

We join our fellow Recorder Road residents at Stuart Court, Riverway Court and Cavendish Court in urging Norwich City Council to adhere to its own DIA policy and protect vulnerable residents in Recorder Road.”

The head of city development services, Norwich City Council, explained that under the revised Highways Agency agreement gritting would in future be carried out by the county council as part of a countywide winter maintenance programme. This was reviewed each year and consideration could be made to this request and the other representations received from residents in the vicinity of Recorder Road. The city council as a district council provided the grit bins. The council had allocated more into its budget for grit bins and would be carrying out a review over the summer in advance of the 2011/12 season: it would be mindful of this request for a grit box from the residents of Recorder Road as part of this review.

2. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Duke Street – speed management

Councillor Bearman, divisional ward councillor for Town Close Ward, asked the following question on behalf of Mr Andrew Tomlinson:-

"Following the petition presented to you in July 2009, and the information provided through Police Action in 2010 showing that vehicles travelled along Duke Street at 70mph:

- (1) what action does Norwich City Council intend to take to curb the continued excessive speeding of vehicles using Duke Street causing damage to properties and risk to pedestrians on the narrow pavements?; and,
- (2) how will the council address the issue of illegal cycling on pavements, particularly in the northern part of Duke street where the contraflow cycle lane is not proposed?"

The transportation network manager, Norwich City Council, referred to the constraints of the current budget situation for highways measures and said that the police could raise public awareness of speed through its community safety camera partnership. In previous years the safety camera partnership had operated SAM (speed awareness monitor) that flashed up drivers' speeds as vehicles went past it, and recorded the data for later use by public bodies. This scheme was currently on hold but talks were on-going to try and resurrect it. She would ask that Duke Street be considered as a potential site for SAM.

Discussion ensued in which members considered that this was an issue for the police and that it should be brought to their attention. Councillor Bremner asked that the questioner was provided with a written response and that a copy be sent to the local SNAP and police team. The head of citywide development services said that the city council's constitution required notice of a question by 10am on the day before a meeting and therefore it was not practical to seek a response from the police in advance of a meeting but he would ensure that it was followed up retrospectively.

DIY streets

Councillor Jeraj, Town Close ward councillor, to ask the following question:-

"Does the committee support the idea of DIY streets, as pioneered by Sustrans, where residents organise and design small scale and low cost improvements to their local street?"

The head of city development services explained that Sustrans was promoting DIY Streets which was a community led initiative to enhance the safety of residential streets. This was a lower cost alternative to home zones to civilise the street through planting, etc. Cavell Road was an example of a home zone in the city. Members would need further information in order to take a view and therefore he proposed to bring a report on DIY Streets to a future meeting of the committee.

Councillor Jeraj confirmed that he was satisfied that a report on DIY Streets would be considered by the committee in due course.

South Park Avenue – speed reduction

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

"I am a city councillor for Eaton. My colleagues and I have received numerous requests for traffic calming on South Park Avenue as has the local PCSO (police community support officer) who covers this area.

The requests take the form of:

- (1) North Park Avenue is a similar road but without the bad bend which exists on South Park. Why if North Park has speeding tables cant we have them on South Park?
- (2) South Park runs the length of Eaton Park and therefore is crossed by pedestrians especially children in three places to access the park, there needs to be some traffic calming to make these crossing points safer from the speeding traffic.
- (3) No 25 buses run at 10 minute intervals along the road which make it busy throughout the day and night. They have to slow down to pass one another on the bend in the road otherwise they travel in excess of 30 mph.
- (4) Traffic travels too fast along this road and we need traffic calming each side of the bad bend.

The requests mainly come from residents who live on South Park Avenue who are more aware of the speeding traffic; however other residents have also expressed concerns.

I would like to ask whether it would be possible to measure the speed of vehicles on South Park Avenue to ascertain whether speeding is as bad as residents report.

Once the evidence is produced discussions can then start about the various ways of reducing speed. Possible measures cover a wide range such as

temporary mobile 'slow down' and '30 mph flashing' signs, or a 20 mph speed limit or traffic calming. I am anxious to firstly produce the evidence, hopefully by mechanical means and then explore what can be done to reduce speed.

Please can you say whether this first step of gathering speed information can be done?"

The transportation network manager said that the speed awareness management system (SAMS) could be used to gather evidence that vehicles were exceeding the speed limit. She pointed out that members of the public might perceive that buses were exceeding the speed limit when this was not the case.

During discussion, Councillors Lubbock and Scutter referred to the number of requests for traffic calming speed management schemes and said that the introduction of a 20mph speed limit in all residential areas and associated awareness campaign would negate the need for individual schemes. They considered that the accrued costs of such schemes could be comparative to the cost of implementing a citywide 20mph scheme in residential areas. Members also suggested that other methods should be implemented to evaluate the speed of traffic, including community speed watch schemes, which the police operated outside the city council's boundary. It was also considered that the bus companies needed to be informed if any of their drivers were exceeding the speed limit on this route.

Councillor Carlo suggested that the county council could make a major schemes bid for funding for traffic calming measures throughout the city from the Department for Transport's Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF).

Councillor Spratt, deputy cabinet member for planning and transportation, Norfolk County Council, addressed the committee in support of the service provided by the bus companies and said that it was unlikely that bus drivers exceeded the speed limit. He pointed out that South Park Avenue was an important route for residents of Cringleford, Eaton, Wymondham and outlying areas and that imposing a 20mph speed limit on this road would effectively "close" the city to country people.

The transportation network manager responded that there were different mechanisms of gathering data on average speeds. One option was for officers to collect data with a radar gun but as this would be based on the odd hour here and there could only give an indication of the position. A tube across the road would cost around £450 each time and there were countless requests and it was difficult to prioritise one request over another. The committee had considered the outcome of the 20mph trial and because of the cost of implementation that would mean that there was no funding available for other safety measures for 2 years and there were concerns that it would not be effective in reducing speeds in residential areas, the scheme had not been approved. A minor schemes bid had been made to the LSTF and authorities were not allowed to make 2 submissions. In any case major schemes bids needed to be submitted by 18 June and therefore it would not be feasible to prepare one in the timescale. Officers would facilitate a dialogue with the police to see what the best solution would be to address the concerns of the residents of Eaton ward.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Carlo declared a personal interest in that she was chair of the Norfolk and Norwich Transport Action Group.

4. MINUTES

RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 24 March 2011.

(Councillor Waters was admitted to the meeting at this point.)

5. CONFIRMATION OF HIGHWAY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME 2011-12

The transportation network manager, in response to a question, explained that some contingency had been allowed for the Newmarket Road / Eaton Road scheme since the last meeting and therefore there was £40,000 available for reallocation to other schemes.

Mr James Savill asked the following question:

“The Council has kindly sent us the evaluation model they apply to set priority for works.

The officers have kindly offered us a open and transparent evaluation of the Albemarle/Mount Pleasant traffic issues in the light of unexpected funding becoming available due to Eaton Road works being cancelled. This is using the evaluation criteria that they have kindly sent us. Officers have kindly also allowed our documentation and business case to be presented at this meeting.

When we look at the evaluation criteria we are very confused as to why an area supporting 3 schools, sheltered housing and suffering 70% speeding and with a proven accident rate has less priority than Essex Street, proposals for controlled parking zone; annual waiting restrictions and contra flow cycle lanes.

Can the officers and councillors please tell us:

- (a) We are very confused as to why Mount Pleasant/Albemarle did not get a higher priority given that it ‘ticks’ most of the critical boxes . Are the full comparative evaluation documents completed for the 5 items proposed are available for councillors and public to see?
- (b) Given the recently revealed police records of 4 accidents (2 involving injury) in a 200 metre stretch of road supporting 3 schools will the council now honour its commitment within today’s documents to invest funding to proactively resolve issues on Mount Pleasant and Albemarle? Given the accidents took place in the vicinity of not one but three schools and also sheltered housing for 100 plus vulnerable adults there is a clear case for this

are to be considered a priority. The council documentation acknowledges a local consensus of action. Please can we have confirmation that the council will follow its written and duty of care commitment here?"

A resident of the Cedars sheltered housing scheme then addressed the committee setting out her concerns about problems of parking on Albermarle Road, particularly associated with the two schools, and her concerns about access for emergency vehicles given that there was a high proportion of vulnerable, older people living in the vicinity.

Councillor Jeraj, Town Close ward councillor, addressed the committee on behalf of residents in Mount Pleasant and Albermarle Road, in favour of the proposal for residents, suggested remedial actions as set out in the appendix to the report. He said that there was consensus view among residents for traffic management measures supplemented with travel plans from the two schools.

Discussion ensued. Councillor Bremner said that schools across the city had similar problems with parking and that this was not specific to this area. Norwich High School for Girls and Stretton School served a wider catchment area from the county. There were also other areas of the city with higher concentrations of older people. School travel plans could be successful in addressing this problem and the police could assist in providing guidance and leaflets. The chair confirmed that he had received a letter from the head of Norwich High School for Girls outlining the objectives that the school aimed to achieve through its travel plan.

The transportation network manager referred to issues raised by members and said that a scheme in Albermarle Road and Mount Pleasant was not being recommended for approval. There had not been an accident for 11 years on Albermarle Road and the other accidents had occurred at the junction of Newmarket Road with Albermarle Road. Traffic calming measures would have no effect on congestion. She referred to a suggestion to implement a no stopping order which had recently been approved outside the new Free School in Surrey Street, and said that it would be onerous on local residents receiving deliveries at other times. Surrey Street was a very busy road in the city centre with regular enforcement whereas Albermarle Street was primarily residential. Officers had sufficient data on traffic in Mount Pleasant and Albermarle Road as it had been monitored extensively as one of the pilots in the trial of 20mph in residential streets. The street could be considered for a DIY Street scheme if the committee agreed in future to support these.

The committee then discussed the report and the transportation network manager answered questions. She explained that the contingency for the Newmarket Road / Eaton Road junction included costs for yellow cross hatching and that there was some minor flexibility within the budgets. Members considered that it would be useful to visit the traffic control unit to see how the SCOOT network operated.

RESOLVED 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 (CPZ) extensions and that a further report will be considered at the next meeting, when the results of the consultation on CPZ extensions had been completed to review all outstanding traffic regulation orders and decide which ones to implement in the current financial year ;
- (3) agree that 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;
- (4) ask the committee officer to arrange a visit to the traffic control centre for members of the committee.

6. NORWICH AREA TRANSPORTATION STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION – MAKING ROOM: ST STEPHENS STREET AREA

The head of city development services presented the report with the aid of slides and plans, and together the major projects manager, Norfolk County Council, answered questions. The outcome of the bid to the Local Strategic Transport Fund would not be available until the end of June.

Discussion ensued in which members generally supported consultation on a scheme to improve public transport into the city centre, with specific benefits to Norwich market, The Lanes, Theatre Street and The Forum. However Councillor Plant expressed concern that other roads might not have sufficient capacity if westbound traffic from Westlegate was prevented from turning right into Rampant Horse Street and Theatre Street. Members were advised that traffic modelling showed that there would be capacity and that congestion on the inner ring road and Grapes Hill would be alleviated. Members were advised that the details for delivery vehicles on Chapelfield North had not been finalised. Organisations representing cyclists and pedestrians would be included in the consultation.

The chair said that he was opposed to any attempt to close Westlegate and that it would have an adverse effect on retail businesses and visitors to the city. The chair moved and Councillor Shaw proposed the recommendations of the report subject to deleting (e) the implementation of a right turn only arrangement for all westbound traffic on Westlegate, except for cycles. Discussion ensued in which Councillor Bremner reiterated officers' advice that that the scheme would be unviable if this element was removed. The head of city development services confirmed that there was no proposal in the scheme to pedestrianise Westlegate. Other members of the committee considered that consultation should be on all elements of the scheme.

RESOLVED with 1 member voting in favour (Councillor Adams), 2 members voting against (Councillors Bremner and Waters) and 1 member abstaining (Councillor

Plant) the amendment to delete (e) the implementation of a right turn only arrangement for all westbound traffic on Westlegate, except for cycles, was lost.

The chair then moved the recommendations contained in the report.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) approve for consultation the proposals to create a new access route to the city centre for buses and deliveries via Chapelfield North and associated traffic management and design changes, as a contribution to the implementation of the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy.
- (2) ask the head of city development services and the head of law and governance to progress the statutory procedures associated with advertising the traffic regulation orders that are necessary for the implementation of phases one and two of the scheme, as described in paragraph 13 and shown on the plans in appendix one.

7. MAJOR ROAD WORKS – REGULAR MONITORING

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

CHAIR