

**Norwich Highways Agency committee**

**10:00 to 11:30**

**20 September 2018**

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

Apologies: County Councillors Vincent and Thomson

\*(v) voting member

**1. Public Questions/Petitions**

**Public question -**

**Question 1 - 20 mph proposals for Eaton Rise and speed enforcement**

Mr Les Rowlands, Eaton ward resident, asked the following question:

“While I fully support the proposal for a 20mph zone for Eaton Rise I wonder if consideration could also be given to creating a series of "pinch points" on the service road which runs along Ipswich Road from Constable Road to Welsford Road. This is because the service road is often used as a "rat run" by early morning traffic running into the city avoiding the main road to connect to Eaton Road and CNS school. Residents' pets have been run over by fast moving cars in the past and it is only a matter of time before something more serious occurs.”

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

“I am pleased to see that you support the 20mph proposals for Eaton Rise.

This committee has agreed a policy for the implementation of 20mph restrictions that applies across the city with the aim of maximising the number of streets that can benefit from this lower limit, whilst still being affordable. Traffic calming features on our roads are expensive to install and a major maintenance liability. . Consequently, the policy is that such measures are only proposed in areas where the existing average speeds are over 26mph.

The proposals before us today are consistent with the policy agreed by this committee on implementing 20mph restrictions and the use of traffic calming. The committee will be considering these proposals later this morning

Although speed monitoring has not recently been conducted on this section of the Ipswich Road service road, similar comparable roads do have speeds that are on average less than 26mph. It is therefore highly unlikely that average speeds at this location are over 26mph. We would not, therefore, look to provide “pinch points” or any other physical measures such as road humps for that reason.

However, I understand that the proposal is to install 20mph repeater signs and 20mph white painted roundels on the carriageway to inform drivers of the restriction in this area.”

Mr Rowlands asked as a supplementary question:

“What thought has been given to enforcement of the new 20 MPH speed limits in the city generally, for example, community speed checks with the police with local authority support? We’re aware of the latest ANPR technology which can also detect speed.”

The principal transportation planner, Norwich City Council, replied that enforcing speed limits was a responsibility of the police. Norfolk Constabulary supported 20mph speed restrictions which were self-enforcing and did not rely on hands-on enforcement to encourage compliance. The city council was supportive of community speed watch and would like to see these evolve in partnership with Norfolk Constabulary. He said that he was aware that Eaton Village Residents Association was considering this activity, which would help to improve drivers’ awareness of the speed restrictions. At the moment, the council was not considering enforcing 20mph speed limits with camera technology. Speed cameras were installed in areas where there was evidence of a road safety issue and vehicle speed was considered a contributing factor.

### **Local members’ questions:**

#### **Question 2 – Eaton**

Councillor Ackroyd, Eaton Ward councillor, asked the following question:

“Recent traffic works in Eaton caused residents living there to experience the most horrendous summer of delays and disruption.

Despite assurances that a full implementation plan would be carried out by Transport for Norwich (TfN) before works began, the local community had to live through many foreseeable situations such as:

- Traffic chaos on the first day with apparently no traffic management in place for the temporary lights until requested by councillors.
- Inaccurate knowledge of the area e.g. that Barclays Bank, and Eaton Hill housing exist despite the latter being passed at planning a few years

ago. The latter resulting in residents having no vehicular access to and from their houses until requested by councillors.

- Failure to notify residents in Eaton Street of extremely noisy overnight work being carried out.
- Inaccurate and poor signage e.g. an overnight road closure sign - 7am to 7pm - in Church Lane outside Waitrose despite this being the only vehicular access for approx. 1500 houses. Investigation revealed that the sign should have read that there would be access.

Does the chair agree that TfN could have done better, and what measures does he propose to ensure that this situation does not arise again?"

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

"We're aware that work in Eaton over the summer has been disruptive and frustrating for residents and businesses. We made every effort to address this by keeping residents and businesses informed and adapted traffic management and the delivery of works based on feedback wherever possible. Public information notices and traffic management plans were distributed to more 2,000 properties in the wider area, as well as to the local media. There was also regular dialogue between scheme engineers and councillors, as you have identified, throughout the scheme.

The first few days of works were particularly disruptive due to the temporary traffic management arrangements. Measures were immediately put in place that significantly improved traffic flows. This included restrictions to access to Barclays Bank, amending traffic signals and lane closures and turning off the traffic signals on the Cringleford bridge. It is not correct to say there was no traffic management in place; it was in place throughout.

We were fully aware of the residents at Eaton Hill. The design team visited them prior to the start of works to agree access arrangements. Amendments to traffic management associated with Barclays Bank were introduced to stop vehicles blocking Church Lane, brought about partly by poor driver behaviour.

With regards to the noisier work related to resurfacing, local residents and businesses directly adjacent to the surfacing works received a copy of the public information notice that described the works.

We did experience issues with some of the signage erected during the project being ambiguous and agree that this could have been better. I, personally, apologise for that. Based on feedback from on-site supervisory staff, residents and councillors, changes to the signage were made quickly.

As is standard practice, post project reviews (PPR) form part of the project delivery for all schemes delivered by Transport for Norwich and Eaton is no exception. So it will be discussed. This will include the project delivery team and the contractors and will include all feedback received with a view to ensure that lessons learned are identified and applied to future schemes."

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Ackroyd commented that businesses in Eaton had reported loss of business by as much as 15 per cent during the period of the works. She asked the chair for assurance that greater care was taken during the implementation of schemes in future so that businesses could operate normally. The chair confirmed that this would “absolutely” be the case. He regretted that businesses had suffered but pointed out that the situation in Eaton was not unique, as some disruption during implementation of traffic improvement schemes was inevitable.

### **Question 3- Unthank Road – 20mph**

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

“The Liberal Democrat councillors for Eaton surveyed 220 residents of Unthank Road to find out their views on a 20 mph limit. This was from Christchurch to the Newmarket Road junctions. There was overwhelming support for a lower speed limit in line with the other roads in Eaton Ward. From the 40 responses it was 2 to 1 in favour of a 20 mph limit.

The reasons the residents want lower speeds for all road users include:

- Difficulty in crossing the Unthank Road for children accessing the Colman Road schools and CNS without a crossing and often between parked cars as they queue towards the Ring Road traffic lights;
- To achieve consistency of speed limits with other side roads which will be 20 mph and consistency with Unthank Road further towards the city which is 20;
- Unthank Road is a residential road with many driveways onto it and side turnings, making it difficult to join fast moving traffic;
- Unthank Road is used by many pedestrians and cyclists;
- If 20mph speed limits are not introduced along with other roads, drivers will see the road as an alternative to Newmarket Road and this will increase the volume of traffic using it.

Please will you consider including all or part of Unthank Road in the 20 mph zone for Eaton? If this is not possible can the officers say when it is likely to happen? In the meantime could a flashing sign be deployed to help reduce speeds on this road?”

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

“The policy for the implementation of 20mph restrictions that applies across the city aims to maximise the number of streets that can benefit from this lower limit, but must still be affordable. The policy suggests that we should aim for 20mph to be the default speed on ‘C’ and ‘U’ class roads.

The extent of the 20mph speed restriction in this scheme was carefully chosen with reference to this policy. Unthank Road between the roundabout near the Catholic Cathedral and Newmarket Road is a “C” class road. However, the recorded average speed of vehicles near Judges Walk was 29.6mph. It would therefore require extensive physical traffic calming to bring the speed of traffic down to acceptable levels. This would require considerable investment which we do not have and cannot be justified as part of a cycle scheme.

Further speed surveys have been carried to assess the situation elsewhere on Unthank Road. These show an average speed of 26mph near Beechbank (inside the outer ring road) and an average speed of 28mph near Upton Road (outside the outer ring road). Such speeds are consistent with the need for physical traffic calming and the substantial investment this would require.

I note your suggestion about providing a permanent flashing sign on Unthank Road to enforce the existing 30mph speed limit. However there are no funds for this and it would not be a justified use of Cycle Ambition Grant funding.”

As a supplementary question, Councillor Lubbock commented that consistent application of 20 mph speed limits was proven to be more effective and asked that the council reviewed the current policy to remove the need for traffic calming in areas where the speed limit was over 25 mph. The chair said that a review of the 20mph policy was a decision for all members of the city council. The committee had to consider schemes and make decisions made in accordance with the council’s current policy.

### **Petition for a New Zebra Crossing over Unthank Road between Neville Street and Grosvenor Road and supporting 20mph speed limit**

Councillor Raby, Town Close ward councillor, introduced the petition of 124 signatures collected from residents living at the top end of Unthank Road and referred to three large car free developments in the area which would increase the number of pedestrians using the area. He then presented the following petition:

“Unthank Road is an important pedestrian and cycling route but the section of road serving the area between Grosvenor Road and Clarendon Road is difficult to cross at all times of the day due to high traffic volumes.

We the undersigned, call on the Norwich Highways Agency committee to support the provision of a new zebra crossing along Unthank Road between Grosvenor Road and Clarendon Road, with a 20mph speed limit either side of the new crossing.”

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

“I am sure that Councillor Raby is aware that there are a large number of places around the city that would benefit from pedestrian crossings, and when these are identified officers undertake surveys to prioritise the installation of new crossings in those locations where the need is greatest.

This location has already been identified as a potential location and it was surveyed in 2014. However, there are several other locations which have greater priority than here, and unfortunately, we have not been in a position for a number of years to provide any new pedestrian crossings, unless these have been provided as part of a wider scheme for which we have been able to obtain external funding.

Councillor Raby will also be aware that this committee is supporting the extension of 20mph zones across the city and there is a report to the committee

today on this very subject. Again this is dependent on obtaining funding and currently we have no proposals for the city end of Unthank Road.”

## **2. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

## **3. Minutes**

**RESOLVED** to agree the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 7 June 2018.

## **4. Transport for Norwich – 20mph Areas Associated with the Blue and Yellow pedalways – Consultation Results**

The principal transportation planner introduced the report and said that further consultation responses received before the closing date of the consultation were set out in a supplementary appendix to the report and circulated at the meeting. The majority of the comments had been addressed in the committee report. In relation to a request for variable speed limits, he explained that these were confusing to motorists but were suitable for short periods, for instance, where there was a school on a busy road. Members were advised that a petition had been received from residents of Theobold Road, comprising 77 signatures and objecting to the proposed waiting restrictions. He referred members to the revised plans on page 50 of the agenda papers and said that yellow lines had been reduced following a review. There were some primary locations where drivers should not park in accordance with the Highways Act.

At the chair’s discretion, a resident spoke in support of the Theobold Road petition, and said that residents were concerned about the removal of yellow lines and the impact that this would have on parking. Residents considered that: the proposals were flawed: there had been very little consultation; and, no further consultation on the amended plans. The introduction of yellow lines would exacerbate parking near the converted flats. The proposed yellow lines had been at the request of the bus company. The bus companies used to use mini-buses and now only operated one bus an hour. The roundabout was confusing to drivers. Residents were concerned that Sandy Lane was becoming a rat-run. They would like the bus stop to be moved to the other side of Mansfield Lane. The principal transportation planner confirmed that the reason for the yellow lines was because the bus company reported access issues in Theobold Road and had reduced the frequency of services because of this. Officers had consulted the bus company on the revised plans and had received confirmation that the proposal, in its reduced form, was acceptable.

Councillor Lubbock addressed the committee. The local members for Eaton and the residents’ association welcomed the proposals to increase 20mph areas in Eaton and thanked officers for the experimental order to trial 20mph without physical traffic calming, but asked that instead of 6 months, the experiment was extended to a year. This would enable local members and the residents’ association time to campaign and promote the scheme and reduce speed levels. The principal transportation planner explained that usually signed only schemes were implemented where the current speed limit was less than 25mph. The experimental order could be made for 18 months. The

speed limits would be assessed to see if a reduction to 20mph was achieved, and it would be simply a case of extending the period before an assessment was made. A member suggested that the speed limits could be checked at 6 months and then the speed limit could be made permanent earlier. The principal transportation planner said that the analysis would be made later if the experimental period was extended rather than doing the work twice.

During discussion members commented that Community Speed Watch was for areas where the speed limit was over 30mph, rather than 20mph as proposed, and that the residents' association would need to pursue this. A member said that he believed that restricting Community Speed Watch to areas over 30mph was a policy of Norfolk Constabulary, not a national one, and the position should be clarified with the Constabulary or the Norfolk Police and Crime Commissioner.

Councillor Stutely, Town Close ward councillor, said that residents of Trafford Road welcomed the speed restrictions and asked whether speed checks had been conducted to compare with outcomes in the future. The principal transportation planner said that speed checks had not been conducted but this could be arranged.

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, with all 4 voting members voting in favour, to:

- (1) approve installation of the 20mph scheme for the northern and southern areas and associated amended traffic calming and waiting restrictions including:
  - (a) installation of speed cushions on Constitution Hill;
  - (b) the retention of the two signalised pedestrian crossings on Woodcock Road and the amended traffic calming comprising of speed cushions, needing further advertising as below.
  - (c) highway improvement of widening a section of footpath outside St Andrew Churchyard on Church Lane as shown on plan No.CCAG2/21/25;
  - (d) installation of sinusoidal humps on Eaton Road;
  - (e) installation of a mini roundabout, speed cushions, reduced double yellow lines and bus stop clearways on Coleburn Road, Sandy Lane and Theobald Road;
  - (f) installation of a pedestrian refuge and speed cushions on South Park Avenue;
- (2) ask the head of city development services to carry out the statutory legal procedures to:
  - (a) finalise the speed restriction orders for the northern and southern areas as outlined on plans CCAG2/21/05 and 06, excluding the area as shown on plan No. CCAG2/21/06/A
  - (b) finalise the traffic regulation order for amended double yellow lines in Astell Road, Coleburn Road, Sandy Lane and Thobald Road as shown on plan No.CCAG2/21/23, and

- (c) finalise the traffic regulation order for changing a section of permit parking to double yellow lines in Eaton Road as shown on plan No.CCAG2/21/21;
- (d) advertise and consult on the revised proposals for traffic calming on Woodcock Road as shown on plan No.CCAG2/21/08A;
- (e) advertise and carry out a 12 month experimental extension of a 20mph zone with minimum traffic calming in the Eaton area shown on plan No.CCAG2/21/06/A.

## **5. Transport for Norwich – Earlham Road / Outer Ring Road to Heigham Road safety scheme**

The principal transportation planner, together with the transportation planner (Norwich City Council) introduced the report. After the report had been finalised, five further responses had been received to the Labour councillors' consultation newsletter. These were very evenly split between support and objections, and the matters raised were covered within the consultation responses. Councillor Carlo, from the Green Party had held four drop in information events during the consultation period where over a 100 people came to view and discuss the Earlham Road Green Pedalway plans. The responses were largely reflective of the consultation as a whole in that most people supported the scheme in principle; everyone supported 20mph along Earlham Road and side streets; and, there were some objections to the mandatory lane with associated prohibition of parking, as it would prevent nearby on-street parking.

In reply to a question, officers explained that the plans contained in appendices 5 and 6 were for consultation.

Councillor Carlo thanked the officers for this proposal and said that she welcomed the scheme which would make Earlham Road safer and reduce speeds in the densely populated side streets. The introduction of a 20mph speed limit would reduce cycling on pavements which cyclists continued to do despite police signs. The lack of comments from the police, fire service and bus companies, demonstrated that the proposals for 20mph were welcome. She agreed with Councillor Lubbock that the entire length of Unthank Road should be 20mph.

Councillor Stonard, vice chair and cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth, said that he was very pleased to see this scheme come forward and that this was due to the successful bid for national Cycling Ambition funding.

During discussion a member said that he welcomed the scheme but expressed concern that there could be delays in implementation, such as with the recently completed Brazen Gate project. The Transport for Norwich manager (Norfolk County Council) provided reassurance that the works would be monitored and that contractors could be subject to penalties if works were not completed satisfactorily or within timescales. As with all projects, Brazen Gate would be subject to a post project review and arrangements would be reviewed and lessons learnt that would benefit future projects.



**RESOLVED**, unanimously, with all 4 voting members voting in favour, to:

- (1) approve the installation of the scheme including:-
  - (a) Earlham Road / ORR roundabout (Appendix 2);
    - (i) upgrading the existing signalised pedestrian crossing to a toucan crossing;
    - (ii) building a new cycle zebra crossing on Earlham Road (eastern arm);
    - (iii) connecting the toucan crossing and cycle zebra with a shared path facility (excluding proposed shared path adjacent to Colman Road) ;
    - (iv) modifying the central island of the roundabout and splitter islands;
  - (b) Earlham Road between A140 and Christchurch Road (appendix 3);
    - (i) implementing 1.5m wide light-segregated cycle lanes on both sides of the carriageway;
    - (ii) creating a new raised table and cycle zebra crossing at the junction with Christchurch Road;
  - (c) Earlham Road between Christchurch Road and Heigham Road (Appendix 4);
    - (i) introducing a 20mph restriction including the side streets;
    - (ii) installing a new zebra crossing on a raised table near to Wellington Road;
    - (iii) building pedestrian priority crossings on side roads;
    - (iv) making changes to waiting restriction but existing waiting restrictions outside St Thomas Church to remain unchanged;
  - (d) Heigham Road/ Mill Hill Road / Earlham Road junction (Appendix 5):
    - (i) improving junction including narrowing of the carriageway;
    - (ii) installing cycle zebra over Earlham Road;
    - (iii) constructing a raised table across the junction;
    - (iv) the closure of West Pottergate at its junction with Heigham Road /Earlham Road to motor-vehicular through traffic.
- (2) ask the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory procedures to:
  - (a) finalise the traffic regulation order for the necessary amendments of no waiting restriction on Earlham Road;
  - (b) finalise the speed restriction order on Earlham Road and side roads;
  - (c) finalise the Traffic Management Order for West Pottergate;
- (3) agree for consultation the proposed extension of the 20mph zone (including traffic calming features) to include the area between Christchurch Road and the Outer ring road (Appendices 6 and 7);
- (4) delegate consideration of any comments received from the consultation to the head of city development services, in discussion with the chair and vice chair of this committee.

## 6. Transport for Norwich – Earlham Fiveways Roundabout

The principal transportation planner said that the further five responses to the Labour consultation newsletter reported above also applied to the proposal included in this item.

Councillor Peek, Wensum ward councillor, referred to the ongoing problem of drivers queuing on the road for Tesco's garage and shop. The principal transportation planner said that this had been raised with Tesco's and some steps had been taken to mitigate this including introducing a pay at the pump facility, which was not popular with drivers. The vice chair said that the problem was drivers waiting on the forecourt to turn right and creating a backlog. It was not possible to impose a restriction if westbound traffic could only turn left and use the roundabout, because barriers would be needed. The principal transportation planner confirmed that petrol stations could only operate if oil tankers could turn straight in or out in a single movement, and therefore a barrier could not be placed on the road to prevent right turns. The vice chair suggested that the garage operators could put up signage to advise westbound drivers not to turn right.

**RESOLVED**, unanimously with all 4 voting members voting in favour to:

- (1) approve installation of the scheme as shown in Appendix 2 including:
  - (a) upgrading three existing signalised pedestrian crossings to Toucan crossings;
  - (b) connecting all crossings with a shared path facility;
  - (c) building splitter islands on the four arms of the roundabout;
  - (d) resizing the central island to reduce the width of circulatory lanes;
  - (e) building a new raised table on Gypsy Lane near to the roundabout;
  - (f) installing new street lighting on the central island;
  - (g) implementing a 20mph speed restriction order on Gypsy Lane (part), Gypsy Close, Beverley Road (part) and Beverley Close.
- (2) ask the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory procedures to proceed with the scheme.

## 7. Lakenham Area Permit Parking Review

The principal transportation planner in introducing the report, referred to the plan set out in appendix 1 of the report, and explained that it was not proposed to include even numbers 140 to 160 Barrett Street in the proposed controlled parking zone. He said that he had received a further email from a resident in support of a clearway for the bus lane in Mansfield Lane which would not require a traffic regulation order.

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, with all 4 voting members voting in favour, to:

- (1) note the responses to the permit parking consultation;
- (2) agree to implement a permit parking scheme operating Monday to Saturday 8 am to 6:30 pm in Abbot Road, Elwyn Road, Gamewell Close, Hall Road (part), Latimer Road and Randolph Road as shown on plan no . PL/TR/3584/439.1 attached in Appendix 1;
- (3) agree not to implement permit parking in Barrett Road (part), Beeching Close, Beeching Road, Cavell Road, Coke Road, Duckett Close, Mansfield Lane (part) and Springbank, but to implement double yellow lines on the junctions as shown on plan no . PL/TR/3584/439.1 attached in Appendix ;
- (4) ask the head of city development services to complete the statutory processes to implement these proposals.

## **8. Goldsmith Street Area Parking and 20mph Proposals**

Councillor Carlo, Nelson ward councillor, said that she welcomed the scheme but considered that Exeter Street should be closed to traffic to stop it being used as a cut through to Dereham Road. This street closure would provide a safer area for children to play. The principal transportation planner said that potential closure of Exeter Street had been considered but the current proposal was based on the outcome of the consultation.

The chair referred to the consultation responses and said that a number of suggestions had been accepted, including a parking space for the car club and electric vehicle charging. The principal transportation planner said that the infrastructure would be put in place for the electric vehicle charging unit.

**RESOLVED**, unanimously with all 4 voting members voting in favour to:

- (1) note the responses to the consultation as summarised in Appendix 1;
- (2) agree to allow permit entitlement for properties within the Goldsmith Street area redevelopment as listed in appendix 2;
- (3) agree to implement waiting restrictions and 20mph zone as shown on the plan in Appendix 3, and agree to advertise amendments as shown by the plan in Appendix :
- (4) note that a road hump notice for speed tables has been advertised:
- (5) ask the head of city development services to complete the statutory processes to implement these proposals as advertised and to advertise an amendment Traffic Regulation Order;
- (6) ask the head of city development, in discussion with the chair and vice chair, to determine any objections to the amendment traffic regulation order.

## 9. Transport for Norwich – Rose Lane and Prince of Wales Road

During discussion, the principal transportation planner, in response to a members' question, referred to the plans and explained the proposals in relation to cyclists leaving the railway station and heading up Prince of Wales Road.

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, with all 4 voting members voting in favour, to:

- (1) agree the revised layout for the area surrounding the junction of Rose Lane with Prince of Wales Road as shown on the plan contained in Appendix 1:
- (2) ask the head of city development services to commence the statutory procedures associated with the following traffic regulation orders and notices associated with this phase of the scheme, which is shown on the plan contained in Appendix 1:
  - (a) reversing the direction of flow of traffic on Eastbourne Place, but maintaining cycle contraflow;
  - (b) introducing a 'Restricted Zone' in Eastbourne Place allowing loading only;
  - (c) relocate the existing light controlled crossings and upgrade them to Toucan crossings linking them via the newly created open space (one on Prince of Wales Road and one on Rose Lane);
- (3) delegate consideration of any objections to these traffic regulation orders to the head of city development services in consultation with the chair and vice chair.

## 10. Review of Parking Permit Pricing

The principal transportation planner said that there was an error in the report. The increased charges would be £3 a year and was 25p a month. He pointed out that the table in paragraph 13 of the report should be amended as the resident permits for medium sized vehicles should be corrected to £37.20 and for long vehicles to £52.80 per year.

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, with all 4 voting members voting in favour, to:

- (1) note the report;
- (2) approve the following changes to the parking permit charges, for the reasons as set out in the report, as follows:
  - (a) increase the monthly parking fee by 25p for all residential permits, and,
  - (b) the 2-hour charity rate business permit, which is charged at residential rates.

## 11. On-Street Parking Charges Review

**RESOLVED**, having considered the report, unanimously with all 4 voting members voting in favour, to agree not to increase on-street parking charges this year for the reasons as set out in the report.

## 12. Annual Report of the Norwich Highways Agency Agreement 2017-18

In reply to a question, the highways services manager (Norfolk County Council) explained that the footways maintenance programme had only five maintenance schemes each year due to financial constraints. This was based on priority. Other measures were also carried out to repair footways, especially where there was a trip hazard or a small localised repair made.

The head of city development services (Norwich City Council) explained some of the reasons where on street penalty charge notices (PCNs) had been issued and waived. This could be due to lines not being clearly defined or inadequate signage. He said that he was seeking for a reduction in waived PCNs in future.

Councillor Jones referred to the Norfolk Member Fund and said that he had been disappointed to learn that the annual £6,000 for minor highway improvements in his division had been allocated without his consent and that he had been misinformed that the funding could be rolled forward into the next financial year. The chair said that this was a particular problem for county councillors representing the Norwich Divisions. The principal transportation planner said that as a consequence of this happening, there had been a new structure in place which should prevent this situation reoccurring. Councillor Jones said that there had also been a situation where one of his constituents had a query about a pavement not being gritted and there had been confusion between customer contact teams at county and city councils as to whose responsibility it was. The principal transportation planner said that the city council was not responsible for all highways issues and that in the case Councillor Jones had outlined the issue was with ensuring that customer contact teams were advised accordingly. The highways services manager apologised and said that public enquiries should be straight forward and that they would strive to prevent this happening again.

During discussion members considered surface dressing and the issues caused by “tar and chip”. The highways services manager said that this was the standard form of surface road treatment, which sealed the surface and prevented water getting in and causing potholes, and that given the financial situation, the county council had the second largest programme in England. The contractors were aware of the aftercare following the application of the treatment, which included sweeping up loose chippings and clearing gullies. A member suggested the use of micro-asphalt. The highway services manager explained that a range of surfacing treatments was available and treatments were carefully considered for each site. Micro-asphalt had advantages and disadvantages, but was difficult to repair and replace.

In reply to the chair, the Transport for Norwich manager explained that the Brazen Gate scheme would be reviewed in a post project review. The delay had been due to a bespoke stand to support three components on the same pole. The review would consider whether a standard pole would have been more appropriate.

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, with all 4 voting members voting in favour, to approve the Norwich Highways Agency Annual Report for 2017-18.

CHAIR