



NORWICH HIGHWAYS AGENCY COMMITTEE

10.00am to 11.05am

28 July 2011

Present: **County Councillors:** **City Councillors:**
 Adams (Chair) (V) Bremner (Vice-Chair) (V)
 Plant (V) Gayton (V)
 Bearman Carlo
 Scutter Gee (substitute for Councillor Altman)
 Shaw Grenville

*(V) – Voting Member

Apologies: City Councillor Altman

1. PETITIONS

Chapelfield East – waiting restrictions

The deputy manager of Chapelfield Children’s Nursery Ltd presented the committee with the following petition on behalf of the nursery and parents:

“We the undersigned would like to make an objection to the proposed plans for changes to the loading bay and motorcycle parking on Chapelfield East. Chapelfield Children’s Nursery is a very busy nursery with over 80 children attending per day with a variety of drop off/pick up times between 8.00am and 6.00pm. Many families commute into Norwich to use our service and they rely heavily on the loading bays as it is our parents’ only way of dropping off their children. They currently only have 15 minutes to use the bays and some of our families have three children to drop off. This can be very inconvenient when there are no spaces at the best of times. I understand that the council has suggested that they could use Walpole gardens however there are also very limited spaces around there.

We feel if you were to change one of the bays to pay and display parking, it would have a detrimental effect on our business.

We would like to highlight that it may not solely be used for the mosque but also people shopping for a short time. It would also mean a lot more congestion in Chapelfield East during peak times, which could become a hazard for the children.

As a nursery our parents already complain to us on regular occasions and find it very difficult to park in the bays as they are taken up with service vehicles, (some of whom are using dispensations and I have been informed by the council that this is not allowed.) Also people are often waiting to pick up staff from the House of Fraser.

We feel as a long standing occupier the proposed plans could have a negative effect on our parents and they would be at even more of a disadvantage for using a service which is well established and in very high demand.”

The chair received the petition and a statement provided from one of the parents and said that as the petition related to the report on waiting restrictions it would be considered under that item later on in the meeting.

2. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Ashby Street – Business Permits

(As three questions had been received that related to business permits in Ashby Street, the chair asked Ms Matthews to read out her question, and the other two questions were noted at the meeting.)

Ms Rebecca Matthews presented the findings of a survey of parked vehicles conducted by residents and asked the following question

“I handed a petition in 2004 and 2006 regarding the use of business permits in Ashby Street. On the Norwich City Council website it states clearly that the business permits are not to be used for commuting, yet it is evident to the residents of the street that a large number of permits are being used this way.

My question is what does the council propose to do to ensure permits are used "legally"?”

Mr Peter Bradbrooke had submitted the following question:

“On any given day there are approximately 20 to 24 vehicles using business permits parked in Ashby Street / Kings Lane. Many of these vehicles are parked early morning and do not leave until the end of the working day, if this is not ' commuter ' parking what is? I recently handed a week long survey, conducted by residents, in support of this to an officer.

The parking regulations are quite specific on the issue of commuter parking - it is not allowed.

Residents have no problems with business permit users who use their permits as per the NCC parking permit terms and conditions i.e. for people visiting the business premises or for employees who use their vehicles as part of their work.

The evidence, in the form of the cars themselves, is there every day, day in day out for all to see, so why has the issue not been dealt with?”

Councillor Little, ward and divisional councillor for Town Close, had submitted the following question:

“Nearly five years ago businesses in the area of Ashby Street were limited to two street parking permits per business and it was agreed to keep the situation under review. Residents are still reporting that the number of cars parked displaying business permits in the street is still unacceptably high and affecting their quality of life. They are also concerned that the requirement which limits the permits for operational use only may not be being adequately enforced. Could the committee agree to review the situation, both in terms of the number of permits allowed per business and the level and effectiveness of enforcement, with a view to coming forward with fresh recommendations?”

The principal planner (transport), Norwich City Council, responded on behalf of the committee and said that this was a long standing issue that was difficult to address. He suggested that the parking manager conducted another survey and wrote to business permit holders advising them that the permits were for operational use and not commuting. Businesses in Queen’s Road had been vociferous in their right to business permits.

Discussion ensued in which members congratulated the residents for their thorough survey. It was suggested that the business permit users should be requested to explain the purpose that the vehicle had been parked on the street in relation to the survey findings. Business permit users should also be reminded that permits were for operational use when permits were renewed annually.

RESOLVED to ask for a report to a future meeting of the committee on the use of business permits in Ashby Street.

20mph areas in the city

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

“The government has relaxed the regulations for implementing 20 mph speed limits. With fewer hoops to jump through and no need to provide expensive and unpopular speed humps can the committee give consideration to look at reviewing the many existing 20 mph areas in the city to see how they could be joined up in a holistic way?”

This could be done incrementally over the next few years culminating in a blanket 20 mph limits in all residential streets in Norwich. This would have a positive effect on the health of our communities, especially obesity in children by increasing walking and cycling. Perhaps even the Health Authorities could contribute to this preventative measure? It would also improve air quality and increase social interaction. By spending small amounts of time and money now, there could be huge benefits for communities in the future.”

The head of citywide development services, Norwich City Council, and referred to the committee’s previous decisions in relation to the results from the 20mph pilot, budget restraints and the committee’s decision to review its approach to speed management, which would be considered in the course of the current financial year.

He pointed out that for every request for speed tables there were other people who did not want them. The government had relaxed its regulations in relation to speed reduction which could save costs in implementation.

Discussion ensued in which members supported the approach suggested by Councillor Lubbock and requested that a report on the impact of the government changes in its approach to speed management should be considered at the next meeting. Councillor Lubbock responded to a suggestion from Councillor Gayton, that the success of 20mph speed limits was reliant on enforcement from the police when services were facing cuts, and said that a holistic approach would be self-regulating over time and that as a result of the Localism Bill and the community infrastructure levy (CIL) communities would have money to spend on local schemes.

RESOLVED to ask the head of citywide development services to:

- (1) provide a report on the government guidelines in respect of speed management in residential areas to the next meeting of the committee;
- (2) note that there will be a report on the review of 20mph speed limits to a future meeting of the committee within the current financial year.

Sight seeing bus tour

The chair reported that a letter had been received from Mr Agombar, Sight Seeing Tour of Olde Norwich, regarding his business and the use of concessions to use waiting bays as part of his tour. (Copies of the letter were circulated at the meeting.)

RESOLVED to ask the head of citywide development services to respond to Mr Agombar on behalf of the committee.

Half Mile Road

The chair reported that County Councillor Edwards, Mile Cross Division, had written to the committee officer to thank the committee and Norwich City Council for getting the problem of the uneven pavement in Half Mile Road fixed so quickly following the presentation of a petition, on behalf of Mile Cross residents, to the council in March which was subsequently considered by the committee at its March meeting. The work was completed in May 2011. Councillor Edwards stated that he considered that the work was what was needed and comprised the removal of paving slabs which were replaced with tarmac on the south side of the road, from the Aylsham Road to Mile Cross Road.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 26 May 2011.

4. CHANGES TO WAITING RESTRICTIONS

Mr Rex Warner, chair of Norwich Car Club, spoke of his aspirations for the expansion of the car club and said that each car club car replaced 4 existing cars. In response to a member's question, the principal planner (transport) said that the

car club had been originally funded by CIVITAS and was part of the Norwich Area Transport Scheme's modal shift to sustainable modes of transport.

Members then discussed the proposals for Chapelfield East and considered that it was necessary to take into consideration the needs of the mosque and to be aware that the waiting bays were for general public use, not that of one or two organisations. The deputy manager of Chapelfield Nursery Ltd requested that the technical submission which accompanied the petition was taken into consideration before a decision was made. She also pointed out that the busiest time for children being dropped off for the nursery was between 8.00am to 9.00am and 5.00pm to 6.00pm.

The chair then moved the recommendations as set out in the report, subject to proposing that a decision on the changes to waiting restrictions in Chapelfield East would be deferred to the next meeting.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) ask the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory procedures to:
 - (a) implement the administrative changes to traffic regulation orders listed in appendix 1 of the report;
 - (b) implement the changes to waiting and loading restrictions as advertised at the following locations;

Annual waiting restrictions

Location	Plan number
(i) Albertine Close	PL/TR/3329/722/3
(ii) Burnet Road	PL/TR/3329/722/4
(iii) Frensham Road	PL/TR/3329/722/1 & PL/TR/3329/722/2
(iv) Ives Road	PL/TR/3329/722/15
(v) North Park Avenue	PL/TR/3329/722/5a & PL/TR/3329/722/5b
(vi) Pottergate	PL/TR/3329/722/7

Norwich car club

(i) Avenue Road	PL/TR/3329/722/22
(ii) Christchurch Road	PL/TR/3329/722/21
(iii) Greyfriars Road	PL/TR/3329/722/23
(iv) Marlborough Road	PL/TR/3329/722/16
(v) Northcote Road	PL/TR/3329/722/17
(vi) Park Lane	PL/TR/3329/722/20

City Centre pay and display bays

(i) St Giles Street	PL/TR/3329/724/4
(ii) Music House Lane	PL/TR/3329/724/3
(iii) St Martins Lane	PL/TR/3329/724/2

- (2) implement the amended changes to loading restrictions in:
 - (i) Valleyside Road PL/TR/3329/722/9b see appendix 6*

- (3) advertise and implement the proposed changes to waiting restrictions in
 - (i) Carrow Road PL/TR/3584/425, see appendix 7*
 - (ii) Fishers Lane PL/TR/3329/722/40 see appendix 8*
 - (iii) Neville Street PL/TR/3329/722/41 see appendix 8*
 - (iv) Patteson Road PL/TR/3329/722/19b see appendix 5*
 - (v) Stepping Lane PL/TR/3329/722/42 see appendix 4*

- (4) agree not to proceed with the following planned restrictions:
 - (i) Drayton Road / Bignold Road – double yellow lines
 - (ii) Fairfax Road – double yellow lines
 - (iii) Heyford Road – loading restrictions
 - (iv) Silver Road / Knowsley Road – loading restrictions
 - (v) St Saviours Lane – loading restrictions

* of the report.

- (5) agree to allow the residents of no's 51-69 South Park Avenue to park on the tarmac vehicle crossovers in front of their properties, on the condition that they display a dispensation letter from the city council;

- (6) defer consideration on the proposed changes to waiting restrictions in respect of Chapel Field East and ask the head of citywide development, Norwich City Council, to report back to the next meeting of the committee.

5. CONSULTATION RESULTS ON PROPOSED EASTERN CPZ (CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE) EXTENSION AND WAITING RESTRICTIONS IN CROME ROAD AND DENMARK ROAD.

The principal planner (transport) advised members that one of the objectors from Thorpe Park had withdrawn his objection and was satisfied with the proposals to extend the eastern CPZ.

The chair referred to the letter received from Mr Ian Williams of Gertrude Road, who had been unable to attend the meeting, which was circulated at the meeting and reproduced in the minutes below:-

“I am writing to report that my comments have not been included in the report and so as I am unable to attend I am setting out my comments.

I agree whole heartedly with the proposal of waiting restrictions on Denmark Road at the junction with Magdalen Road/Constitution Hill to ease traffic flow. I witness every morning cars queuing on Magdalen Road waiting to turn right into Denmark Road causing delays to all road users.

I would also respectfully request that double yellow lines are advertised along the south side of Denmark Road from the junction to number 33 Denmark Road. The reasons are:-

1. Advertising longer yellow lines means that they can be shortened at no extra cost where as advertising shorter yellow lines means that extra cost would be incurred if they need to be lengthened. (I refer to a previous NHAC meeting deciding about advertising and installing longer yellow lines on Gilman Road and shortening them if deemed necessary at a future date).
2. Most cars which park from 33 Denmark Road to Halcombe Court park with two wheels on the pavement. Sometimes they park so far on the pavement that wheelchair and push chairs cannot pass safely.
3. I have surveyed at various times, when walking to school in morning and cycling home at night, that between <10 cars will have to be parked elsewhere if these longer double yellow lines were installed. These could be commuters, residents of The Erins, Halcombe Court, Howard Mews (who have their own car park) and residents of Denmark Road who live on the north side.
4. As the officers state in the report speed management is not part of the proposal. Police Officers will never enforce speed limits along Denmark Road as they never enforce the speed limit (20mph) of traffic coming down Constitution Hill toward the pedestrian crossing.
5. Traffic flows will be improved if this section has double yellow lines from junction to #33 Denmark Road.
6. Residents of 33 and 35 Denmark Road might want double yellow lines outside their property to stop drivers blocking their garage entrances.

Many thanks for considering these issues and hope the committee will install the longer yellow lines, which as a user of this road by foot, bike and car will improve for everyone.”

The principal planner (transport) referred to the report which contained a précis of Mr Williams’ objection and addressed the issues he had raised. He pointed out that several residents had objected to the proposal to extend the yellow lines.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) ask the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory procedures to implement the following restrictions as advertised:
 - (a) Thorpe Park PL/TR/3355/796
 - (b) Denmark Road PL/TR/3355/794
- (2) agree that the proposed waiting restrictions in Crome Road are not implemented.

6. CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE EXTENSION NEAR TO THE UNIVERSITY OF EAST ANGLIA

RESOLVED, having considered the report of the head of citywide development, Norwich City Council, to the installation of the reduced University of East Anglia controlled parking zone extension as shown on plan number PL/TR/3584/424a attached as appendix 2 of the report.

7. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NORWICH CITY AGENCY 2010/11

During discussion, the assistant director highways, and the city agency/NATS manager, Norfolk County Council, together with the head of citywide development services, answered questions on the road casualty statistics. Members were advised that the overall trend was that of decline and, although there was no room for complacency, was within targets. Any steep rises or drops were expediential, with the majority of accidents occurring on main radial routes or at junctions; there were no clusters in a particular location or in residential areas.

Members also commented on the need to promote road safety to road users and discussed the merits of the cycling proficiency programme for young cyclists. The city agency/NATS manager advised members that accident trend areas were targeted and that remedial works included a balance of education, installation of road safety measures and enforcement of traffic regulations.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) approve the Annual Report and consider its key messages, at appendix 1 of the report;
- (2) ask the assistant director highways, Norfolk County Council, and the head of citywide development services to provide a detailed report on road casualty statistics to a future meeting on the committee.

8. HIGHWAY PERFORMANCE MONITORING OF THE HIGHWAYS AGENCY AGREEMENT

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

9. MAJOR ROAD WORKS – REGULAR MONITORING

Councillor Scutter requested that diversions signs were properly located to advise motorists of major road works and avoid congestion on major routes such as the ring road.

In response to a question on the ground subsidence in Finkelgate, the head of citywide development services reported that the city council was in ongoing discussions with the insurance companies and that he would report back to a future meeting on the progress.

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

CHAIR