



NORWICH HIGHWAYS AGENCY COMMITTEE

10am to 10.55am

22 March 2012

Present: **County Councillors:** **City Councillors:**
 Adams (chair) (V) Bremner (vice-chair) (V)
 Spratt (V) (substitute for Gayton (V)
 Councillor Plant) (from Carlo
 item 2 onwards) Stephenson
 Bearman
 Shaw

*(V) – Voting Member

Apologies: County Councillors Plant and Scutter, and City Councillor Grenville

1. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The chair welcomed Councillor Stephenson, Norwich City Council.

2. PETITIONS

Petition 1 - Pavements, curbs and crossings in Thorpe Hamlet

Mr Leon Smith introduced the petition and presented it to the chair on behalf of students from The Hamlet Centre:

“The Hamlet Centre Trust, Ellacombe Care Home, Marion Road Day Centre, Lionwood Nursery and Lionwood Junior School are all located in and around Thorpe Hamlet Norwich. With the amount of wheelchair and pushchair use around this area, we the undersigned ask that pavements, curbs and crossings be evaluated and that desperately needed maintenance and alteration work is carried out.”

(The petition comprised an e-petition and a signed paper petition.)

The head of city development services, Norwich City Council, replied on behalf of the committee and said that the city council had received £20,000 from the county council to introduce drop kerbs and asked that a representative of the city council could meet with the students to discuss this further. The city council would also be

consulting other groups, such as the Norwich Access Group, to discuss how best to make best use of this funding.

The students agreed to the meeting and the head of city development services said that he would arrange a meeting with the students to take forward the issues that they had raised in their petitions.

3. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Question 1 - Wherry Road

Mrs Prue Dobinson asked the following question:-

“I am a home owner in Wherry Road, Norwich and together with my neighbours in the town houses would like to request the committee to make an exception to the rule that more than one wheel over the edge of our property gets a parking ticket.

The currently prevents parking in front of our integral garages and restricts temporary or occasional access for trades-maintenance and visitors. The land boundary is 7 feet from the garage doors, which is not enough for a car to park without overhanging. The pavement is more than wide enough to allow pedestrians, wheel chair users or double buggy to pass behind a vehicle on the pavement.

The houses are 10 years old and therefore residents have not been eligible for a parking permit.

It has been acknowledged that parking provision is insufficient and until January we were allowed to park a car up to the garage door. We would like to have this facility reinstated and ratified as it is creating difficulties in our daily life.”

(Photographs were displayed at the request of the questioner.)

The transportation and networks manager, Norwich City Council, replied on behalf of the committee and said that each of the houses had 1 parking unit per household, but some of the flats had no parking provision at all. She pointed out that the development was a pedestrian zone. The space in front of the houses had not been intended as parking spaces and was to allow access to the garages. The traffic regulation order should be enforced. If an exception was made it would affect other places, particularly in the city centre, which were in a similar position.

Mrs Dobinson said, by way of a supplementary question, that she considered that the situation was unfair as $\frac{3}{4}$ of her car was on her own land and in front of her garage. There was no where else for visitors to park, particularly with young children.

The chair said that although he was sympathetic to the residents of Wherry Road, the committee could not make an exception in this particular case.

Question 2 – Storm drain Soleme Road

The chair read out the following question on behalf of County Councillor Richard Edwards, Mile Cross Division, who was unable to attend the committee meeting:-

“When is Soleme Road cycle and footpath storm drain going to be unblocked? What can be done to prevent it being clogged up with silt and leaves? I have reported it many times and it does not seem to have been resolved.”

(Photographs provided by Councillor Edwards were displayed.)

The head of city development services explained that street cleaning was a function of the city council, as the district council, and that there did appear to be leaves in the drain but it was not clear whether the drain was actually blocked. He undertook to investigate and respond to Councillor Edwards in writing.

Councillor Bearman requested that he received a copy of the reply.

Question 3 – Cow Hill parking permits

Councillor Stephenson asked the following question on behalf of Councillor Adrian Holmes, Ward councillor for Mancroft Ward:-

“Residents in Cow Hill have contacted me to say how difficult it can be to find a free resident's parking space (especially on a Saturday). They point out that based on data from 2010 the number of permit holders was 275 with only 66 spaces available.

Given this situation - they have asked why permit parking holder cannot be allowed to use the pay and display spaces when necessary?

As a further point has the council got a policy on the limit of permits issued above the number of permit parking spaces available?”

The transportation and networks manager said that the committee would be considering the review of parking permits at its next meeting which would address the issues arising from the use of controlled parking zones. Residents cannot use their parking permits to park in the pay and display spaces but could pay for the space if they wished like any other road user.

Question 4 – 20mph in residential areas of Norwich

Councillor Judith Lubbock, Eaton Ward councillor, ask the following question:-

“The city council's corporate plan 2012-15 includes a commitment to advocate a 20mph default speed limit in all its residential roads. This is part of the corporate priority ‘safe and clean city’ and is aligned to reducing the number of killed and seriously injured road casualties.

I am sure that you will be pleased that Norwich has joined nearly 7 million other residents who now live in an area where there is a commitment to a

20 mph default speed limit. Places like York, Oxford, Bristol and Edinburgh have made that commitment. Portsmouth has turned their commitment into reality.

Public opinion has also turned in favour of 20 mph speed limits on residential streets. According to the British Social Attitudes Survey conducted last year 71% of drivers support it and the coalition Government have made implementation easier and less costly.

What I would like to ask this committee is whether they would consider prioritising this important road safety measure and allocate money from the 2013-14 budget to implement this commitment above other road safety measures? Thus ensuring that all residents feel the benefit of this measure and once implemented it will reap rewards for years to come.

Alternatively would the committee investigate if money from developer contributions could be used to fund this measure just as it has been used to expand the car club in Norwich – a decision you are considering later in the agenda.

I have long been a champion of 20 mph speed limits in residential areas and I feel hopeful that on securing a commitment to it in the city council's corporate plan for the coming 3 years it must surely become a reality. I trust this committee will do all it can to help with that.

I have circulated to you information about the benefits of 20 mph default speed limits from the 20's plenty website should anyone need reminding of them."

The transportation and network manager in response said that the problem of using S106 funding for these measures was that there would need to be significant development for sufficient transport contributions to fund the implementation of the programme. The major project manager, Norfolk County Council, explained that the funding for the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy (NATS) Implementation Plan did not include provision of the implementation of 20mph speed limits in all residential areas of the city, but there were other measures that would reduce speed limits and encourage cycling and pedestrians.

Councillor Lubbock said that by reducing speed limits in residential areas more people would be encouraged to cycle or walk and that she regretted that it had not been done earlier to save escalating costs.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Councillor Bearman declared a personal interest in item 3, public questions, question 4, as a member of "20's Plenty for Us".

5. MINUTES

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 26 January 2012.

6. NORWICH AREA TRANSPORTATION STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION – DEREHAM ROAD BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT) PHASE 1, DEREHAM ROAD / OLD PALACE ROAD/ HEIGHAM ROAD JUNCTION

(Copies of the consultation responses and letters to the committee were available for inspection at the meeting.)

A member of the public addressed the committee and said that she was pleased that the officers' recommendation was to retain the right hand turn from Dereham Road into both Old Palace Road and Heigham Road.

During discussion the major project manager answered members' questions. He explained that the public concern about the proposal to prohibit the right hand turn from Dereham Road into Old Palace Road and Heigham Road had been raised during the first round of consultation. The committee and officers had considered that it was important for a second round of consultation on the options. In response to a question, he explained that it was only possible to use advanced stop lines for cyclists where all lanes stopped at the same time. Therefore the use of advanced stop lines on the Dereham Road was not an option.

Councillor Bearman commended the officers for the conduct and standard of the public consultation on this scheme.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) approve for implementation the proposals to modify the Dereham Road/Old Palace Road/Heigham Road junction which retain the right turns into both Old Palace Road and Heigham Road, providing improvements to bus reliability and journey times on Dereham Road, to replace the existing worn out traffic signals and enhance the pedestrian crossing facilities on all arms of the junction if possible;
- (2) record the committee's gratitude to the officers for their contribution to the development of the scheme and the public consultation.

7. NORWICH CAR CLUB EXPANSION PROPOSALS

Councillor Bremner, in his capacity as the city council's cabinet member for planning and transport, referred to a response to a question from Councillor Carlo he had made at full council earlier that week in which he had promoted car clubs as a solution to alleviate parking problems in the terraced streets of Norwich.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) note the continued demand for the car club and welcome its' planned extension across Norwich;
- (2) authorise the head of city development and head of law and governance (Norwich City Council) to carry out the necessary statutory procedures to introduce car club bays as detailed in attached plans in appendix 1 and associated changes to waiting restrictions:

Location	Plan number
1. Chapel Field East	PL/TR/3329/730/1B
2. City Road	PL/TR/3329/730/3
3. Ella Road	PL/TR/3329/730/6
4. Heigham Street	PL/TR/3329/730/7
5. Nelson Street	PL/TR/3329/730/4
6. Surrey Street	PL/TR/3329/730/5
7. Trafford Road	PL/TR/3329/730/2

8. NORWICH PARK AND RIDE FARE CHANGES

During discussion Councillor Carlo suggested that statistics showing the usage of park and ride facilities over the last 5 years, provided by the county and city councils, might be of interest to members.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) amend the charges for parking at the Airport Park & Ride site, as detailed in Appendix 1;
- (2) ask Norwich City Council to advertise and introduce these changes to the Norwich City Council (Norwich Airport Park and Ride) Traffic Regulation Order 2003 in accordance with Sections 32 and 35 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

9. NORWICH AREA TRANSPORTATION STRATEGY (NATS) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND NORWICH NORTHERN DISTRIBUTOR ROUTE (NDR)/POSTWICK HUB UPDATE

The committee considered the report to the county council's ETD overview and scrutiny panel and discussion ensued. Members referred to the measures already realised as part of the NATS implementation plan, such as the role of the St Augustine's gyratory in improving air quality, Newmarket Road bus and cycle lane and the cycle network. However Councillor Carlo raised concerns that the NDR was not required and Councillor Bearman called on the council to ensure that the solution to traffic congestion was holistic and funding spent wisely.

During discussion reference was made to the Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) bid and it was noted that whilst this committee had agreed to the principle of the Chapelfield North scheme, it was expected that there would be a consultation on the scheme and that the committee would consider the results at a future meeting.

RESOLVED to support the recommendations set out in the appended report as follows:

“That Norfolk County Council’s cabinet:

- (1) submits a planning application for the Northern Distributor Road (NDR) to the A1067;
- (2) continues to progress a dual carriage way NDR between the A140 and A1067 as part of the planning submission, or consider a single carriageway option;
- (3) delivers construction of the NDR as a single project to A1067, or consider a staged delivery (ie the A140 first, then to the A1067 at a later date);
- (4) the forward funding profile as provided in the DfT bid for the A140 NDR project (appendix A) and the A1067 NDR (appendix B);
- (5) continues to underwrite the NDR (value depending on dual or single option between A140 and A1067) but taking note of the GNDP in principle funding of up to £40m towards the NDR and related measures.”

10. PERFORMANCE MONITORING OF THE HIGHWAYS AGENCY AGREEMENT

RESOLVED, having considered the report of the head of city development services, Norwich City Council, to note the available performance results.

11. ON STREET PARKING ENFORCEMENT MONITORING REPORT

RESOLVED, having considered the report of the head of city development services, Norwich City Council, to:

- (1) receive the available performance results and note that income is above budget and the number of penalty charge notices issued is similar to previous years;
- (2) acknowledge the projected surplus and note that this is subject to end of year recharges for single status outcomes and subsequent CDS recharges.

12. MAJOR ROAD WORKS – REGULAR MONITORING

The transportation and networks manager reported that Vulcan Road South was open on 19 March 2012 to outbound traffic. It was expected that the road would be completely open next week – two weeks' ahead of schedule. She also advised members that Finkelgate was closed to demolish the damaged property and would return to one-way opening as before to allow for repairs. It was hoped that Finkelgate would be fully opened by the summer.

RESOLVED to note the report.

13. MEETING SCHEDULE 2012-13

RESOLVED, having considered the report of the head of law and governance, Norwich City Council, to agree the following schedule of meetings for the civic year 2012-2013, all meetings to be at 10am and held at City Hall:-

24 May 2012
26 July 2012
27 September 2012
29 November 2012
24 January 2013
21 March 2013
23 May 2013

CHAIR