

Norwich Highways Agency committee

10:00 to 11:30

5 September 2019

Present: **County Councillors:** **City Councillors:**
 Adams (chair) (v)* Stonard (vice chair) (v)
 Mackie Stutely (v)
 Clipsham Carlo
 Ward Maxwell

Apologies: County Councillor Gurney and City Councillor Neale

*(v) voting member

1. Member question/statement

Councillor Stutely asked a question to the chair, about the Transport for Norwich – A140 Mile End Road and Colman Road Improvements to Relieve Congestion at the Daniels Road Roundabout scheme which had been approved at the last meeting, as follows:

“At the meeting on 21 March 2019 the committee approved the Transport for Norwich – A140 Mile End Road and Colman Road Improvements to Relieve Congestion at the Daniels Road Roundabout. Following discussion, I moved, seconded by the chair, that the committee noted that the proposed scheme would impact on the existing school crossing patrol operating at the Colman Road / South Park Avenue junction and resolved to ask the Transport for Norwich manager to explore the impact on the school crossing patrol and request additional resource are provided if needed (ie, an additional school crossing patrol officer.)

Following the meeting, I was advised that the request for an additional school crossing patrol officer had been denied. I also wrote to this committee’s former chair, Councillor John Fisher, in his new capacity as cabinet member for children’s services (Norfolk County Council) to seek his support for a new road crossing patrol officer at the school. Councillor Fisher replied stating several guidance notes and county council policy which he considered justified this refusal. None of this applies to this junction because of its unique and exceptional circumstances as alluded to in this extract from Councillor Fisher’s reply where he curiously makes the case for me:

“Road Safety GB guidance states:

SCPs (school crossing patrols) should not be located on light-controlled crossings unless there are exceptional circumstances such as poor driver behaviour (for example red light running), large groups of children crossing or concern about the children’s age and ability to use the facility correctly. Local road safety enforcement, education or pedestrian training at the school in question may help to address these concerns.”

There is certainly a risk from red light running, large groups of children and vulnerable children (both young and with disabilities) in this case. Astonishingly, in one statement Councillor Fisher wrote that “it is the responsibility of the parent/guardian to get their child(ren) to and from school safely, not NCC’s (Norfolk County Council). I have argued that there are many reasons why parents must ask their children to walk to school alone, and despite Councillor Fisher’s dismissal, it certainly happens. According to the Eastern Daily Press’s research in 2018, the Colman Road/South Park Avenue is the fourth most dangerous in the city. It is certainly one of the busiest for both traffic and pedestrians. If the scheme goes ahead without the provision of a new school crossing patrol there will be significant risk of serious collisions involving children. The county council is failing in its obligation to provide a second school crossing patrol to help ensure our children’s safety.

I am concerned that the scheme will be implemented without an additional school crossing patrol officer and that the full implications of this were not available to members when making their decision. I therefore intend to campaign to stop the implementation of this scheme.

Please can you confirm what the outcome of the Transport for Norwich manager’s exploration into the impact of the scheme on the operation of the school crossing patrol was and confirm that he agrees that it is impossible for one school crossing patrol officer to manage the staggered crossings throughout the traffic light cycle and therefore, what are the reasons for not providing additional resources to maintain the current level of service to the children and families crossing at both South Park Avenue and Colman Road.”

Councillor Tony Adams, chair, replied as follows:

“Thank you for your question. I can confirm that following the Norwich Highways Agency committee meeting in March, the Transport for Norwich manager spoke with colleagues at county council regarding the resourcing of the school crossing patrol at this location.

These discussions identified that the decision had been taken by the children’s services committee to not employ additional road crossing patrols and to remove sites that fail to meet the national guidance as the postholder resigns. The issue of road crossing patrols has been discussed at numerous childrens’ services committee meetings where members were advised that national guidance had made it clear that road crossing patrols were not to be provided at sites where a pelican (signal controlled) crossing was in place. This location does not meet the

national criteria as there is a signal controlled crossing already in place. It is not appropriate for the Transport for Norwich manager to comment on the ability of the current school crossing patrol arrangements to manage the proposed staggered crossings.

The Transport for Norwich manager responded directly to you outlining the outcome of those discussions and Councillor John Fisher has also responded to you on this issue. I am also aware that your concerns were raised and noted at a recent Transforming Cities joint committee meeting at County Hall.”

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Stutely said that whilst he supported the scheme which would relieve congestion on the road network, he considered that without an additional school crossing patrol officer it was unsatisfactory. He asked the Transport for Norwich manager (Norfolk County Council) whether the modest sum of around £4,000 per annum to provide a crossing patrol was worth the risk of a child's life at this junction. The Transport for Norwich manager, Norfolk County Council, replied that this was a question for members and that he was not in a position to reply. He pointed out that the responsibility of crossing controls had recently been transferred from children's services to the fire service and that a review across all locations was being undertaken. Councillor Stutely emphasised that his concern was for the safety of children crossing at this junction and that he would be actively campaigning in support of an additional school crossing patrol officer.

2. Public Questions/Petitions

Public questions

The chair announced that three questions have been received which related to Item 5 (below), Welsh Streets' Area Permit Parking Re-consultation.

Question 1

Ms Sandi George asked the following question on behalf of Ms Rosalind Marriott, owner of a property in Caernarvon Road:

“As a responsible landlady of 47 Caernarvon Road, I am concerned at the proposal to introduce parking permits in Caernarvon Road. I need to visit the property on and off during July and August in order to maintain the property to an acceptable standard, in September I need to visit in order to carry out an inventory with the students and in January to interview prospective students for the following academic year. On each occasion I spend more than 4 hours at the property during the working day.

Please would you ask the committee to explain where I should park or what sort of permit I should apply for? I should add that I live 145 miles from Norwich.”

Councillor Tony Adams, chair, replied on behalf of the committee:

“Thank you for your question and I am sure you realise that a very significant proportion of the houses and flats in the permit parking areas in Norwich that are within permit parking areas are let out rather than owner occupied. Consequently, the need for landlords to access and maintain properties is well understood and a range of options are available to landlords and their contractors depending on the nature of the visit.

Details of these are available on Norwich City Council’s website, and as we have had very few issues with landlords over the many years that we have operated permit parking schemes I think it is unlikely that you will have any problems should the permit scheme go ahead.

Your tenants will also have access to the visitor permit scheme which provides not only the four hour permit, but all day visitor permits as well.”

At the chair’s discretion, Ms George asked a supplementary question on Ms Marriott’s behalf regarding the restriction of two cars per household in controlled parking zones and how this would affect houses in multiple- occupation (HMOs). The principal planner (transport), Norwich City Council, replied on behalf of the committee and confirmed that households in the permit parking zones outside the city centre could have two residents’ permits and a four hour visitors’ pass and up to 60 day scratch cards per annum. He pointed out that the average car was wider than the average terrace house in the city and therefore where a household had a second car, it meant that they had to park outside someone else’s house and that he hoped that residents would be considerate of their neighbours.

Question 2

Ms Sandi George, Caernarvon Road resident, asked the following question:

'As a long standing resident of Caernarvon Road for 41 years plus, I like others have seen the coming and going of traffic and parking in the area and heard the question that continually rears its head - 'Do we or don't we want parking permits? And here we are again.

Please remember that Caernarvon Road is the longest road within the group of roads in this second, this year, consultation.

We are also the road that is the most inconvenienced by non-resident traffic. How? Well, we accommodate anyone who has any association with both Avenue Junior School (where incidentally I used to teach full-time) and Peabody Nursery – e.g. parents, visitors and staff who choose to park on our road. Since the last consultation we have also had Cadent blocking off parts of the road with their equipment and digging up the road and adjoining roads for gasworks. Then there have been road closures because of work at the junction with Earlham Road and over all of these weeks, parking has not been an issue.

You would think that with all this extra traffic requiring parking, Caernarvon Road residents would without question and unanimously, vote for parking permits but you would be wrong.

Every time we have voted 'No' loud and clear, and we have done it this time around too. We trust those who park on our street and they appreciate the flexibility no parking permit gives. Take this away and all is lost. No-one likes their freedom taken away especially if there is nothing to be gained by it.

By imposing parking permits you will make those residents who share abodes and have more vehicles than the allotted number of permits per household, seek elsewhere to park hence perpetuation rather than solving, parking issues. And I put it to you that this is why we are here now - half of College Road etc., was permitted about two years back and cars moved to the other part of College Road and residents there objected. Before they lived in harmony knowing that if you chose to live with on road parking, you have to park where you can.

Absolutely nothing will be gained for Caernarvon Road by forcing parking permits upon us, except to hit our pockets.

Leave Caernarvon Road alone and let us see if we are impacted by what you are proposing to do around us. Let us be an experiment. If it doesn't work, you can say 'We told you so' but give us that chance.'

Where is the money coming from to implement what you propose? £46,000 for the first phase. £46,000 for this? Couldn't the pot holes be fixed instead?

Is this the intention of a sweeping permit city?"

Councillor Tony Adams, chair, replied on behalf of the committee:

"We are due to consider the proposals for permit parking in your area today, and I am confident that members of this committee will take account of the points that you have raised, which I note are confirmed by the information contained within the report.

I believe it is the case that local councillors have canvassed in the area about permit parking (as this is something that has been routinely raised by some residents of many of the streets in your area) but this recent consultation is the first time that residents in the area have been formally asked with the prospect of permit parking actually being funded and installed for very many years.

Permit parking schemes are self-financing and the income that we get from permits pays for their implementation, maintenance and enforcement. We do not aim to make any additional income from them to pay for other services such as filling potholes. If a surplus is made then this would be spent on transport improvement in the Norwich area; however, the permit parking scheme has not made any significant surplus in recent years."

Ms George by way of a supplementary question, referred to the re-consultation as a "second referendum" and said that the residents of Caernarvon Road were adamantly opposed to the proposals and that there were ample parking spaces during the day. The principal planner (transport) said that the reality was that if Caernarvon Road was not included in the controlled parking zone then it would have problems of displaced parking from the surrounding streets. The issue was not in the day but when people

returned from work and could not find spaces to park. Controlled parking zones removed cars of people who did not live in the area and ensured that spaces were available for residents.

Question 3

Mrs Mary Clark, Earlham Road, asked the following question:

“I am a resident of the section of Earlham Road in the postcode NR2 3RW. I would appreciate if the following information could be supplied to all the members of the highway committee ahead of the above meeting.

Although the report to the committee states that the overall threshold for implementing parking permits was reached on Earlham Road, this ignores the distinction between sections of Earlham Road. The council officers have decided that the boundary of the zone should be Christchurch Rd, which, whilst a junction, does not reflect the lived experience of residents, which is that the ‘natural break’ is at Earlham House/Batley Court and the entrance to the Earlham Cemetery on Earlham Road.

If one takes the row of 15 terraced houses between Earlham House and Christchurch Road as a community and as a postcode (NR2 3RW), this does not sit as a natural part of the ‘Welsh Roads’ community. Based on discussions with my neighbours over the last two days, I have ascertained that all but five of the fifteen households are opposed to the imposition of permits. Although I accept that there is a need to impose boundaries somewhere on a somewhat arbitrary basis, this particular boundary does not reflect the natural boundaries and disenfranchises a particular group of residents as they happen to be on Earlham Road.

I would therefore ask the council officers to break down the responses on Earlham Road further using the methodology in paragraphs 11 and 12 of the committee report, based on postcode, and provide this to committee members before they make a decision. I know that this will show that the vast majority of residents beyond Earlham House/Batley Court on the south side of Earlham Road are opposed to parking permits.

Given that the majority of parking on this stretch of Earlham is by residents (it is not widely used by commuters as it is too far out of the city centre and parking during the proposed hours of the permit is rarely an issue), the solution of imposing parking permits is in effect a solution to a problem that does not exist, and disadvantages the residents unnecessarily. If the breakdown shows that the residents of NR2 3RW are indeed mostly opposed to the permits, I would therefore propose that the boundary of the zone on the south side of Earlham Road would be Earlham House/Batley Court, not Christchurch Road.

If this were to be the case, the committee would also then need to consider the context of the north side of Earlham Road (NR2 3RQ), where the residents may have differing views. It would clearly be disadvantageous to end up with permit parking on one side of the road and not the other, so, if the target is reached for permits by taking both of these post code areas as a whole, so be it.”

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

“Thank you for your question

I understand that officers did not break down the Earlham Road result into two sections, because there was an overall majority in favour on both sides of the divide at Bately Court.

On the city side of that point there were 26 households in favour of permits with 11 against (70 per cent in favour), whilst the stretch between Bately Court and Christchurch Road there were 12 households in favour and 9 against (57 per cent in favour).

It was made clear in the consultation letter that was sent to residents that we would consider the outer part of Earlham Road separately if that area did not favour permits whilst the inner area did. The result was not split in the report as that was not the case.”

In reply to Mrs Clark’s supplementary question, the principal planner (transport) confirmed that it was proposed to extend the controlled parking zone on Earlham Road to Christchurch Road and that the residents of Earlham House and Bately Court and businesses at Earlham House would be eligible for permits. He also agreed with Mrs Clark that to ensure access to the rear of properties (180 to 208 Earlham Road), he would ask members to consider the advertisement of double yellow lines at this location later on in the meeting.

Petition

The chair announced that notification of a petition had been received of a petition which related to Item 5 (below), Welsh Streets’ Area Permit Parking Re-consultation.

Mr Shan Barclay, Caernarvon Road resident, presented the following petition:

“Respected chair and members on the committee, I have lived in Norwich for 40 years and on Caernarvon Rd for 30, the parking situation on our street is no worse now than thirty years ago.

There have been three previous attempts to impose permits on our road and in every case the great majority felt we didn’t need them and this is still the case, maybe even more so now.

I am sorry that I have had to draw up a petition again because the recent consultation had to be re-run, even though previously our street, being so strongly against, was not initially included. This is because our previous petition had to be put aside to make way for the new hearing. With due respect to Bruce Bentley and all the hard work he and others have had to put into it, I believe that all of this was actually unnecessary. Also I regret that I was unaware that this hearing had been brought forward so the deadline for submission this hand petition was cut short so I was unable to get more signatures of which there could have been many, not only I stress from Caernarvon Road.

I stress also that none of these signatures was obtained under duress, quite the contrary. My first question to all was: "have you received the letter from Bruce Bentley about parking permits and if you have, have you responded online? If not, I recommend you do so straight away, however you wish and many as a result who would not otherwise have done so actually did this.

If they were against, I only then invited them to sign. There were also many who were out and some houses were empty when I called and even despite this, as you will have seen, the petition still has over 100 signatures.

The question on the petition read: "We the undersigned do not wish to have permit parking on our streets". Namely Caernarvon, Denbigh, Milford, Swansea and Wellington. (Some signed from neighbouring streets who were nevertheless affected and were against too).

The main reason I encountered for not signing was from those who feared that if they voted against and the decision went the other way, their street might be used by others from neighbouring streets and elsewhere which had permits as an alternative parking place. Had it not been for this many more would probably have signed.

To refute this fear, I cite among other things the fact that when recently Denbigh was largely unavailable for over two weeks owing to gas main works, there was still no great problem (Upwards of 15 car spaces at a time were lost).

Among reasons for not having permits were:

- No need
- Won't help us because only between 8-6.30pm when not needed anyway
- Costly,
- Inconvenient,
- An imposition,
- Will create ill-will because we will have to 'police' our streets,
- Don't want to have patrols,

Also, that supposed 'cost-neutral' claim doesn't include fines which could come to a lot; and others as well, including that permits do not guarantee as some mistakenly thought a space near or in front of their house: and that 'all or none vote' is an imposition as well.

To sum up, I respect democracy and the need to have it, but maintain that ruling out the firm opinion of many, as seen in this petition and no doubt online too, is also undemocratic and feel that this opinion should be heard and accommodated also

Personally, and I believe that I am not alone in this on Caernarvon Road at least, I would be willing to take the risk of remaining as we are without permits for the sake of the integrity of our street which is a very neighbourly one and which for example has had very successful street closure events among other things to

prove it. I therefore invite the chair and committee to consider this option in view of the very large opinion here that permits are unwanted and an imposition.

To this end I humbly submit this petition to you now.”

Councillor Tony Adams, chair, replied on behalf of the committee:

“Thank you for taking the trouble to organise this petition and for submitting it to this committee.

As this petition directly relates to the item on today’s agenda, I hope you will agree that it is right that the members of the committee should consider your representations while they debate the proposals.”

(The chair advised Mr Barclay that according to the city council’s constitution a supplementary question was not permitted when presenting a petition. However, in response to concerns raised by residents, it was noted that the rescheduled date of the September meeting of this committee had been advertised for several weeks on the city council’s website.)

3. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Carlo declared an other interest in item 5 (below) ‘Welsh Streets’ Area Permit Parking Consultation” in that she lived in the consultation area and was a Nelson ward councillor. She also said that she did not own a car and did not have a predetermined view.

4. Minutes

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 21 March 2019.

5. ‘Welsh Streets’ Area Permit Parking Re-Consultation

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

Councillor Carlo, Nelson ward councillor, said that controlled parking zones had been introduced because commuters outside the city were parking on residential streets and either walking or catching buses into the city. The introduction of this scheme was a conundrum with residents in College Road having waited for some time for the opportunity to be included in a scheme and residents in Caernarvon Road and Earlham Road being opposed to inclusion a controlled parking zone. The principal planner (transport) then responded to questions Councillor Carlo asked on behalf of residents. He confirmed that the scheme in College Road had been approved at the last meeting and demonstrated on a plan the position of the four hour short stay parking on College Road and that the yellow lines in front of the school would extend to the end of the current zig zag lines in front of the school. He was confident that there was sufficient parking for permit holders in College Road, as some of the houses in College Road

were large and had off street parking. He also explained that it was usual to provide short stay parking close to businesses. The Mitre had its own car park but parking spaces had been provided in the vicinity because St Thomas's church hall was nearby. During discussion, members considered the issues raised by the re-consultation and members expressed sympathy for the residents who were opposed to parking permits. Members noted the "edge effect", where people outside the city park in residential streets and catch the bus or walk into the city, with one member reporting that residents in Crome ward were experiencing this too. Members commented that HMOs exacerbated the pressure on parking in this area. The committee took into account that the majority of residents in Caernarvon Road had consistently opposed a residents' permit parking scheme and that once the scheme was fully implemented it would be subject to displacement parking from adjacent streets.

Discussion ensued in which the voting members considered that Caernarvon Road could be excluded from the proposed extension of the previously approved scheme with provision to review the implementation of the scheme within a short period. Members sought the opinion of the local member, Councillor Carlo as to whether the remaining section of Denbigh Road and top end of Milford Road should also be excluded. Councillor Carlo said that she could support the trial on Caernarvon Road given the intensity of feelings that residents had expressed. She said that she took a neutral stance on the controlled parking zone as she was not a car owner and did not want to impose permit parking on other people. However she commented that the remaining section of Denbigh Road was particularly narrow and there was a problem of cars being parked on the pavement and that she was concerned about its proximity to The Garden House. Members indicated that because of the experience of knock on effect of controlled parking zones on neighbouring streets and that Caernarvon Road would be surrounded by streets with parking permits; then in the residents' interests the trial should be reviewed by the committee at its March meeting and this would also fit in with the statutory process which needed to be completed within in a two year period.

The principal planner (transport) with the aid of a plans suggested that extra double yellow lines on the south side of Earlham Road should extend from the existing zebra crossing near Bately Court west to the houses on Earlham Road to prevent parking across the access to the rear of these properties.

The chair and vice chair moved the recommendations as set out in the report and as amended above in relation to excluding Caernarvon Road from the controlled parking zone and reviewing it at the March meeting of this committee, and commencing the statutory process in relation to the proposed double yellow lines on the south side of Earlham Road.

RESOLVED, with all 4 voting members voting in favour (Councillors Adams, Mackie, Stonard and Stutely) to:

- (1) note the responses to the permit parking consultation;
- (2) to trial the exclusion of Caernarvon Road from the controlled parking zone and to review the outcome of this trial at the meeting of this committee on 19 March 2020;

- (3) approve the extension of the previously approved scheme - Monday-Saturday, 8:00am to 6:30pm (8:00 to 18:30) controlled parking zone (CPZ) (as shown on the plans (nos. PL/TR/3584/440/A) and as set out in Appendix 1 to include the following streets that were previously excluded from the scheme:
 - (a) Denbigh Road (remaining section);
 - (b) Earlham Road (part) to its junction with Christchurch Road;
 - (c) Milford Road;
 - (d) Swansea Road;
- (4) ask the head of city development services to complete the statutory processes to implement these proposals;
- (5) ask the head of city development services to commence the statutory process to implement:
 - (a) short stay parking spaces as shown on the plan in Appendix 2 on Havelock Road, Milford Road and Swansea Road; and ,
 - (b) double yellow lines on the south side of Earlham Road, between the pedestrian crossing at Bately Court and nos 180 and 182 Earlham Road to provide access to the access road to the rear of nos 180 to 208 Earlham Road;
- (6) delegate the consideration of any representations to the short stay parking spaces to the head of development services in consultation with the chair and vice chair of this committee.

6. Proposed waiting restrictions in Catton Grove and University wards – consultation results

Councillor Stonard, Catton Grove ward councillor spoke in support of the proposals to install the waiting restrictions as advertised and said that he understood the reasons for the additional installation of cycle stands, directional arrows as road markings and a white “H” bar at the car park of the flats at Lilburne Avenue, as set out in the report.

RESOLVED, with all 4 voting members voting in favour (Councillors Adams, Mackie, Stonard and Stutely) to:

- (1) approve the implementation of waiting restrictions and minor works in the following locations:
 - (a) Catton Grove Road / Lilburne Avenue / Woodgrove Parade as shown on plan No. PL/TR/3329/786;
 - (b) Heyford Road and Stirling Road as shown on plan No. PL/TR/3329/786;

- (c) Earlham Road – layby outside St Marys Church as shown on plan No. PL/TR/3329/795;
 - (d) North Park Avenue as shown on plan Nos. PL/TR/3329/796 and 79;.
- (2) ask the head of city development services to complete the statutory processes to implement these proposals.

CHAIR