

Norwich Highways Agency committee**10:00 to 11:10****17 March 2016**

Present: **County Councillors:** **City Councillors:**
 Morphew (chair) (V) Bremner (vice chair) (V)
 Agnew Stonard (V)
 Sands (M) Carlo
 Button (substitute for Councillor Harris)
 Jackson

 *(V) voting member

Apologies: County Councillors Adams (V) and Shaw and City Councillor Harris
 (other council business)

1. Public questions/petitions

Margaret Todd, Norwich Cycling Campaign, asked the following question:

“The Norwich Area Transport Strategy says that cycling improvements will be concentrated along the designated pedalways, and:

“4.18. Elsewhere, delivery has included making the general road environment safer and more convenient for cyclists through advanced stop-lines at traffic-signal controlled junctions, improved cycle route facilities and cycle parking.”

Finkelgate junction with Queens Road is part of the Orange Pedalway route, not very attractive for cycling, but a reasonable route through to Hall Road, City Road and Lakenham. The proposed changes are part of a much wider scheme to alter traffic patterns for the better in the city centre and it uses Cycle Ambition funding to achieve this.

However, these late changes to the Orange Pedalway take it through an unsatisfactory right hand turn out of Thorn Lane and to the busy two way stretch of Ber Street and across the coach parking, with no helpful provision for cycling, until it reaches All Saints Green and Brazengate. These changes to Finkelgate are the opposite of “cycle proofing” and a through cycle route should have been planned for this whole scheme. This quarter of the city will, as proposed, be made less accessible to cycling. Kings Street and Rouen Road end in Bracondale and now Brazengate is proposed as the sole cycle friendly route at one end of this whole quarter.

Cycling, like walking goes for the direct route. The city is removing the ugly barriers designed to keep pedestrians safe from straying into traffic by slowing traffic and redesigning junctions. People will not use Brazengate if they want to cycle to Hall Road, any more than they would go to St Giles if they wanted to go to the market from here because there was busy traffic in St Peter's Street. They will take the risk. We have not seen the plans for Brazengate, probably; it is still going to be a challenge for many cyclists.

Will the committee look at putting some provision for cycling safely across the inner ring road at this point and not endorse a scheme that instead of improving a junction, moves the Pedalway on the map? We ask this committee not to approve a new junction that makes things worse for cycling as part of changes made with Cycling Ambition funding."

The chair prefaced his response by thanking the Norwich Cycling Campaign for its contribution to cycling improvements and referred to the constraints of transport solutions in a medieval city. He provided the following response on behalf of the committee:

"The Transport for Norwich Strategy aims to provide transport options, in an increasingly sustainable way across the Norwich area, by improving facilities for cycling, walking and public transport. However, the consequence of improving substantial parts of the city, and re-allocating space away from private motorists is that priority access routes for car access have to be part of the overall approach. The expectation is that the more major routes (and the inner and outer ring roads in particular), will cater for an increasing proportion of private motor journeys. This requires consideration as to how these routes can cater for the demand that is being placed upon them.

The Finkelgate junction is one location where the inner ring road joins one of the main vehicular access routes into the city centre, providing access to four of the major car parks. As is often the case within the historic environment, it is simply not possible to provide everything to the standard that would be desirable and in this location, it is vehicular traffic that needs to be considered first as this is one of the main routes that we are expecting vehicular traffic to use.

That is not to say that other modes have no priority, however, when space is constrained it is not always possible to provide facilities for every user individually, and that is the case here. Options were considered for all the junctions from the Ber Street/ Queens Road/ City Road junction through to Finkelgate, but space constraints have resulted in the scheme proposed focusing solely on the Finkelgate junction.

There is insufficient space available to enable the provision of the required number of traffic lanes that ensure the operation of the ring road is not compromised, and bypass cycle lanes, without removing the footways (which is clearly not an option). The provision of advance stop lines has been investigated without this facility, but do not function well because ahead and turning lanes are operating independently to maximise the effectiveness of the junction. Consequently, it is safer for cyclists to use the normal carriageway if

they wish to traverse this junction, than it would be to provide a substandard facility.

As the report has noted, the Orange Pedalway through this part of the city was never considered satisfactory, and the lack of options available at Finkelgate or Ber Street has resulted in a reconsideration of the route. The alternative suggested has been assessed against the existing route, and other alternatives, and is considered to be better. Whilst recognising that the turn from Thorn Lane into Ber Street is not ideal, an alternative route, via Rouen Road, and segregated cycle facilities to a toucan crossing, using All Saints Green is also available, but is slightly longer. It is, of course true that cyclists will choose the most convenient route available between their origin and destination, but the cycle routes proposed are intended to provide a safe environment for less confident cyclists, and it has not proven possible to achieve this on the original route given the constraints.”

By way of a supplementary question, Margaret Todd referred to cyclists, like pedestrians, wanting to take the most direct route and the need to improve safety. She asked the chair to give a commitment that the inner ring road and junction would be monitored. The chair agreed that the inner ring road and junction would be monitored and explained that the improvements were a response to predicted outcomes of the Golden Ball Scheme and Westlegate scheme

The NATS manager (Norfolk County Council) explained the financial implications of the scheme (as set out in the report considered under item 4(below) and pointed out that it would not be funded by City Cycle Ambition funding. The scheme would be principally funded from local growth funding, together with community infrastructure levy funding and S106 funding from the Westlegate development.

2. Declarations of interest

Councillor Bremner declared an other interest in item 6 (below), Transport for Norwich Plan – Car Club expansion 2016, in that he represented the county council on The Forum Trust, which as an organisation had commented on consultation.

3. Minutes

RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2016.

4. Transport for Norwich Plan – Finkelgate Improvement

The principal planner (transport) introduced the report. The Norwich Society had submitted a late representation calling on the Queens Road / Ber Street junction to be left turn only heading south to help traffic flows; concerned about the reduction in the size of the refuge at the Queens Road / Finkelgate crossing and expressing support of improvements to help pedestrians in the city centre by removing through traffic. Members were advised that the scheme was fully signalled and would ensure traffic flows. The Queens Road / Finkelgate crossing was 4.8 metres by 12.4 metres and therefore smaller than the current crossing but still provided a large refuge for

pedestrians and cyclists. (Copies of the letter from the Norwich Society were circulated at the meeting.)

During discussion, the principal planner (transport) referred to the report and answered members' questions. Members generally welcomed the proposals which would remove traffic from the city centre and ensure traffic flows on the inner ring road. Members noted the comments from the Norwich Cycling Campaign about the Orange Pedalway and that experienced cyclists would be disinclined to use the alternative route. However the improvements at the junctions and keeping traffic flowing would benefit cyclists and all road users at this location.

Councillor Carlo suggested that the increased traffic on the inner ring road was contradictory to the reason being given for the Northern Distributor Road and together with the reduction in park and ride encouraged the use of private car journeys. The vice chair replied that the changes in the city centre pushed traffic on to the inner ring road, which had been designed to take the volume of traffic, unlike the medieval streets in the city centre. The scheme was part of a holistic approach to traffic management and would reduce air pollution from standing traffic in the city centre. The major projects manager (Norfolk County Council) said that the new park and ride contract was in its early days but would be monitored to evaluate its effectiveness at removing car journeys from the city's road network.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to

- (1) agree the implementation of the proposed light controlled junction and mini roundabout at Finkelgate as shown on Plan no. PK6055-NA-001A in Appendix 1.
- (2) ask the executive head of service for regeneration and development to complete the statutory process to make the Traffic Regulation Orders and to implement the following:
 - (a) to allow two-way traffic on Timberhill between its junction with All Saints Street and Lion and Castle Yard;
 - (b) provide an additional 9 Pay and Display parking spaces at the northern end of Rouen Road, removing two parking spaces at the northern end of Ber Street;
 - (c) provide 4 Blue Badge parking spaces in two separate bays on Ber Street outside John Lewis, removing the existing 2 spaces on the other side of the road;
 - (d) remove the existing bus bay outside John Lewis on Ber Street, replacing it with a shorter Coach Bay; and,
 - (e) remove the permit parking spaces on Finkelgate replacing them with new spaces in - Horns Lane (one space), Lily Terrace (two spaces) and Mariners Lane (removing two spaces on northern side, providing five spaces on southern side) and installing double yellow lines for the entire length of Finkelgate.

As shown on plans nos. PK6055-MP-007, PK6055-MP-008 and PL/TR/3329/763 in Appendix 2.

- (3) note the re-routing of the Orange Pedalway via the new facilities provided as part of the Golden Ball Street scheme.

5. Transport for Norwich – Cycling Improvements Fifers Lane Area

The transportation and network manager (Norwich City Council) introduced the report. She referred to the proposed zebra crossing on Fifers Lane to Ives Road (appendix 4) and said that because a small amount of land was owned by a third party, it would be necessary to negotiate with them or realign the path.

Discussion ensued in which the transportation and network manager explained that the provision of a section of the cycle way had been agreed as part of a development, on land owned by the city and county councils. This link could not be guaranteed to be constructed during the timeframe of the City Cycle Ambition grant funding.

Councillor Jackson said that he was sceptical that this scheme would provide value for money when other projects around the city would benefit from the investment. Acknowledging that the route would benefit pedestrians, he asked whether cyclists would use the cycle path. He also considered that the consultation had only included statutory consultees and that a decision should be deferred to allow for wider consultation.

Councillor Stonard said that as a ward councillor, he welcomed the cycling improvements and pointed out that pedalways were advisory. Confident cyclists could use other routes. The pedalways provided a safe environment for less confident cyclists. The “ambition” of Push the Pedalways was to double the numbers of cyclists over the next ten years. All the local members for Catton Grove considered that the proposed scheme was a positive move to replace the roundabout and provide a direct route from the airport, industrial and residential estates into the city centre and reduce car use.

The transportation and network manager explained that the scheme was unlikely to cost £330,000 that had been allocated in the original bid. She explained that a Dutch roundabout, as requested by the Norwich Cycling Campaign, would have been very expensive and therefore had not been taken forward. The Fifers Lane roundabout and the signalled crossing on its eastern side would encourage drivers to slow down and would be beneficial to cyclists and advantageous to pedestrians. Each scheme was designed to ensure that as many improvements could be made as possible to meet the needs of people using all modes of transport.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) note the results of the consultation;

- (2) approve the installation of :
 - (a) proposed works on Fifers lane, Ives Road and Heyford Road as shown on Plan No.PE4101-R1-031; and,
 - (b) proposed conversion of existing footpath between Bussey Road and Ives Road into footway / cycleway as shown on Plan No.PE4100-R1-010-P1.

6. Transport for Norwich Car Club Expansion 2016

(Councillor Bremner had declared an interest in this item.)

The principal planner (transport) introduced the report. Since the report had been written, two representations had been received regarding Fellowes Plain which was one of proposals which had not been recommended to progress.

Councillor Bremner referred to comments received in respect of the proposal for Bethel Street and suggested that consideration should be given to using two of the police car parking bays for the car club. He acknowledged the police needed parking spaces for operational reasons but considered that this should be explored before a decision was made.

Discussion ensued in which the principal planner answered members' questions and explained that that Bethel Street with the car club bay complied with national guidelines for the width of a road in an urban area. He also pointed out that a 20mph speed limit was recommended and the parking bays would help slow traffic down. The Bethel

Councillor Bremner moved and Councillor Morpew seconded that a decision on the proposals for the implementation of a car club bay in Bethel Street and its associated restrictions be deferred to a future meeting to allow for alternative options to be considered. On being put to the vote and all voting members voting in favour the amendment was carried.

The chair then moved the recommendations as amended and it was,

RESOLVED, unanimously, to:

- (1) note the consultation representations received regarding proposed car club bays;
- (2) agree not to implement those spaces detailed in paragraph 14 of this report;
- (3) ask the head of city development services to complete the necessary statutory procedures associated with implementing the following car club bays (and any associated restrictions as noted) as and when cars become available:

All Saints Green	Norman Road
Angel Road	Northumberland Street (with associated double yellow lines)
Atthill Road	Oak Street
Blackfriars Street	Opie Street
Branford Road	Penn Grove
Caernarvon Road (with associated double yellow lines)	Pettus Road
Calvert Street	Portersfield Road
College Road	Recreation Road
Crome Road	Redwell Street
Dover Street	Rouen Road
Edinburgh Road (with associated double yellow lines)	Rugge Drive
Girton Road	Salter Avenue
Godric Place	Silver Road
Greenways East (with associated double yellow lines)	St Benedicts Street
Greenways West	St Giles Street
Guernsey Road	St Phillips road
Havelock Road	Stafford Street
Helena Road	Sussex Street
Marlborough Road	St Albans Road
Maud Street	The Avenues
Nelson Street (with associated double yellow lines)	Wingfield Road

- (4) ask the head of city development services to complete the necessary statutory procedures associated with implementing double yellow lines on Silver Road adjacent to letter box;
- (5) defer consideration on the proposals for the implementation of a car club bay in Bethel Street and its associated restrictions to enable other options to be considered and delegate to the head of citywide development in consultation with the chair and vice-chair.

7. Britannia Road area traffic and parking management scheme (Community infrastructure levy (CIL) neighbourhood fund)

The committee noted that the Crome local members supported this proposal.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to:

- (1) note the proposed scheme objectives and associated measures;
- (2) ask the head of city development services to advertise for statutory public consultation the necessary traffic regulation order to provide waiting restrictions and road hump notice for traffic calming measures as detailed in this report.
- (3) note that any objections received will be considered by the committee in future.

8. End of Life Signalled Crossing on Whitefriars

The transportation and network manager introduced the report. The landlord of the Wig and Pen, St Martin Palace Plain, had expressed concern about the impact of further disruption from road works and the contractors' compound, particularly as summer was approaching and it would particularly affect patrons using the seated area.

Discussion ensued in which members expressed sympathy for the publican and other businesses in the area affected by the roadworks for the Tombland scheme. The vice chair said that the Whitefriars crossing was not on a natural desire line and the proposed new signalled crossing and associated works on St Martin Palace Plain was better situated for access to the riverside walk and the Puppet Theatre.

During discussion, the transportation and network manager referred to the report and answered members' questions. She explained that the scheme was an opportunity to use funding to complete this section of the Pink Pedalway. Funding needed to be committed this financial year or it would be lost. Members considered the consultation responses. The implementation of a signalled crossing (£100,000) was significantly more expensive than a zebra crossing (£40,000). The new crossing was considered to be better for cyclists. The committee was reminded that the area would become a 20mph zone and therefore better suited to a zebra crossing at this location.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve:

- (1) the removal of the existing signal crossing on Whitefriars, and,
- (2) the installation of a zebra with cycle crossing facility with associated works located on St Martin at Palace Plan to the south of the junction leading to Bishopgate as detailed on Plan No. 15-HD-028-12.

9. Committee schedule of meetings 2016-17

RESOLVED, having considered the report of the executive head of business relationship management and democracy, to agree, subject to the approval of the city council's annual council, the schedule of meetings for the civic year 2016-17, all meetings to be at 10:00 and held at City Hall:

16 June 2016
21 July 2016
15 September 2016
24 November 2016
19 January 2017
16 March 2017

10. Major road works – Regular roadworks

The highways and major projects manager (Norfolk County Council) presented a public statement on the surfacing material issues identified by Tarmac. (A copy of the statement was circulated at the meeting.)

Discussion ensued in which the chair and vice chair commented on the statement. They expressed disappointment that the situation had arisen. The contractors should be made aware of the extent of the disruption it had on residents and road users in the city and that it could not happen again. They also commented that they expected the contractors to have issued an apology to the people who were affected.

The transportation and network manager said that the Woodcock Road works would slip back a month to take place from May to July.

RESOLVED to note the public statement about the failure in the road surfacing and the report.

CHAIR