



## NORWICH HIGHWAYS AGENCY COMMITTEE

10.00am to 11.20am

24 November 2011

Present:           **County Councillors:**           **City Councillors:**  
                          Adams (Chair) (V)                   Bremner (Vice-Chair) (V)  
                          Spratt (V) (substitute for           Gayton (V)  
                          Councillor Plant) (to the end     Altman  
                          of item 10)                           Carlo  
                          Bearman  
                          Scutter  
                          Shaw

\*(V) – Voting Member

Apologies:        County Councillor Plant and City Councillor Grenville

### 1.     **PETITION**

#### **Mount Pleasant – request for traffic calming bumps**

Ms Sue Nursey presented the petition and said that 90% of the residents of Mount Pleasant had signed the petition requesting traffic calming bumps in their street subject to the budget becoming available. Residents were concerned about public safety particularly of pedestrians, children, cyclists and older adults. She referred to the email correspondence submitted by Professor Diane DeBell, in advance of the meeting, reproduced below:

“During recent months, Mount Pleasant has experienced a severe increase in speed and "cut through" use of the street by oversized vehicles. The street is used as a short cut by large, oversized, and speeding vehicles between Newmarket Road and Unthank Road.

During 10 days in July (2011), we experienced such severe damage by large and/or speeding vehicles that one parked car was 'written off' and four more were severely damaged in two separate incidents. These were all investigated by the police and four cars were investigated by forensics.

These are only the most dramatic incidents.

We are asking for traffic calming humps to be placed on Mount Pleasant. *We are asking committee's approval for traffic calming humps on Mount Pleasant subject to budget.*

Mount Pleasant has a school and a nursing home adjacent. There is a severe public liability danger at issue. *Pedestrians, children, cyclists and older adults are seriously in danger on Mount Pleasant.* This is in addition to the routine damage to residents' parked cars.

The road width for moving vehicles is less than 2.4 meters wide. A van is 2.1m wide and an HGV is 2.44m. This means that both vans and large vehicles using the street must drive on both the street and the pavement at the same time.

More than 90% of Mount Pleasant residents signed the following petition:

*"We, the residents of Mount Pleasant, Norwich wish to have traffic calming bumps placed along our street."*

Every resident on the street was visited by neighbours and the petition signatures were completed on 30 October 2011."

The transportation and network manager, Norwich City Council, said that previous proposals for speed management in Mount Pleasant had not been supported by a consensus of residents and had therefore not been implemented. (Copies of the relevant reports and minutes would be provided to the chief petitioners.) The current budget situation meant that priority would not be given to U class roads unless police data showed a pattern of accidents that supported the need for speed management measures. The removal of the ability to park cars on the road would have an impact on residents and would have the effect of increasing the speed that cars could be driven through it.

Councillor Bremner, as the city council's cabinet member for planning and transport, said that he was aware of the narrowness of Mount Pleasant and said that refuse trucks often had to mount the pavement to pass. However the average speed in Mount Pleasant was less than 20mph and pointed out that there were many streets across the city with similar problems.

Councillor Scutter pointed out that the petitioners were aware of the budget situation but were asking the committee to accept the need for traffic calming in Mount Pleasant and for it to be done when the budget allowed. Clearly as time passed other priorities might come forward that could take precedent but this was a job waiting to be done. Councillor Carlo referred to the 90% of residents who had signed the petition and said that whilst in the past the residents had not agreed a consensus had now emerged. As a cyclist she did not feel safe in Mount Pleasant. One of the issues was the extraneous traffic which did not need to be there. She said that following a suggestion from Councillor Jeraj, ward councillor for Town Close ward, the committee was expecting a paper on the Sustrans DIY project which could offer a solution to traffic calming. Councillor Gayton concurred that other parts of the city also suffered similar traffic problems.

**RESOLVED to:**

- (1) receive the petition and thank the residents for submitting the petition;
- (2) ensure that the chief petitioners receive copies of previous reports to the committee for information;
- (3) note that the committee will receive a report on the Sustrans DIY project in due course.

**2. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

**Duke Street**

Ms Phyll Hardie, Norwich Cycling Campaign, asked the following question:

“Can the officers please confirm that cyclists proceeding on the southbound carriageway of Duke Street will have priority over vehicles using the entrances and exits to St Andrew’s car park and Dukes Palace Wharf, as this is an important connecting point for touring cyclists using National Cycle Network route 1 on Colegate with the only truly secure and covered bicycle parking in Norwich?”

The transportation and network manager confirmed that cyclists would have priority on the entrance / exit to Dukes Palace Wharf and the car park. At the entrance to the car park the cyclists would not have the automatic priority, but it was anticipated that, given that tidal nature of the flows into Duke Street, and that cars entering the queuing lane could clearly see cyclists, cyclists would be likely to have priority most of the time.

**Business parking permits**

Councillor Jeraj, ward councillor for Town Close Ward, asked the following question:

"Previous reports presented to this committee (for instance Item 10 from 24 March 2011) make clear that business parking permits are not intended to be used for commuter parking. The instructions that accompany business parking permits also clearly state that 'The permit must not be used for all day commuter parking without prior consent of the city council'. Will the council, in its review of permits, seek to amend the wording of traffic orders to make this requirement enforceable, for instance, by introducing a time limit?"

The transportation and network manager said that the permit parking review would include looking at the wording of traffic orders as part of the review. In response to a supplementary question from Councillor Jeraj, the transportation and network manager said that the exact purpose of the review would be to ensure that the scheme was enforceable. The outcome of the review would not be realised until it was completed.

### 3. MINUTES

**RESOLVED** to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2011 subject to the following amendments:

- (1) item 3, Norwich Area Transportation Strategy Implementation Plan – Dereham Road Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Phase 1, paragraph 6, second sentence, to delete “1 and 2” and replace with “2 and 3”:
- (2) item 3, Norwich Area Transportation Strategy Implementation Plan – Dereham Road Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Phase 1, paragraph 8, first sentence, to delete “buses” and insert with “other traffic” to read as follows:  
  
“... to be monitored in case it resulted in other traffic queuing”
- (3) item 5, Government advice on speed management in residential areas, second sentence, to insert “Some” at the beginning of the sentence so that it reads as follows:  
  
“Some members considered that it was of little value without police enforcement.”

### 4. NORWICH AREA TRANSPORTATION STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION PLAN – DEREHAM ROAD BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT) PHASE 1

(The chair agreed to take this as an urgent item.)

The highway and major projects manager, Norfolk County Council, reported that further to the committee’s consideration of the Dereham Road Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) at its last meeting, and following discussions with local members they had agreed to change the previously agreed approach to consultation for the Old Palace Road/Heigham Road junction. This was to provide two drop-in sessions for all interested residents and members, with varying hours to maximise the opportunity for people to attend. It was also proposed not to hold the workshops as previously agreed. These changes would affect phases 1 and 2, as set out in the previous report.

Councillor Bearman confirmed that the local councillors had been consulted and supported this approach.

**RESOLVED** approve the change in the previously agreed approach to consultation on the Dereham Road BRT, approved by the committee on 15 September 2011, and to hold two drop-in sessions for all interested residents, with varying hours to maximise the opportunity for people to attend and not to hold the workshops.

### 5. ASHBY STREET – USE OF BUSINESS PERMITS

The chair invited local residents to ask questions on the report.

Mr Peter Bradbroke asked the following question:

“Regarding recommendations - point 1....this has been an on going issue for seven years, this suggests to us there has been plenty of time to resolve the problem and a positive decision made now in no way would be considered 'knee jerk'. How many more surveys, meetings and discussions are needed?

Under the heading of strategic priority and outcome you use the interesting term 'safe and healthy neighbourhoods' - I can assure you a number of residents are feeling depressed and stressed because of this problem and the lack of action being taken to resolve it. Quality of life for residents is not what it should be.

Background:

2... states clearly 'the overriding purpose of the scheme was to remove commuter parking and promote the uptake of the new park and ride system'. Why is Norwich City Council (Norwich City Council) not enforcing its own wishes and regulations?

4...it seems as though the 'current economic climate' is being used by NCC as an excuse to be lenient to business permit users. We are all subject to the current economic climate, if a CEO (civil enforcement officer) sees a vehicle on a yellow line does he think because of the current economic he will ignore it - I think not! People who work in the city are subject to the 'current economic climate' but they still have to use park and ride etc to get to work.

5...it states clearly some vehicles are being parked for the entire day - if this is not *commuter parking* what is? Why not take action?

6...Glad some abuse of the system was noted, but why no mention of commuter parking?

7...the suggestion that your survey and spot checks were 'in depth' is considered by the residents to be ridiculous - according to appendix 1 the survey covered seven periods over four days, two of the days were half term days! The residents are best placed to see the abuse - we survey **every day** and see the constant misuse of permits.

8...we consider parking pressure to be irrelevant - if people are parked illegally (commuter parking) it doesn't matter if there are 10 spaces or 110 available, anyhow availability fluctuates on a daily basis.

9...why focus on the spaces available ? The issue is commuter parking - why is no reference made to the number of business permit users who do this ?

11...seems to ignore the 'overriding purpose' to remove commuter parking stated in point 2 and also ignore the issue of inappropriate long stay parking that is highlighted in point 13.

We feel this issue has become an exercise in semantics and statistics; this is not what it should be about. It should simply be about stopping people commuter parking.

We do not have a problem with business permit users who comply with NCC's parking regulations."

Ms Rebecca Matthews asked the following question:

"A city wide review of the permit parking scheme was discussed before but not carried out due to a lack of resources. How will it be possible to undertake such a review in the current economic climate? Residents have been campaigning for seven long years. Please can we have a time frame for the intended review and the changes which will follow?"

The transportation and network manager said that it was expected that the outcome of the review of the permit parking scheme would be considered by the committee at its meeting on 24 May 2012. She pointed out that the scope of the review was set out on page 51 of the agenda (paragraph 5, report of the head of city development services, "On-street parking permit price review"). The principal planner (transport), Norwich City Council, said that the conclusion of the council's survey of Ashby Street was that spaces for permit users in the street were not routinely at capacity.

During discussion Councillor Bremner said that the parking situation would be ten times worse if the controlled parking zone was removed altogether. He assured members that Councillor Jeraj's suggestion of imposing a time-limit for some permit users would be considered as part of the review.

**RESOLVED** to:

- (1) agree that no action is appropriate in the short term;
- (2) note that, in another report on this agenda, the head of city development services is being asked to carry out a comprehensive review of the types of permits issued within controlled parking zones, their price, conditions of use and terms of issue, and report the findings to a future meeting;
- (3) ask the head of city development to advise the Ashby Street residents of this committee's decision.

## **6. CHAPELFIELD EAST – ALTERATIONS TO PARKING BAYS**

Ms Julie Hutt, Chapelfield Children's Day Nursery, asked the following question:

"Can you confirm if the pay and display conditions are to be applied to both, currently existing, loading bays, or just the one with existing motorcycle parking, as the second bay closest to nursery isn't shown on appendix 1? Could you clarify/confirm the usage of this loading bay?"

Is the existing nursery exemption of 15 minutes to remain for the existing loading bay and the new pay and display?"

The principal planner (transport) said that the proposed changes only applied to the loading bay furthest away from the nursery and confirmed there were no proposals to change the arrangements for the bay closest to the nursery. There would be an increase of parking spaces to replace the underused motor cycle parking. In

response to a supplementary question from Ms Hutt, the principal planner (transport) confirmed that the 15 minute exemption for users of the nursery would remain.

**RESOLVED** to ask the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory procedures to implement the changes to waiting and loading restrictions in Chapelfield East as advertised and shown on Plan No PL/TR/3329/722/14.

## **7. CONSTITUTION HILL SPEED REDUCING MEASURES**

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

- (1) to approve the installation of speed cushions on Constitution Hill;
- (2) ask the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory procedures to implement the changes to waiting restrictions on Constitution Hill as advertised and shown on Plan No 11 HD 032 0.

## **8. DUKE STREET CONTRA-FLOW CYCLE LANE**

Councillor Bearman spoke in support of the scheme which he considered had a lot to commend it to cyclists.

In response to a member's question, the principal technical officer, Norwich City Council, said that the contra-flow cycle lane was for southbound cyclists only and that northbound cyclists should use the northbound traffic lanes. The cycle lane was not two-way.

**RESOLVED** to approve the implementation of the contra-flow cycle lane on Duke Street as shown on plan number 10 HD 046 1/4.

## **9. TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS PROGRAMME FOR 2012-13**

The chair advised members that the county council's allocation from the countywide budget for improvements for schemes in the Norwich City Council's area was outside the remit of this committee.

Discussion ensued in which members noted that the allocation was more generous than the previous year's. The transportation and network manager answered questions. She advised members that citywide minor works budget was available to fund local schemes in the city, such as signage on non-U class roads. The budget allocation for the schemes was generous. Details of schemes were not usually reported to the committee, unless requested by the committee, but local members would be consulted. Members were also advised that bus shelters were the responsibility of district councils and that the city council would be working with its contractors to ensure that bus stops were in the right locations.

**RESOLVED** to ask Norfolk County Council's cabinet to allocate £215,000 funding to the following schemes:

1	Ipswich Road / Ipswich Grove local safety scheme	£35,000
2	Dereham Road / Nelson Street local safety scheme	£15,000
3	Drayton Road / Boundary Road local safety scheme	£20,000
4	NATS IP – BRT stops on Dereham Road & Newmarket Rd	£20,000
5	NATS IP – Cycle network implementation	£20,000
6	NATS IP – Koblenz Avenue congestion reduction	£20,000
7	NATS IP – Scheme design – to be agreed	£20,000
8	Bus Stop infrastructure	£25,000
9	Minor works including waiting restrictions	£20,000
10	Dropped kerbs	£20,000
	Total	£215,000

## **10. AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT AREA DECLARATION**

**RESOLVED**, having considered the report of the head of city development services, Norwich City Council, to note that the city council's cabinet approved the following approach at its meeting on 9 November 2011:

To:

- (1) declare an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) for the city centre area of Norwich as shown in appendix 1; Incorporating the existing St Augustine's, Castle, Grapes Hill and Riverside AQMAs; Including sites on King Street and Bull Close Road that would otherwise have needed to be declared as site specific AQMAs;
- (2) note that air quality at the existing Grapes Hill AQMA now betters limit values and in the absence of an area wide declaration could be revoked.

(Councillor Spratt left the meeting at this point.)

## **11. ON-STREET PARKING PERMIT PRICE REVIEW**

Councillor Carlo asked that the review would address the situation of student houses in multiple occupation and the allocations where there might be 4-5 cars parked outside. Councillor Bremner pointed out that this also applied to houses where there were large families or other shared accommodation.

The transportation and network manager said that the review would be an opportunity to look at the operation of the permit parking zones and was not about extending the zones to other areas.



**RESOLVED** to:

- (1) ask the head of city development services to make the necessary arrangements to increase permit prices from January 2012 as detailed in Appendix 1;
- (2) ask the head of city development services to carry out a comprehensive review of the types of permits issued within controlled parking zones, their price, conditions of use and terms of issue, and report the findings to a future meeting.

**12. PERFORMANCE MONITORING OF THE HIGHWAYS AGENCY AGREEMENT**

The transportation and network manager pointed out that more recent casualty figures had been received which showed that the trend had gone down. Councillor Scutter expressed concern that the number of people who had a slight injury had increased.

**RESOLVED** to receive and note the available performance results.

**13. MAJOR ROAD WORKS – REGULAR MONITORING**

The transportation and network manager presented the report and advised members that Finkelgate would be re-opening on 3 December 2011, not 26 November as stated in the report, and would be one-way only (including cyclists) for 6 months to allow the demolition of the property. The transportation and network manager and the principal technical officer then answered questions on the report.

Councillor Scutter referred to the Newmarket Road and Eaton Road scheme and asked why the side roads were closed for 5 weeks rather than one week. The principal technical officer said this was the shortest period of time that the contractors had required to complete the scheme.

In response to a question from Councillor Shaw, the transportation and network manager said that the city council would be liaising with Broadland District Council and BT over the road closure in Vulcan Road South.

**RESOLVED** to note the report.

CHAIR