option.

Given that we have money potentially dedicated to traffic calming it seems inappropriate not to use those funds for the good of Fornham All Saints and the reduction in traffic speeds so “do nothing” has been withdrawn.

### 2 I don’t believe anything will actually change whatever we say

These options are within budget and have the support of SCC (Highways) and WSC. We can’t guarantee anything as we have no power ourselves, but we are told that the result of the consultation will be implemented subject to feasibility. We will do everything we can to ensure it is implemented.

### 3 When will the changes be implemented ?

This is likely to take some time as the scheme will need to go to SCC for processing, authorisation and then construction. The likely timeframe is measured in months and may not be until 2022.

### 4 The Parish Council won’t listen to my view.

This process is designed to achieve a result that the majority of residents vote for. The councillors express no view or preference, their sole aim is to facilitate the wishes of the residents. It has historically been divisive and controversial. All we are trying to do is present you with the best achievable choice and help to implement your choice afterwards. We are volunteers and we respectfully request that all debate and discussions are held in a positive and constructive manner.

### 5 What about the illegal U-turns at the junction of Tut Hill and Marham Parkway ?

Marham Parkway is still the responsibility of the developer and the SCC highways team are pressing for improved road safety measures before the road is handed over to them. Hopefully we will see a barrier of some sort erected soon.

### 6 Can we have Westley Village-style squeezer barriers ?

These are no longer available as they have a poor road safety record so they are not an option.

### 7 What about better access to Marham Park ?

Road closure would facilitate pedestrian, cycle and disabled access up Tut Hill into Marham Park. Separately the estimate for improving the footpath in the field is £15,000 and there was a £20,000 contribution required to fund that under the s106 agreement for the development of the most recent phase at Marham Park.