



## MINUTES

## Norwich Highways Agency committee

10:00 to 11:15

7 June 2018

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

Apologies: County Councillors Vincent and Jones (C)

\*(v) voting member

## 1. Public Questions/Petitions

### Public question - Fairfield Road

Councillor Stutely, Town Close ward councillor, to ask question on behalf of Dr Pauline Bryant, Lime Tree Road, as follows:

“Please could the committee consider the likelihood that cars will drive down Fairfield Road to get out of a traffic jam at the lights on Lime Tree Road. Fairfield Road has no footpath. An increase in traffic would be a safety hazard for pedestrians.”

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

“Fairfield Road is a private road; it is narrow and the planting on either side of the road that encroaches into the carriageway gives the appearance of a private driveway rather than a road. For drivers who are unfamiliar with the area there would be nothing to suggest that it provided a link through to Town Close Road. It is therefore thought unlikely that drivers will use this route.

The effects which Dr Bryant describes are considered to be possible only in the very short term after the changes are introduced, when drivers are getting used to the changed timings of the signals. This is one of the reasons that the changes are planned to be introduced during the summer when traffic levels are less subject to peak flows, to give drivers the opportunity to find suitable alternative routes to complete their journeys.”

(Notice of another public question had been received but had not been processed due to an oversight by the committee officer. This question was taken under item 4, below)

### **Petition – Roadworks in Eaton Village**

Councillor James Wright, Eaton ward councillor, by way of introduction to the petition said that residents and businesses were concerned about the proposed five week road closure for cycle improvements, and querying the cost of the scheme which had it been implemented with the Cringleford scheme would have saved £200,000. He then presented the petition, comprising 800 signatures, as follows:

“Eaton Village Residents' Association (EVRA), local councillors, businesses and residents have significant concerns about the proposed transport changes coming to road works in Eaton Village and feel that councillors and officers at Norwich City Council and Norfolk County Council are failing to take on board these views.

We the undersigned, therefore, urge you to consider the following:

- (1) It is wholly inappropriate to spend such a large sum of money (£600,000) on changing the short section of cycle track near The Cellar House pub in Eaton. We do not believe that the outcome will benefit either cyclists or the general public and we ask you to reconsider undertaking this work.
- (2) If the work has to go ahead, then we ask you to look again at the necessity of closing the slip road - especially for so long - with its adverse effect on both residents and businesses.”

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

“The funding that is allocated to the delivery of this phase of the project covers a range of works. In addition to the widening of the existing cycle track near The Cellar House pub, works will also include resurfacing the carriageway, improved lining within the junction, replacement of the traffic signals with more advanced equipment, moving the vehicle stop line back in Bluebell Road so buses and other large vehicles can turn left from Eaton Street more easily, reducing traffic speeds through traffic calming and the introduction of a 20mph restriction.

Closure of the slip road is required to ensure the safety of operatives who will be delivering the works on the ground. All efforts will be made to reduce the length of the closure, which will be clearly communicated should this be possible. Access to businesses and residential areas of Eaton will be maintained and officers and contractors will be liaising with relevant people throughout the works to ensure deliveries to businesses continue with minimum disruption. Advanced communication of the works will be undertaken to raise awareness.

It should be remembered that this scheme has been subject to a full consultation process which resulted in significant changes being made to the scheme to take account of local concerns; it has also been subject to a rigorous democratic process through this committee.”

The transportation and network manager, Norwich City Council, said that members of this committee had taken into account that the Cringleford scheme would cost £300,000 and the Eaton scheme £600,000 when making its decision on the Eaton Village scheme at its meeting on 20 July 2017.

## **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 22 March 2018.

(Plans and slides were displayed during the consideration of the following items.)

## **4. Transport for Norwich - A11 Newmarket Road – A140 Mile End Road Improvements to relieve congestion at the Daniels Road Roundabout**

(The following public question was taken under this item as it had been overlooked by the committee officer despite notice being given.)

Dr Barbara Goodwin, Lime Tree Road, asked the following question:

“Could the committee ensure that warning and informative temporary signs announcing the changed timing of the lights will be placed at relevant access points to the side roads (for example, at the Ipswich Road/Lime Tree Road junction) in order to deter through-traffic and rat-runners from using these roads, and to prevent congestion in the side roads in the initial period of implementation?”

The transportation and network manager replied on behalf of the committee and confirmed that there would be temporary signs positioned near the junctions of Ipswich Road and Lime Tree Road and Christchurch Road and Unthank Road. It was proposed to implement the trial changes to traffic signal timings over the summer while traffic was relatively quiet and then carry out the assessment in September when traffic was at its peak.

The chair introduced the report and moved the recommendations which he considered offered a better solution to traffic congestion at this time.

Councillor Lubbock, Eaton ward councillor, addressed the committee and raised a number of questions relating to the report and residents' concerns about access and queuing in the side roads and pointed out that implementation of the traffic signal timings coincided with the five week road closure at Eaton. In reply, the transportation and network manager referred to the report and explained the locations of the lights and signals that would be affected by the trial. She noted that the yellow boxes on the Daniels Road roundabout needed to be repainted and that local members would like highways officers to attend a site visit. Delaying the implementation of the trial until

after the closure of the Eaton Slip Road would be counterproductive as it was intended for traffic on the A11 and A140 run smoothly. The impact assessment in the report had been prepared for the previous scheme and was correct in that there were 40,000 vehicles each day on the A11 and maintaining traffic flow would reduce pollution and offset the impact of cars queuing on the side roads. The NATS/city agency manager, Norfolk County Council, referred to the report and explained that an application was in the process of being submitted for Department of Transport Transforming Cities Funding. The application comprised 1500 words and set out the vision of what the capital funding would be used for. There had been no specific consultation conducted with the general public as part of putting this application together because the vision encompassed the aims of the Greater Norwich growth agenda, improved links to the north east of the city and Research Park, and had taken on board emerging consultation responses from stakeholders and the general public in response to the Transport for Norwich Strategy.

Discussion ensued in which the vice chair spoke in support of the recommendations and said that it was a case of balancing competing needs. Members of the committee had listened to the concerns of local residents and decided not to remove the traffic signals at this time. However, it was important to keep the 40,000 vehicles that used the A11 each day moving.

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

- (1) note that a current bid to the Department for Transport (DfT) which includes a full appraisal of the entire transport corridor between Wymondham and the city centre along the Newmarket Road, would mean that any major interventions at this time are likely to be premature;
- (2) note that a trial of changes to traffic signal timings at junctions and crossings on both the A11 and A140 are to be carried out to determine whether this will improve capacity on the main road network;
- (3) ask that a report on the outcome of both the bid to the DfT and the trial of traffic signal timing changes is presented to a future meeting.

#### **5. Norwich Area Transportation Strategy Implementation Plan – Rose Lane and Prince of Wales Road**

The chair introduced the report.

During discussion the principal planner (transportation), Norwich City Council, referred to the report and answered members' questions. He confirmed that traffic modelling demonstrated that the removal of the bus lane and the works to the King Street junction would avoid delays and improve bus flows. Members were also advised that access to Mountergate would be in both directions. Services under Prince of Wales Road constrained tree roots and lighter planting was being proposed. There was a hackney cab rank on Prince of Wales Road. There was an informal arrangement where pre-booked private hire vehicles could pick up in Castle Meadow. The first phase would include the works to Rose Lane and King Street.

The vice chair said that he welcomed the proposed scheme which would improve traffic flow in this area. In reply to his question, the principal planner (transportation) said that there the SOS bus would be catered for as part of the proposals. .

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, to:

- (1) note the results of the consultation on the Rose lane / Prince of Wales Road project and that as a result of that consultation 3 elements have been added to the overall scheme, these being:
  - (a) an additional loading bay on Market Avenue;
  - (b) no loading at any time along the entire length of Rose Lane and Market Avenue except in the specifically designated loading bays;
  - (c) a length of bus lane on Market Avenue;
- (2) approve the general principles of the overall Rose Lane / Prince of Wales Road scheme, including:
  - (a) re-aligning the road between the end of Mountergate and Prince of Wales Road, creating a new public space on Prince of Wales Road and a two-way link between Prince of Wales Road and Mountergate;
  - (b) closing Eastbourne Place to motorised traffic;
  - (c) narrowing Rose Lane to two traffic lanes along the majority of its length, providing wider pavements, an off-carriageway cycle route, landscaping and loading bays. The current bus lane is to be removed;
  - (d) converting King Street between Prince of Wales Road and Rose Lane to a pedestrian / cycle zone and close it to through motorised traffic at its junction with Prince of Wales Road, significantly upgrading this section of National Cycle Route No. 1. The direction of traffic flow along King Street to be reversed from Rose Lane through to the Greyfriars Road junction;
  - (e) moving the disabled space from King Street to Greyfriars Road;
  - (f) providing a cycle track through Cattlemarket Street from Rose Lane, linking with the existing facility;
  - (g) providing an enhanced pedestrian / cycle facility on Market Avenue;
  - (h) creating a contra-flow cycle lane on Bank Street, moving the disabled parking to the south side of the road;
  - (i) adjusting the layout of Agricultural Hall Plain to take account of the closure of King Street providing a new cycle link to Castle Meadow from Prince of Wales Road and wider pavements;
  - (j) maintaining Prince of Wales Road as a one-way route for motorised traffic, installing an off-carriageway contra-flow cycle route to the south side by narrowing the carriageway (but maintaining two lanes of traffic);
  - (k) closing St Faiths Lane to motorised traffic at its junction with Prince of Wales Road, maintaining two-way cycling and enhancing pedestrian provision;

- (l) Considering proposals to visually upgrade the area around the Foundry Bridge.
  - (m) Creating an additional loading bay on Market Avenue
  - (a) Introducing a no loading at any time restriction along the entire length of Rose Lane and Market Avenue except in the specifically designated loading bays
  - (b) Creating a length of bus lane on Market Avenue
- (3) agree to implement the first 2 phases of the scheme which are the closure of King Street and the works on Rose Lane, Cattlemarket Street and Market Avenue, including the two-way link from Mountergate to Prince of Wales Road.
- (4) ask the head of city development services to complete the statutory procedures associated with the following traffic regulation orders associated with phase 1 and 2 that have been advertised.
- (a) Close King Street to through traffic just north of its junction with Greyfriars Road, creating a pedestrian and cycle zone with access only
  - (b) Rescind the current one-way order on this part of King Street, reversing the traffic flow for that section between Rose Lane and Greyfriars Road only
  - (c) Introduce a with flow cycle track on Rose Lane
  - (d) Introduce a 'loading only' restriction in the proposed pedestrian areas
  - (e) Introduce no waiting and no loading restrictions along both sides of Rose Lane
  - (f) Introduce dedicated loading bays on Rose Lane
  - (g) Relocate the disabled bay on King Street to Greyfriars Road.
- (5) ask the head of city development services to commence the statutory processes for the additional traffic regulation orders identified in the report that are consequent on detailed design changes and consultation responses to include:
- (a) an additional loading bay on Market Avenue;
  - (b) no loading at any time along the entire length of Rose Lane and Market Avenue except in the specifically designated loading bays;
  - (c) a length of bus lane on Market Avenue.
- (6) delegates consideration of any objections to these traffic regulation orders to the head of city development services, in consultation with the chair and vice chair;
- (7) note that detailed design work continues on the future phases of the scheme and that further reports detailing these will be presented to future meetings;
- (8) note that the details of these proposals are shown on Plan contained in Appendix 5.

## **6. Thorpe Road Area Permit Parking Consultation**

The principal planner (transportation) advised members that two further representations had been received in relation to the consultation that were opposed to the proposals; one against permit parking in the area at all and suggesting that there should be more short stay parking in Wellesley Lane South; and, one representation on behalf of two households, supporting the proposals. Any further comments that were received would be discussed with the chair and vice chair.

The chair commented that the people who had parked in these streets for the football for 20 to 30 years would need to be dealt with sensitively when the scheme was first implemented.

In reply to a question, the principal planner (transportation) explained that the Thorpe Road area controlled parking zone was adjacent to zones which operated either 08:00 to 18:30 or 24/7, and that residents could apply for 4 hour visitor passes or up to 60 scratch-cards for all day parking by visitors each year.

**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 24 hour seven day a week permit parking scheme in Cintra Road, Ranson Road (remaining properties only), Stanley Avenue, Telegraph Lane East (part) Thorpe Road and Wellesley Avenue South, and the double yellow lines on Stanley Avenue as shown on the plans (nos. PL/TR/3584/437C) attached in Appendix 1;
- (3) delegate the consideration of any representations to minor amendments to the extent of the originally proposed short stay parking area in Wellesley Avenue South to the head of city development services, in consultation with the chair and vice chair;
- (4) note that double yellow lines will be implemented on the south side of Thorpe Road in the Broadland district council area to complement the recommended extension to the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ):
- (5) ask the head of city development services to complete the statutory processes to implement these proposals.

## **7. Transport for Norwich – Earlham Road/Outer Ring Road to Heigham Road Safety Scheme**

The principal planner (transportation) introduced the report and pointed out a minor amendment to the scheme to introduce a full speed table across the junction of Earlham Road, Heigham Street and West Pottergate instead of the separate road humps shown on the plan in appendix 4. This alternative proposal had the support of local members. In relation to appendix 1, an amendment was proposed to change the pavement between Earlham Road and Gypsy Lane to shared pedestrian/cycle use to

enable cyclists to travel from Earlham Road (inbound) into Gypsy Lane and to connect with the new toucan crossing facility.

Councillor Carlo, Nelson ward, welcomed this scheme and said that she had witnessed the increase in traffic on Earlham Road over the last 30 years and considered that it was no longer safe. Many years ago Sustrans had proposed reducing speed in Earlham Road but this had been considered too radical at the time. There was support for speed reduction measures from local residents but this was based on signage rather than speed tables.

The vice chair said that there was a need to look at cycle safety in Earlham Road. Many cyclists used West Pottergate and The Avenues to avoid Earlham Road. The recommendations provided a good compromise.

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, to:

(1) approve for consultation the scheme which includes:

(a) Earlham Road / ORR roundabout (Appendix 1):

- (i) Upgrading existing signalled 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;
- (iv) Modifying the central island of the roundabout and splitter islands;
- (v) Converting the pavement between Earlham Road and Gypsy Lane to a shared cycle/pedestrian path;

(b) Earlham Road between A140 and Christchurch Road (Appendix 2):

- (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 3):

- (i) Introducing a 20mph restriction and in the side streets;
- (ii) Installing a new zebra crossing near to Wellington Road;
- (iii) Building pedestrian priority crossings on side roads;
- (iv) Making changes to waiting restrictions.

(d) Heigham Road/ Mill Hill Road / Earlham Road junction (Appendix 4):

- (i) Improving junction including narrowing of the carriageway;
- (ii) Installing cycle zebra over Earlham Road;
- (iii) The closure of West Pottergate at its junction with Heigham Road / Earlham Road to motor-vehicular through traffic.
- (iv) Installing a speed table across the entire junction;



- (3) ask the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory procedures to advertise the road notices and traffic regulation orders for the safety scheme on the Earlham four-ways roundabout, and Earlham Road through to the Heigham Road / Mill Hill Road / West Pottergate junction, and to note that all responses will be considered at a future meeting of the committee.

## **8. Transport For Norwich – Earlham Five Ways Roundabout Safety Scheme**

The principal planner (transportation) introduced the report and answered members' questions. He explained there were longstanding issues with the use of the garage forecourt and queuing back onto the highway. To some extent these had been mitigated a few years ago when the council convinced the operator to reverse the flow of the one way system on the forecourt, which meant that the queues moved from the main Earlham Road and onto the less busy Earlham Green Lane. He said there was nothing more the council could do to ease the queues.

Councillor Bills said that he represented Cringleford, Bowthorpe and Colney and that he welcomed measures to improve the flow of traffic through this five way island, particularly for blue light vehicles.

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

- (1) approve for consultation the scheme which includes:
  - (a) Upgrading three existing signalled pedestrian crossings to Toucan crossings;
  - (b) Connecting all four Toucan crossing with an improved 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 and implementing a 20mph speed limit on this connecting arm;
  - (f) Installing new street lighting on the central island.
- (2) ask the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory procedures to advertise the road notices and traffic regulation orders for the safety scheme on the Earlham Five Ways roundabout;
- (3) note that all responses will be considered at a future meeting of the committee.

## **9. Waggon and Horses Lane; proposed traffic management**

The vice chair commented that Councillor Jones, Thorpe Hamlet division, supported the proposal.

The chair in moving the recommendations stated that the reason for the traffic regulation order was to protect the building.

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

- (1) ask the head of city development to undertake the necessary statutory procedures and implement an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for the closure on Waggon and Horses Lane to through traffic.
- (2) agree to delegate to the head of city development services that within the first six months, three closure points may be trialled.
- (3) agree that within the first six months of the experiment, its effects will be monitored and appraised by officers and reported to a future meeting of Norwich Highways Agency committee for members to determine whether to further amend, end or make permanent the experiment.

**10. Transport for Norwich – Cycling improvements, Edward Street / Heath Road / Magpie Road junction**

The transportation and network manager introduced the report and updated members on the proposed works to the tree surround. As the tree was not in good health it would be replaced with one at grade tree rather than one in a raised bed. She then referred to the report and answered a members' question about the impact of cycling improvements in the city and that there had been an increase in cycling despite public perception that the cycle ways were not being used. The implementation of schemes would be complemented by parallel work to support training for cyclists and working with schools on cycle safety.

The vice chair said that with only two pedalways in place, cycling had increased in the city by 40 per cent. The chair suggested that the communications officer provided a press release on the impact of the pedalways programme and increase in cycling in the Norwich area.

**RESOLVED**, unanimously (with all 4 voting members voting in favour);

- (1) approve installation of the scheme as shown on Plan No.PEA009-MP-008 including:-
  - (a) a cycle only direct crossing over Magpie Road between Edward Street and Heath Road with low level cycle signals and push button control.
  - (b) a new cycle track through city council land next to No.82 Magpie Road to give a more direct route to cyclists between Edward Street and the new crossing to Heath Road.
  - (c) retention of the existing two stage signal crossing for pedestrians to use.
- (2) ask the head of city development services to carry out the statutory legal procedures to:
  - (a) finalise the traffic regulation order (TRO) for necessary amendments of residents parking, limited waiting and double yellow lines in Heath Road and Esdelle Street

(b) finalise the prohibition of driving order for Heath Road.

(c) confirm the Edward Street and Heath Road cycle order.

CHAIR