

Norwich Highways Agency committee

10:00 to 11:40

21 March 2019

Present: **County Councillors:** **City Councillors:**
 Fisher (chair) (v)* Stutely (v)
 Vincent (v) Malik (v) (substitute for Councillor Stonard)
 Bills Carlo
 Jones (C) Peek

Apologies: City Councillor Stonard (vice chair) (v) and County Councillor Thomson

*(v) voting member

1. Public Questions/Petitions

Public questions -

Question 1 Mr Les Rowlands, Eaton Rise Residents' Association asked the following question:

“Given the general increase in traffic volume and the speed of HGVs throughout the day and night along Ipswich Road (A140 inside the city boundary) could the Norwich Highways Agency committee consider the installation of 'average speed cameras' to enforce the 30 MPH speed limit?

This is because HGVs have a tendency to speed up and exceed the speed limit when there is little or no other traffic on the road which creates considerable 'noise pollution'. This has become a particular problem along Ipswich Road in recent years during the night and very early in the morning because increasingly HGV logistics move around at night and the early hours to avoid traffic congestion. Ipswich Road (A140) is also a key transport artery for European night time freight traffic travelling to and from Felixstowe.

I have been very impressed by Norwich City Council's Vision for Norwich (Norwich 2040): *"Transport policies have important health consequences through their effects on air pollution, noise, injuries, climatic change, and their ability to create (or not) safe conditions for walking and cycling"*.

The siting of 'average speed cameras' would help reduce the speed of traffic and would enable the council to meet and comply with the WHO/European guidelines for night time noise (max 40 decibels).

I would urge you to seriously consider this option which would be a first-step towards the council's vision for Norwich 2040 to *'reduce pressure on our city environment and infrastructure...there will be huge changes to how people work, learn, live and travel'.*"

Councillor Fisher, chair, replied on behalf of the committee, as follows:

"Thank you for your question, I think we are entering an exciting time in the Greater Norwich region with the opportunities that the Transforming Cities fund will present in delivering the Norwich 2040 vision, in terms of changing the way people move around.

However this won't offer us an immediate solution to the issues that you have highlighted, such as the speed of HGV's at night time.

The installation of speed cameras is beyond the remit of this committee; they are provided and administered by the safety camera partnership, which has strict rules where they can be deployed. Nationally, average speed cameras can only be used to enforce speed limits where there is a proven safety record associated with vehicle speeds. No such safety record exists on Ipswich Road and therefore the safety camera partnership would be unable to consider a request for average speed cameras there."

Mr Rowlands confirmed that he did not have a supplementary question.

Question 2 - Mr Peter Ellington, Swansea Road, asked the following question:

"The statement of reason issued by the Norwich City Council for proposing permit parking in the Welsh Streets is published as follows:

"The proposals are considered necessary to enable the safe access of vehicles and the management of on-street parking

The proposal to make the Orders is therefore made because it appears to the City Council that it is expedient to do so in accordance with Sub-Sections 1(a, c and f) of Section 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act, 1984.

(a) for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising

(c) for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians)

(f) for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs"

We consider that the proposal to include certain streets and exclude others is undemocratic and is in contradiction to the above proposal. By excluding Swansea Road, Wellington Road, Caernarvon Road, Milford Road and sections of Earlham Road and Denbigh Road an enclave of free parking is created within an area or permit parking. We consider that the following are likely consequences arising from proposed action:

- (1) It will encourage people to drive around these streets looking for parking spaces, causing a risk to pedestrians (including children walking to the local school) as they are these drivers are not fully focused on their driving whilst looking for spaces.
- (2) It will cause parking congestion (limited or no spaces available for residents or parents dropping off at school), resulting in risks to pedestrian safety and occasions when residents of these streets have to park a considerable distance from their houses – for example, people working shifts are likely to have to walk a substantial distance to their cars if and when they cannot park near their house – late at night or early in the morning. This could put them in danger (for example, the air cabin crew walking to their car parked up to 1 mile away from their house to go to an early shift at 4.30 am).
- (3) By giving permit parking resident will be able to utilise the amenity of being able to park their vehicles near their house. This will improve the safety and practical aspects of living in the area.

These three points are consistent with the Order issued by Norwich City Council for permit parking to the Welsh Streets.

Further, we partook in the survey believing that the decision was going to be made as a whole. The survey did not state that it was street by street decision: it implied that it was all or nothing and that's how we interpreted it. It is undemocratic to exclude streets from the permit zone, when the canvass was unclear to how it would be interpreted.

Question: Is it possible to include Swansea Road in the permit parking zone - the request is justified by four factors (1) excluding the street is in contradiction to the Order (see above), (2) there is a large number of HMOs in the street that did not partake in the survey, these HMOs often have multiple cars taking up lots of spaces (3) the impact on residents of Swansea road of it becoming increasingly difficult to park, as a direct consequence of non-permit holders from surrounding street consuming available on street parking on Swansea Road, (4) apparently, of those houses that voted on Swansea Road, 50% voted in favour.

Failing the above: Should the decision be reconsidered following the potential detrimental impact of the excluded streets and that it was implied that the decision would be for all Welsh Streets? Subsequently, should the petition be held again, allowing the residents to reconsider their position, given that it is being implemented street by street and the detrimental nature of this process on residents.”

Councillor Fisher, chair, replied on behalf of the committee as follows:

“I am sure that the committee will want to consider all the points that you have made during their discussions of these proposal which are on today’s agenda.

However, for clarification, I would like to make it clear that the reason that are published in support of any traffic regulation order (TRO), such as the one that backs these proposals for permit parking, are limited to those prescribed in law and are there in support of the proposals as advertised. They are not there as justification for prejudging any decisions.

I also cannot accept that there was any suggestion in the consultation that it was an ‘all or nothing’ proposal. It clearly stated in the letter that the extent of any permit parking would be adjusted dependent upon the outcome of the consultation.

I acknowledge that Swansea Road does have a high proportion of transient households, but the turnout appears to me to have been both low and inconclusive. The decision on the extent of any permit parking does, however, rest with this committee and the recommendations in the report are there for guidance.

Again, I am sure that members of the committee will discuss this issue later on.”

By way of a supplementary question, Mr Ellington reiterated his concerns about the streets that were not included in the permit parking and the impact that this would have including concern about pedestrian safety and the safety of children walking or cycling to local schools. The principal planner (transport) (Norwich City Council) said that traffic calming and a 20mph speed limit in residential streets was being rolled out across the city through the Push the Pedalways programme. However, this area was one of the first in the city to get traffic calming. He pointed out that traffic calming was beyond the scope of this consultation on residential parking permits.

Question 3 - Ms Julie Dean, Wellington Road, asked the following question:

“I am a resident of Wellington Road and I would like to ask if my street can carry out its own survey to find out how residents feel about partial permit parking in the area?

My reasons are as follows:

- When the proposal was being discussed the residents believed that permit parking would be applied to either all the streets in the area or none of them.
- Leaving some streets without permit parking will result in those streets having an increase in traffic and major parking problems. Residents will have much more difficulty finding a parking space on their own street and will not be able to park on surrounding streets that require a permit.
- Wellington Road has a mix of residents – families with young children, elderly residents, shift workers and those with limited abilities. The current proposal

will jeopardise the safety of these residents and cause considerable inconvenience to many others.

Residents need a chance to reconsider the decision that has been made to provide permit parking on some streets and not others.”

Councillor Fisher, chair, replied on behalf of the committee.

“Thank-you for your question

I said in answer to the previous question that I was sure that members would want to discuss and consider the points raised and I have no doubt that they will also wish to discuss this issue. It is, of course, entirely at your discretion whether you undertake further survey work of your own but I would not wish to see a decision of this committee based on such as survey. Ultimately, the decision on whether to progress with a permit parking scheme rests with this committee.

I have already said that I was surprised that residents believed that the consultation was ‘all or nothing’ given that it specifically stated in the letter that every resident was sent that this was not the case, but as I think you realise, everyone is aware that there are impacts on adjacent streets when permit areas are implemented.”

Ms Dean asked for clarification whether residents could carry out their own survey. The chair said that there was nothing to stop residents conducting a survey, but depending on the outcome of the committee’s discussion later in the meeting, there might not be a need for residents to carry out their own survey.

Question 4 - Mr Shan Barclay, Caernarvon Road asked the following question:

“As a resident on Caernarvon Rd since 1990, I know that our parking situation is no worse now than it was 30 years ago. In view of this I see no need for instituting permit parking and in fact quite the contrary I think it would have a detrimental effect.

It would cost us money which could be better spent and would not solve parking problems for example at night. From 8am-6.30 pm we have no need at all. In view of this what is the rationale of Norwich City Council in trying to impose this on us?”

Councillor Fisher, chair, replied on behalf of the committee:

“I am sure that you are aware from having seen the report to this committee, and heard the questions from other residents that there are differing points of view about permit parking and the role of this committee is to try to account for those views but agree a scheme that has some coherence.

I have no doubt that the committee will have an extensive discussion about the extent of permit parking shortly, but I note that the recommendation in the report is not to include Caernarvon Road in the permit area, so I am a little unsure as to why you might think that it is being imposed on you?

With regards to the problems at night, these are usually a consequence of the number of vehicles owned by local residents rather than external factors, and I'm afraid that permit parking really does not resolve this issue. We do, however, promote the use of car clubs across the city and as each new car results in as many as 15 residents getting rid of a private car this does help to reduce this pressure."

Mr Barclay confirmed that he did not have a supplementary question but said that he appreciated that sometimes there was a need to regulate parking but that he hoped that responsible residents could self-regulate between themselves rather than have it imposed on them.

Question 5 – Ms Anne Haour, Church Lane, asked the following question:

"Can the committee please outline how the proposed changes to the outer ring road, and the responses to concerns raised in the public consultation, line up with the council's corporate priority for a safe, clean and low carbon city?"

Councillor Fisher, chair, replied on behalf of the committee.

"I thought that the report was fairly clear on this point and it does explain that the overall aim of the Transport for Norwich (TfN) strategy is to increase walking, cycling and the use of public transport

However, there is still a need to accommodate and manage general traffic (including Heavy Goods Vehicles [HGVs] accessing the city) as although we encourage the use of more sustainable modes, we cannot require it. Our strategy has therefore been to manage general traffic onto the main road network (and the outer ring road is very clearly a significant element of this), which is more suited to larger vehicles and higher traffic flows, to enable sustainable transport improvements elsewhere.

In addition, the scheme is designed to reduce queuing and congestion, and this is one of the major contributors to air pollution and the scheme on average benefits both pedestrians and public transport users. I believe that you will find all these issues have been covered in the report."

Ms Haour commented that she considered that the proposals did not encourage better behaviour from drivers and that there should be a more rounded approach to prioritise pedestrians, cyclists and users of public transport rather than cars. She considered that the matter of enforcement for driver negligence and speeding was a major issue. The principal planner (transport) confirmed that the objectives of the Transport for Norwich strategy placed public transport, walking and cycling at the top of the list over other modes of transport, but it was still necessary to ensure that traffic circulated around the city. The ring road was the right place for that traffic to be. By moving traffic off side roads and on to roads that could take it; the scheme provided the opportunity to improve pedestrian crossings and bus journey times.

(In addition to the questions above, three further questions were received from residents who were unable to attend. At the chair's discretion, the questions and a

response were circulated at the meeting and published on the website. The following question was taken at the meeting because Ms Tomlinson's circumstances had changed and she was able to attend.)

Question 2 - Ms Sarah Tomlinson, Earlham Road, to ask the following question:

"The Norwich City Communications Style Guide says in Section four: making sure our communications are understandable and accessible say that 'It's important to make sure we consider our audience before we start any communication. As a local authority, our audience is often very broad and made up of a diverse spectrum of people from very different backgrounds, varying education levels and includes those whose first language is not English. In the vast majority of case (with the possible exceptions of things like reports for a small, niche and specialised audience), we would want to make sure we use plain English to get our message across in the most clear and concise way possible. Our aim is to get our message across first time, without the reader having to come back with queries'.

With reference to the communications that were sent out as part of your consultation process, I do not believe the council's own guidelines were met. I am referring to the sentence "The council will adjust the extent of any proposed permit scheme dependant on the results of the consultation". If this followed the council's own communications guidelines, it should have clearly stated that the council would implement parking restrictions only in the streets that vote in favour of the proposal. I have spoken to various neighbours, residents, friends and many people who thought that it was an all or nothing vote, not street by street. The communications were simply not plain English as your policy states.

So if people did not understand what was proposed, are the recommendations valid? Should we be asked again with clear communications and with the council getting their message across 'without the reader having to come back with queries' as your policy states? Or, if there was misunderstanding, should the all or nothing total vote count?

Councillor Fisher, chair, apologised that the communications had been misunderstood and said that this would be reviewed, he then replied on behalf of the committee as follows:

"All information sent out as part of this consultation was reviewed by specialist communications officers and altered where necessary, to ensure that the information is clear. This is a requirement of all correspondence that the Council sends out in bulk and this particular phrase has been used in numerous consultations in the past and has never caused confusion before

Whilst in hindsight it might appear that the recommendation was on a street by street basis that was not necessarily going to be the case as changes to the extent of any permit parking area are considered in the light of responses received, so it would not have been true to suggest it in any correspondence."

By way of a supplementary question, Ms Tomlinson said that she worked in communications and that she had tested the council's consultation material against the Flesch reading ease readability formula and it had scored 47.5 which meant that it was difficult to read, taking into account plain English score was between 60 and 70, The Economist 55, and university graduates aim for 30. She therefore asked whether the consultation was still valid. The chair replied that he believed that the consultation was valid but he took on board what she was saying. This was the first time that such confusion had occurred over a consultation on residents' parking permits.

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillors Carlo and Malik declared an other interest in item 4 'Welsh Streets' Area Permit Parking Consultation" in that they lived in the consultation area and were Nelson ward councillors. They also both said that they did own a car and did not have a predetermined view.

3. Minutes

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 20 December 2018.

4. 'Welsh Streets' Area Permit Parking Consultation

(Councillors Carlo and Malik had declared an interest in this item.)

(Copies of further responses to the consultation and comments on the committee report were circulated at the meeting and, subsequent to the meeting, published on the council's website with the documents for the meeting.)

The principal planner (transport) introduced the report and referred to the further responses circulated at the meeting and three emails that he had received from residents reiterating comments made during the consultation, and said that these did not affect his recommendations as set out in the report. He confirmed that the reference to Avenue Road in recommendation (2) (c) should be replaced with The Avenues. He then answered a member's questions confirming that the existing parking bays in the Avenues and waiting restrictions on Earham Road and explaining the rationale for including the section of Earham Road (as shown on appendix 1). The scheme provided an opportunity to address verge parking in The Avenues and provide some short stay parking there for visitors to the park.

The chair referred to the report and said that he was surprised that none of the schools operated a travel plan which he considered was a necessity, particularly as one of the schools employed 74 people. The Transport for Norwich manager explained that there was an expectation for all schools to have a travel plan and some schools' plans needed to be updated. Schools had access to the county council's online software which had an inbuilt award system as an incentive schools to compete against each other. Travel plans made a big impact on how children travelled to school.

Councillors Carlo and Malik, as ward councillors for Nelson ward, commented that parking issues made up the greatest part of their case work and that it was important to

get the right scheme for the area. They recognised that there were residents in the area who wanted permit parking and had waited a long time for it such as the residents in College Road, but that there had been some confusion in the area that the consultation was on a whole scheme rather than on a street by street basis. Their concern was that following the publication of the scheme, some residents from the streets not included in the scheme had changed their minds. There was a lot of pressure on parking in the area and there was concern that the streets without parking permits would be affected by non-resident parking once the scheme was introduced. A significant number of houses in Earlham Road and the area were houses in multiple-occupation (HMOs) and the residents had several cars. It was important that problems were not stored up for the future and that residents in these streets (Caernarvon Street, Swansea Road, Havelock Road and Wellington Road, and parts of Earlham Road) had an opportunity to reconsider permit parking.

Discussion ensued on the feasibility of re-running part of the consultation. The chair said that this was an exceptional case as it was not the practice to re-consult. He pointed out that the responses from residents in Caernarvon Road had been 47 respondents against and 4 in support of permit parking. The principal planner transportation said that the recommendation in the report was a balanced recommendation. There was a clear precedent for supporting permit parking in the streets near the city and in earlier tranches residents of College Road and Recreation Road had not supported permit parking. As permit parking expanded to neighbouring streets, other residents wanted their streets to be included because of parking problems. Councillor Carlo said that the residents of College Road, Recreation Road and The Avenues had made their views clear and that they wanted permit parking, which should be implemented without delay. Officers advised the committee that a re-consultation of the remaining streets could not take place until the end of the pre-election period and until after the local elections. There would need to be some discussion with local members about changes to some of the waiting restrictions so it was likely that the consultation would commence at the end of May or early June 2019. The scheme could be implemented as recommended and in addition, there could be a re-consultation of the residents living in the streets that were excluded from the proposed scheme.

The chair moved and Councillor Stutely seconded the revised recommendation which was circulated at the meeting.

In reply to a question, the principal planner transportation confirmed that the width of The Avenues was sufficient to allow on-street parking with room for vehicles and cyclists to pass them, but it would sometimes be necessary to give way in order to pass oncoming vehicles and cycles

A member sought confirmation that there was provision for minibuses and taxis used to transport children to Parkside School. The principal planner transportation referred members to Appendix 2 of the report and explained that parking bays that following the initial consultation, 4 hour parking bays were provided for the school. He also pointed out that additional parking bays had been provided for the school in Recreation Road because the swimming park and sporting facilities were used out of school hours.

RESOLVED, unanimously, with all 4 voting members voting in favour (Councillors Fisher, Vincent, Stutely and Malik) to:

- (1) note the responses to the permit parking consultation;
- (2) agree to implement a Monday-Saturday, 8:00am to 6:30pm (8:00 to 18:30) controlled parking zone (CPZ) as shown on the plans (nos. PL/TR/3584/440/A) as set out in Appendix 1 in:
 - (a) Cardiff Road, Havelock Road and part of Earlham Road and Denbigh Road;
 - (b) College Road and Recreation Road from the junction of Avenue Road to the junction with Earlham Road;
 - (c) The Avenues between Recreation Road and Christchurch Road;
- (3) install extended yellow lines at the junctions of other streets in the area including Caernarvon Road, Denbigh Road (part), Earlham Road, Swansea Road and Wellington Road also shown on the plan no. PL/TR/3584/440/A in Appendix 1;
- (4) ask the head of city development services to complete the statutory processes to implement these proposals.
- (5) ask the head of city development services to re-consult residents in the remaining streets in the light of (2) to (4) above to give them the opportunity to reconsider whether they wish to have permit parking or not;
- (6) commence the statutory processes to introduce short stay parking provision in the vicinity of The Avenues School and Peapod Nursery, and the businesses on Cardiff Road and Havelock Road in accordance with details to be agreed with local ward members;
- (7) note that the results of this additional consultation will be considered at a future meeting.

5. Transport For Norwich – A140 Mile End Road and Colman Road Improvements to Relieve Congestion at the Daniels Road Roundabout

The chair introduced the report.

County Councillor Watkins, Eaton Division, addressed the committee on behalf of local residents and suggested that the proposal to implement the proposals as set out in the report was premature and would not alleviate the problems at the Daniels roundabout. He considered that the announcement of the Transforming Cities funding would provide the opportunity for a more comprehensive solution. His concerns about the scheme included: that the parking bays on Colman Road would defeat the object of improving traffic flow on the ring road; that the changed priorities on South Park Avenue and Unthank Road would inconvenience local drivers; that queues of traffic at the junction at Colman Road and South Park Avenue would be detrimental to air quality near the three schools; that the proposed staggered pedestrian crossings were not ideal near schools

with a crossing patrol officer; and that residents of Caroline Court had raised concerns about cars parking on the existing yellow lines which were not enforced.

The principal planner (transport) said that this Transport for Norwich scheme was to improve the efficiency of the major networks and make the city more attractive for walking and cycling. The ring road was a major route for vehicles which did mean that it took priority over side streets. He explained that it was necessary to introduce staggered pedestrian crossings on the ring road to prevent congestion. The Transport for Norwich manager explained the aim of the scheme was to prevent traffic backing up on the ring road. The bus companies were conscious of the impact of the proposals which would make overall journey times more consistent, which is what their passengers wanted. The Transforming Cities funding would provide an opportunity to tackle traffic congestion all over the Greater Norwich area. The engineer network analysis, Norfolk County Council, advised members that there had been thorough analysis of the impact of this scheme and that indicative pollution analysis from deceleration would be reduced by up to 10 per cent in the mornings and between 15:00 and 19:00, up to 7.5 to 8 per cent.

Discussion ensued in which the chair spoke in favour of progressing with the scheme. Councillor Stutely said that he supported the scheme which would help alleviate traffic congestion but that he had concerns about the safety of school children using the staggered pedestrian crossings and how this would be managed by just one school crossing patrol officer. He therefore moved, seconded by the chair, that additional recommendations to assess the impact of the scheme on the school crossing patrol and look into the feasibility of additional resources if needed. Another member said that he considered that another school crossing patrol officer would be required at this location. Councillor Stutely said that crossing patrols had an educational importance for children as well as guiding children across the road.

A member explained her reasons for opposing this scheme which she said did not remove HGVs from the ring road, pointing out that Colman Road was a residential road and that she had concerns about the safety of school children at the Colman Road and South Park Avenue junction.

In reply to a question about turning right from Waldeck Road, as set out in Appendix 1, plan 3, the principal transport planner confirmed that, locally, there were similar crossings near to junctions that functioned well.

RESOLVED, unanimously, with all 4 voting members voting in favour (Councillors Fisher, Vincent, Stutely and Malik) to:

- (1) agree to implement the proposals on Colman Road, Mile End Road, South Park Avenue and Unthank Road as shown on the plan numbered 1-4 attached as Appendix ;
- (2) ask the head of city development to complete the necessary statutory process to implement the above proposals with the exception of those items in (3) below as detailed in the report;

- (3) ask the head of city development to advertise the following minor amendments to the previously proposed traffic regulation orders, as shown on the plans in Appendix 1:
 - (a) the removal of the previously advertised short stay spaces on Unthank Road and their replacement with double yellow lines;
 - (b) changes to the proposed arrangement of the bus stop and parking spaces on the westbound section of Colman Road;
- (4) agree to delegate any objections to these minor changes to the head of city development services in discussion with the chair and vice-chair;
- (5) note that the proposed scheme will have an impact on the existing school crossing patrol operating at the Colman Road / South Park Avenue junction;
- (6) ask the Transport for Norwich manager to explore further the impact on the school crossing patrol and request that additional resources are provided if needed.

6. Transport for Norwich – Bank Plain and London Street

The chair introduced the report.

The principal planner (transport) introduced the report and said that since the report had been written the Department for Transport (DfT) had confirmed that the £6.1 million had been awarded to Greater Norwich for schemes across the policy area.

During discussion, the principal planner (transport) and the transportation and network manager (Norwich City Council) answered members' questions. In reply to a member's concern that drivers abused the access from via Bedford Street/ St Andrews Hill and Opie Street to Castle Meadow, members were advised that it would be difficult to change the current arrangements because of an existing car club bay and parking bay but as these were proposed to be removed as part of the scheme, it could be considered in the future, but would be a significant change and was outside the scope of the current proposals. The committee noted that it could be looked at in the future but was not part of the current proposal. Members also sought confirmation that the proposals set out in this report estimated at £906,000 would be funded from the Transforming Cities funding. The committee also noted that tenders would be invited for the shared bike scheme in the summer.

RESOLVED, unanimously, with all 4 voting members voting in favour (Councillors Fisher, Vincent, Stutely and Malik) to:

- (1) agree to consult on proposals, shown on the plans contained in Appendix 1, that will:
 - (a) Improve the section of London Street at its junction with Opie Street;
 - (b) Improve the area at the eastern end of London Street, at its junction with Bank Plain;

- (c) Improve Bank Plain by widening pavements and re-arranging the on street parking and loading facilities;
 - (d) Upgrade Bank Street to create a more pedestrian friendly environment;
- (2) ask the head of city development services to commence the statutory procedures associated with the following traffic regulation orders and notices associated with these proposals, which is shown on the plan contained in Appendix ;
- (a) Install new loading facilities in Bank Plain on the western side;
 - (b) Create an extended blue badge parking area and further loading facilities on the east side;
 - (c) Replace the loading bay on Redwell Street with Car Club spaces;
 - (d) Widen the light controlled pedestrian crossing on Bank Plain, and include crossing facilities for cyclists;
 - (e) Introduce a restricted zone in Bank Street, maintaining the existing one-way arrangements for motorised vehicles but allowing contraflow cycling and allowing loading only in the street;
 - (f) Remove the existing designated bays (including the car club bay, pay and display bays, blue badge spaces and loading bays) in Bank Street and Opie Street and the existing bus and coach stops on Bank Plain;
- (3) note that the responses to the consultation and any objections to the statutory notices will be considered at a future committee.

7. Permit Issuing Software Upgrade and the Introduction of Virtual Parking Permits

The chair introduced the report and said that he supported the introduction of virtual parking permits that was presented with the new software.

A member referred to the introduction of online road tax renewal and said that there was a public perception that as tax discs were no longer visible on cars there was no enforcement, and suggested that there could be a similar issue with virtual parking permits. The principal planner transportation said that he did not consider this would be an issue. There was regular enforcement of the permit parking schemes

RESOLVED, unanimously, with all 4 voting members voting in favour (Councillors Fisher, Vincent, Stutely and Malik) to:

- (1) note that the software that is used to issue parking permits needs to be replaced;
- (2) agree to the rollout of 'virtual' permits (where appropriate) once the new system is in place;
- (3) authorise the head of city development to make the necessary changes to the permit parking terms and conditions to reflect the move to virtual permits.

8. Committee Schedule 2019-20

RESOLVED, to agree, subject to approval at the city council's annual council, the schedule of meetings of the Norwich Highways Agency committee for the civic year 2019-20, with all meetings to be at 10:00 and held at City Hall, as follows:

Thursday, 20 June 2019

Thursday, 19 September 2019

Thursday, 19 December 2019

Thursday, 19 March 2020

CHAIR