



**NORWICH HIGHWAYS AGENCY COMMITTEE**

**10.00am to 10.45am**

**26 January 2012**

Present:           **County Councillors:**           **City Councillors:**  
                          Adams (chair) (V)                   Bremner (vice-chair) (V)  
                          Spratt (V) (substitute for        Gayton (V)  
                          Councillor Plant)                Carlo  
                          Bearman                            Grenville  
                          Scutter                             Jeraj (substitute for Councillor Altman)  
                          Shaw

\*(V) – Voting Member

Apologies:        County Councillor Plant and City Councillor Altman

**1. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

**Dereham Road - BRT**

Mr Patrick Hewins, local resident, asked the following question:

"In the current consultation on right turns from Dereham Road to Old Palace/Heigham Road, the cost of the option allowing right turns is given as £300K to £400K. Does this include the possible expense of moving possible utilities (under junction extension)? Could the council survey the small area involved to check for utilities and communicate the results and probable expense of dealing with them, and at least giving local councillors this information as soon as possible, and well before the March meeting of Norwich Highways Agency committee (NHAC)? This would clarify the financial aspect of this.

The cost of the option banning right turns is given as £350K in the minutes of the NHAC meeting of 24 September 2011. In the current consultation document, this same cost is given as £300K. What is the reason for this reduction?

Residents would like to know the answer to this question well before the March meeting of the NHAC."

The highways major projects manager, Norfolk County Council, replied on behalf of the committee and confirmed that the utility companies had been consulted and that

two utility companies would require diversions to underground services if option 3 (the retention of the right hand turn from Dereham Road into Heigham Road and Old Palace Road) was chosen as the preferred scheme following the public consultation. Preliminary estimates had been received that indicated a budget cost of £50,000 for diversion to underground plant.

The highways major projects manager explained that the costs quoted in the report to committee (January 2011 and September 2011) were indicative estimates for similar schemes carried out elsewhere and at this stage a detailed breakdown of costs was not available. However in respect of option 2 (the banning of the right hand turn from Dereham Road into Heigham Road and Old Palace Road), following detailed cost estimates from the contractor, the estimated cost for option 2 had been revised and was now £300,000. Should option 3 be chosen as the preferred scheme following public consultation, the additional cost would be funded through a contribution from the traffic signal upgrade programme. These costs included works and fees so were for the whole scheme costs. These costs would be reviewed as with any other highway scheme and refined as more detailed work was carried out. A briefing note could be prepared for members of the committee.

In response to a supplementary question from Mr Hewins, the highways major projects manager explained that the higher relative cost of option 3 was due in part to an allowance for diversions to underground services. The estimated budget for option 2 (banning right hand turns) was £300,000 and for option 3 (retaining right hand turns) was £400,000.

### **CNS school - highways improvements**

Councillor Lubbock, ward councillor for Eaton Ward, asked the following question:

“I recently attended a meeting at CNS school, Eaton Road, where 1700 pupils now attend.

It was a meeting to discuss issues which affect those neighbours who live close to the school and not surprisingly parking and travel to school were the main issues. So although there are no formal Travel to School meetings these are continuing in another guise. The school has a good road safety record and they want to keep it that way.

There were 3 requests for improvements immediately outside the school which I said I would formally bring to your attention to see whether progress could be made on any or all of them.

They were:

- (1) School signs painted on the carriageway to alert drivers to the school.
- (2) 20 mph signs for a stretch of road outside the school like the arrangement with primary schools.
- (3) A cycle track along Eaton Road (North side) taking a small amount of the wide grass verge alongside the path.”

Councillor Lubbock also referred to a letter of support for these requests received from the school's student/parent committee and an email from a year 10 student.

The transportation and network manager, Norwich City Council, replied on behalf of the committee. Eaton Road was on a local cycle connection route and it would be feasible, if budget was not an option, to widen the footpath to provide a cycle track subject to consultation with local residents. As this was on the cycle network consideration could be given to prioritise this as a scheme as and when funding became available. In relation to the request for school signs to be painted on the highway, the cost for each sign was around £400 to £500 and involved a complicated stencil. An example of a sign was available in Silver Road but the reason that these were not rolled out as a matter of course was because of the on-going maintenance costs. Members were advised that government guidance on 20mph in residential areas was still awaited. The transportation and networks manager would respond to the correspondence from the school and would arrange to speak to the year 10 student and his fellow students about the issues.

Councillor Lubbock said that young cyclists, such as the year 10 student, should be encouraged and asked what an estimated cost would be for widening the footpath to make it safer to allow cyclists to use it. The transportation and networks manager said that she estimated that it would cost around £75,000 to £100,000.

## **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Scutter declared an interest in the request from the CNS school's parent and student committee, item 1 above, CNS highways improvements, as a member of the parent and student committee.

Councillor Bearman declared an interest in item 6, Reprocurement of ETD Highways service, because he had served on the procurement panel.

## **3. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2011 subject to item 1, petition, resolution, inserting a fourth resolution as follows:

- (4) acknowledge that a traffic management scheme is needed in Mount Pleasant and that this will be implemented as and when finances are available and as assessed against other schemes in order of priority.

## **4. REVIEW OF ROAD CLOSURES ON FOOTBALL MATCH DAYS**

The transportation and network manager said that since the publication of the report the outcome of the consultation had resulted in 80% of residents in favour and 20% opposed to road closures. She also pointed out that there were ongoing concerns that had been raised from the owner of a traffic management company and season ticket holder about the legal basis of the closures and the methods used for closing the roads. The practical aspects of the road closures were proving to effectively manage crowds and minimise the disruption to vehicles.

Councillor Bremner spoke in support of the proposal and said that the pilot scheme had been a success.

**RESOLVED** to ask the head of city development services to arrange for the necessary statutory processes involved in making the experimental traffic regulation order associated with the road closures around Norwich City Football Club's football ground (Carrow Road) on match days permanent.

## **5. PATTESON ROAD: CAR CLUB BAY**

Mr Rex Warner, Commonwheels, spoke in support of the proposal as part of his company's vision for extending its membership and services across the city.

During discussion the transport and network manager replied to a question regarding the strategic approach to the development of car club bays in the city and said that committee approval was required if objections from members of the public were received.

**RESOLVED** to:

- (1) note the continued demand for the car club and welcomes the extension of the car club into the north city;
- (2) approve the implementation of a single car club parking space for Patteson Road, (western end near to its junction with Aylsham Road; replacing an existing single permit parking bay (as shown on plan number PL/TR/3329/722/19b (detailed in plans in Appendix 2));
- (3) ask the head of city development services to complete the necessary statutory procedures and implement the car club space described in this report as part of city wide planned growth of the car club.

## **6. RE-PROCUREMENT OF ETD HIGHWAYS SERVICE**

(Councillor Bearman had declared an interest in this item and took no part in the discussion.)

The highways major projects manager said that county and city council officers were working together on the proposed re-procurement of the county's ETD highways service and that there would be further reports to the committee as work progressed.

Councillor Spratt referred to paragraph 1.3 of the report and pointed out that he considered potential collaboration with Suffolk County Council, to establish a joint procurement team, would be beneficial to both Norfolk County Council and Norwich City Council.

**RESOLVED** having noted the report of the director of environment, transportation and development, Norfolk County Council, to note the report and that the recommendations will be considered by the county council's cabinet in March 2012.

## **7. CIVIL PARKING ENFORCEMENT**

(Copies of the Norfolk parking enforcement guidance manual, referred to in paragraph 9 of the report, were circulated at the meeting.)

**RESOLVED**, having considered the report of the head of city development services, to adopt the Norwich City Council civil enforcement policy, January 2012.

## **8. PERFORMANCE MONITORING OF THE HIGHWAYS AGENCY AGREEMENT**

During discussion, Councillor Jeraj asked whether there was cause for concern because the reduction in retail footfall was not reflected in a corresponding reduction in pedestrian casualties. The head of city development services said that it was difficult to detect trends with low numbers and that the longer term data indicated that there was no increase or cause for concern. Further discussion could be continued outside the meeting. It was suggested that text explaining the graphs would be useful and it was noted that details of trends over the year were included in the annual performance monitoring report, with benchmarking against other similar cities.

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

## **9. MAJOR ROAD WORKS – REGULAR MONITORING**

**RESOLVED**, having considered the report of the head of city development services, to note the report.

CHAIR