

Report for Resolution

Report to	Norwich Highways Agency Committee 26 May 2011	Item 6
Report of	Head of city development services	
Subject	Confirmation of Highway Capital Improvement Programme 2011-12	

Purpose

The purpose of the report is to confirm how the £100,000 of Local Transport Plan (LTP) funding allocated to the Newmarket Road / Eaton Road scheme should be re-allocated given the decision to reduce the scope of that scheme.

Recommendations

Members are recommended to:

- (1) Note that the revised costs for the Newmarket Road / Eaton Road modified scheme are a total of £130,000, of which £70,000 will be provided through the signal improvement programme and £60,000 through the local transport plan programme.
- (2) Allocate the remaining £40,000 LTP budget to the introduction of waiting restrictions and the controlled parking zone extensions
- (3) Agree that until the funding provision improves no improvement works are undertaken on the U class network, aside from anything that can be funded from the £10,000 budget for citywide minor works (bollards, signs etc), unless they make a direct and significant contribution to the NATS IP or those works form part of a local safety scheme implemented to tackle a known proven accident problem.

Financial Consequences

The amount of Local Transport Plan funding allocated to improvement works in the City for 2011/12 is £205,000. Details of how to allocate £105,000 were agreed at the March meeting. This report details of how the remaining £100,000 can be allocated.

Strategic Priority and Outcome/Service Priorities

The report helps to meet the strategic priority – Strong and prosperous city, working to improve the quality of life for residents, visitors and those who work in the city, now and in the future - and the service plan priority delivering the LTP

Contact Officers

Joanne Deverick, Transportation manager

01603 212461

Background Documents

NHAC Report and Minutes November 2010, March 2011

Report

Background

1. At your meeting in March you considered reports about the proposed pedestrian, cycle and public transport improvements at the Newmarket Road / Eaton Road junction and the capital improvement funding allocation. At that meeting members decided not to implement all the proposed improvements at the Newmarket Road / Eaton Road junction. Officers were asked to re-cost the scheme, and allocate the savings achieved to a combination of the following projects; annual waiting restrictions, controlled parking zone extensions and contra-flow cycle lanes.

Revised Budget

2. The revised scheme for Newmarket Road/Eaton Road, which includes the pedestrian and cycle facilities and carriageway markings at the Newmarket Road / Daniels Road roundabout, but excludes the reduction in the length of the bus lane and the banned right turn into Leopold Road has been priced at £130,000. The signal improvement programmed has allocated £70,000 to this project, and therefore a £60,000 contribution will be required from the LTP budget to complete the works.
3. In addition to the works that were agreed at the March meeting it has been suggested that including the junction in the SCOOT network that means the signals can dynamically respond to traffic conditions, will also help congestion at the junction. As it will be the main A11, and particularly buses, that benefit from this proposal officers are seeking funding for this element from the Growth Point Funding for bus priority measures.
4. If £60,000 is allocated to the Newmarket Road/Eaton Road scheme £40,000 remains to be allocated among the other 3 schemes identified at the March committee. Both the annual waiting restrictions project and the controlled parking zone extensions include commitments that this committee has made to take projects forward, and in the case of the annual waiting restrictions the traffic regulation orders (TROs) have already been advertised and consulted on. Members may recall that a representative of the Thorpe Park management committee attended the previous committee to lobby for the funding required to implement the CPZ extension that had been previously approved for consultation.
5. It is unlikely that the £40,000 would be sufficient to implement both the annual waiting restrictions and CPZ extension in their entirety. It is therefore suggested that a report is brought to your next meeting, when the results of the consultation on the CPZ extension have been completed. Members can then review all outstanding TRO's and decide which ones to implement in the current financial year.

Requests for other schemes to be considered

6. Following press coverage of the decision to implement a reduced scheme at the Newmarket Road / Eaton Road junction a formal request for traffic management measures in Mount Pleasant was sent to the County's Portfolio holder for Transport with an explicit request that it was put before this committee. A copy of the request is attached as appendix 1.
7. Members are reminded that considerable resource has already been directed by the committee to find solutions for the issues in the Mount Pleasant and Albemarle Road area and it has previously been impossible for the committee to get a consensus view among residents of what they would like to see happen in their area. In developing the latest request it is considered by those making the request that a consensus now exists following a public meeting with the then MP in February 2010. Also individual Members have expressed support for the recent proposals, including Councillor Lubbock and ex Councillor Read.
8. Members will be aware that Mount Pleasant is not the only area where problems have been raised; members will recall that at the meeting in March a petition was presented to committee by on behalf of the residents of Essex Street calling for speed management measures in their road. Additionally as a result of the recent campaigning work for the local elections speed and traffic management issues have been raised by a number of members across the city.
9. When the provisional programme of improvements works was presented to committee in November, before the full extent of the budget cuts was known, possible schemes had been ranked in priority order based on 5 main criteria;
 - whether they were incomplete projects that needed further funding
 - whether they linked to other projects with additional funding sources
 - the number of issues that they addressed
 - the LTP3 priorities that they satisfied.
 - whether they were part of the NATS implementation plan. (NATS IP)
10. However, given the 80% year on year cut in the budget these an even more focussed approach is required. At the November 2010 meeting the majority of priority weighting was given to incomplete projects and hence the recommendation to spend surplus funding otherwise allocated to the Newmarket Road/Eaton Road scheme to waiting restriction requests and/or CPZ extension.
11. Resolving isolated issues of traffic and speed management in residential areas, other than those on the A, B & C road class network tend to have a local impact. Also they generally make a more modest contribution to NATS priorities and the NATS IP.
12. It is therefore suggested that until the funding provision improves, during this period of very constrained budget availability no improvement works are undertaken on the u class network, aside from anything that can be funded from the budget for citywide minor works (e.g. bollards, signs etc). This would be unless they make a direct and significant contribution to the NATS IP or

those works form part of a local safety scheme implemented to tackle a known proven accident problem.

Case for Including Mount Pleasant and Albemarle Road Remedial Actions in Norwich City Council Highways Committee May 2011.

This paper makes the case for including remedial road works in Mount Pleasant for NHAC May 2011 meeting

Background

Mount Pleasant and Albemarle Road are residential Streets. They qualify as roads for specific concern as they support 4 schools in the area (c. 1000 children between 2-18) and also a Home for the Elderly (The Cedars: some 75 residences). The streets are narrow: effectively one car width wide and the area suffers from speeding and also kerb mounting. Introduction of speed signs (20MPH) have had no effect in reducing speed (Council documentation) nor resolving the kerb mounting. Albemarle Road suffers blockages and illegal parking and Ambulances are unable to reach The Cedars on peak times. Police are regularly called to resolve traffic issues. The situation has recently been exacerbated by speed humps in adjacent Christchurch road which drives yet more traffic onto these vulnerable roads. It is one of the few roads in the area with no self-enforcing measures. It is not a 20MPH zone.

In terms of the evaluation process below are some facts that support inclusion for action:

National and Local Policy on Vulnerable Areas

Because of the elderly and school children the area conforms to DfT guidance regarding vulnerable areas which should have a priority for Council action.

Speed Limits

70% of traffic in Mount Pleasant exceed the 20 mph speed limit (council data).

Concerns from Local Stakeholders

- 2 Schools have expressed formal concerns about traffic safety
- The residents of The Cedars, being particularly vulnerable, have also expressed concern
- Numerous residents have expressed concern on safety
- Council Officers have noted safety issues:
 - ‘...*significant safety issues*’ (formal report to Highways Committee 2008)
 - The situation is ‘*far from satisfactory*’ (J Massey, Director, October 2010)

Impact

Some 1000 schoolchildren use the area and there are c. 75 residences in the Cedars supporting some 70-100 vulnerable people). This is in addition to local residents. Therefore remedial proposals would carry significant impact and also support school transport plans which try to encourage walking and cycling to school (climate change).

Council Evaluation Criteria

See below for summary (highlighted)

