

MINUTES**Norwich Highways Agency committee****10am to 12.30pm****24 July 2014**

Present: **County Councillors:** **City Councillors:**
 Adams (V) (chair) Stonard (vice chair) (V)
 Bremner (V) Harris (V)
 Sands (M) Gayton
 Shaw Carlo
 Grahame

*(V) voting member

Apologies: County Councillor Hebborn (other council business)

1. Governance arrangements**RESOLVED** to note:

- (1) that the county council had elected Councillor Adams as chair for the ensuing civic year;
- (2) record Councillor Adams' gratitude to Councillor Stonard, who as vice chair, had acted as chair in the interim period.

2. Petition

(A petition about item 8 (below) Push the Pedalways – Park Lane to Vauxhall Street, had been received and would be considered when the committee considered that item on the agenda.)

3. Public questions**Thorpe Hamlet flooding**

Mr Kevin Marsh, a chartered engineer living in Wellesley Avenue South, asked the following question and referred to a display of maps/drawings and slides, which he had prepared in advance of the meeting. :

“On Sunday the heavy rainfall which hit Thorpe Hamlet flooded a number of properties and potentially would have flooded more without intervention of the local residents. This is the third time in the last 18 months that a so called ‘extreme event’ has overwhelmed the drainage system and threatened local properties.

I am keen to raise the concerns of the local residents and hopefully find a solution which will prevent this happening in future.”

The Norwich Agency/NATS manager, Norfolk County Council, thanked Mr Marsh for his illustrations and asked permission to take these back to highways engineers at the county council for further consideration. He then replied to the question on behalf of the committee as follows:

“As a result of the flooding experienced in May and July 2014 a flood investigation is currently being carried out in Norwich City Centre, Hellesdon, Sprowston and Thorpe Hamlet. Norfolk County Council, the districts,, Norwich City Council and Anglian Water will be working in partnership to identify causes to the flooding. The result of this investigation will form a list of recommendations for the respective bodies and effected persons to implement.. The recommendations list will be published in October 2014, however, work with the effected persons will be on-going preceding the publication of this list.”

Mr Marsh said that he was pleased that the planned action and that Anglian Water would be included in the consultation as the sewers were the main issue.

(Two public questions about item 8, Push the Pedalways – Park Lane to Vauxhall Street, had been received and would be taken when the committee considered that item on the agenda. A question had also been received from local members about item 9, below, Push the Pedalways – 20mph areas)

4. Declarations of interest

Councillors Bremner, Gayton, Grahame and Stonard declared an other, non-pecuniary, interest in item 6 below, Permit parking review, in that they all hold residents’ visitor parking permits. Councillor Grahame also said that she used a permit in the course of her work.

5. Minutes

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 12 June 2014.

6. Permit parking review

(Councillors Bremner, Gayton, Grahame and Stonard had declared an interest in this item.)

Discussion ensued in which the transportation and network manager, Norwich City Council, referred to the report and answered members' questions.

Members considered that it was important to reach a balance between charging residents an appropriate charge whilst deterring abuse of the residents' visitors' parking permits. There was a need to address the abuse of visitor parking permits, encourage people to seek alternative use to cars and alleviate pressure on parking spaces within the controlled parking zone.

Members also sought reassurance that there would be provision for carers, including family members visiting for childcare purposes. It was suggested that evidence for parking permits for long term use by carers could be demonstrated by the receipt of appropriate benefits or a doctor's letter. The transportation and network manager confirmed that she would ensure that the consultation captured information on the number of families using visitor passes for family members providing childcare in their homes. There would be an article in the Citizen magazine to raise awareness of the proposed changes and consultation. Members were also advised that tradesmen working in controlled parking zones could use the visitor permit for the property they were working on or parking waivers that many already had. It was possible for the civil enforcement officers to identify the owner of the permits using their hand held devices.

The vice chair said the consultation would be conducted for four weeks in September and that in order not to miss an opportunity to implement the scheme in November 2014, he proposed that the committee met in October 2014 to receive the results of the consultation.

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

- (1) agree the recommendations and changes to the visitor permit parking scheme to replace the current Visitor permit scheme with:
 - (a) a new short stay visitor permit offering two hours of parking for visitors (operated by a 'clock'): this would be offered free to households on certain means tested benefits.
 - (b) up to 60 'pay as you go' day permit scratchcards per household per year
 - (c) the charges being set as follows:
 - (i) shortstay visitor permit at the rate of £10 administration charge and 75p per month for enforcement ie £14.50 for 6 months and £19 for 12 months, with a maximum period of 18 months;
 - (ii) Scratchcards to be a maximum of 60 for each household at a cost of £1 each in inner city zones, and 50p for the outer Norwich zones.

- (2) ask the head of city development services to consult on the proposals in the autumn 2014.
- (3) hold an extraordinary meeting of the Norwich Highways Agency committee on 23 October 2014 at 10am to consider the outcome of the consultation.

7. Push the Pedalways - The Avenues

The chair moved the recommendations in the report and discussion ensued.

Councillor Carlo, local member for Nelson Ward, expressed concern that local members had not been given an opportunity to comment on the proposed scheme before it had been presented to the committee. She stated that she was concerned about the proposals generally and was not supportive of the details, citing the dedicated with-flow cycle lanes as a concern due to the needs of different cycle users who will travel at different speeds. The transportation and network manager apologised and said that she would ensure that local members were given an opportunity to comment on the scheme before it went out for further consultation in September. The transportation and network manager apologised and said that she would ensure that local members were given an opportunity to comment on the scheme before it went out for further consultation in September.

During discussion the transportation and network manager and the design, landscape and conservation manager, Norwich City Council, answered members' questions and referred to the report and slides and plans displayed at the meeting. The vice chair confirmed that the Push the Pedalways board had taken into consideration comments from members of the public and other members concurred that there was local support for the proposed scheme which would improve cycling in the Avenues; protect the grass verges and tree roots; accommodate additional bus movements and extend the existing 20mph speed restrictions in the area. The design, landscape and conservation manager confirmed that the cycle track would be sufficient width to allow faster cyclists to overtake slower ones. The project manager had liaised with the landscape architects and the tree protection officers on the preservation of the trees. The detail of the location of the two bus stops on the Avenues would be open for consultation.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to:

- 1) note the results of the consultation on the options for The Avenues
- 2) ask the head of city development services to carry out public consultation and the necessary statutory procedures in relation to introducing the proposals shown on plan numbers PE4073-MMD-301739CA04-fea-0090 & 0091 and listed below;
 - (a) Continuous one way cycle tracks 2m-2.2m in width on both sides of The Avenues between Bluebell Road and Colman Road built over the verge with a low kerb separating them from the carriageway
 - (b) Speed reducing crossing tables for cyclists and pedestrians travelling along The Avenues at the following side roads: George Borrow Road, Lovelace Road, Stannard Road and the entrances to Bluebell

allotments; at the junction of Bluebell Road and Cow Drive; and across Bluebell Road north of The Avenues

- (c) The provision of cycle tracks partly separated from the footway on the north side of The Avenues linking to the toucan crossing over Colman Road
- (d) Extending the existing 20mph restrictions so that all streets within the area bounded by Earlham Road, Bluebell Road, Jessop Road and Christchurch Road are covered by a 20mph restriction. Bluebell Road between Earlham Road and North Park Avenue and North Park Avenue will also be subject to the 20mph restriction. The area is shown on the plan attached as appendix 8
- (e) The reinforcement of sufficient verge space with a porous material on The Avenues between Stannard Road and Bluebell Road to allow residents' to park cars off the carriageway, without obstructing the cycle tracks, and access parking within the curtilage of their properties while minimising damage to verges and trees and with vehicles physically prevented from accessing other areas of verge.
- (f) alterations to the traffic signals at the junction of Colman Road and The Avenues to:
 - (i) give cyclists dedicated signals that release them to cross Colman Road several seconds ahead of vehicles;
 - (ii) provide a signalised pedestrian crossing over Colman Road immediately to the south of The Avenues with raised table courtesy crossings at the entrances to the service lanes;
 - (iii) convert the crossing over Colman Road immediately to the north of The Avenues into a toucan crossing that cyclists can ride across alongside pedestrians;
 - (iv) advanced stop boxes enlarged to 7.5m.

8. Push the Pedalways – Park Lane to Vauxhall Street

Mr Bryan Lingwood, Park Lane, by way of introduction, said that the petition had been signed by over 50 residents in Park Lane, representing about 71% of the households and therefore a greater number of households than the 19 people who had responded to the council consultation. The majority of residents would like a reduction in traffic on the road but did not support the proposal to close Park Lane. He then presented the following petition:

“As residents of Park Lane, we are strongly opposed to the Push The Pedalways scheme insofar as it affects Park Lane.

- We do not have a traffic problem. What matters is safety for all road users - pedestrians, cyclists and car drivers alike, as we all share the road, and that means reducing speed, rather than prioritising cyclists.
 - Closure of Park Lane is unnecessary: There is no evidence at all that cyclists are currently deterred from using Park Lane. Installing

a barrier would damage our environment. The proposals would increase rather than reduce the speed of vehicles;

- Gaining access to our homes would become more difficult and would result in confusion for drivers;
- Larger vehicles, including Heavy Goods Vehicles, would have to make 3 (or 5) point turns in order to get back to Earlham Road or to exit via Mill Hill Road;
- It would displace vehicles into the smaller adjacent streets which are quite unsuitable, with consequent harmful effects.

We ask the committee to rethink this aspect of the scheme.”

The transportation and network manager responded on behalf of the committee as follows:

“Before I address the concerns raised in the petition I think it would be useful if I give some context to the proposals.

As members are aware, both the city and county councils are committed to delivering the Norwich area transportation strategy (NATS). NATS recognises that growth within the city and the surrounding urban area cannot be supported in transport terms by the reliance on the private car and that the key to unlocking further potential in the city relies on modal shift towards walking, cycling and public transport. The NATS implementation plan that was adopted in 2010 identified the need to develop a cycle network plan in conjunction with local users groups. This work started in 2011 and involved a series of cycle rides involving officers, members and cycling enthusiasts to develop the best routes for linking key destinations.. This resulted in the launch in June 2012 of the Norwich Cycle Network, which comprises; 5 cross city radial routes and 2 orbital routes linking the key employment, education and leisure areas. These main routes are called pedalways and each has a colour to help people find their way around the network. Connecting these pedalways is a network of local neighbourhood cycle routes.

The pink pedalway, where most of the cycle ambition grant money is being spent, runs from the hospital and the research park, through the UEA, along The Avenues, through the city centre, out across Mousehold and Heartsease and on to the “growth triangle” in Broadland.

Avenue Road and Park Lane are critical links in the pink and orange pedalways. Mill Hill Road is also a popular route for cyclists, which will be acknowledged in the next edition of the cycle map by conferring neighbourhood route status on it.

Surveys show that over 40% of traffic using the streets is through traffic, which is traffic that does not originate in the area between Earlham Road / Unthank Road and the outer ring road, or stop at any point in the area. On relatively narrow, heavily parked streets such traffic volumes can be intimidating to cyclists as vehicles weave in and out of gaps parked cars and cyclists have to judge whether they need to yield to oncoming vehicles. There is a particular problem in the morning peak hour when vehicles queuing on

Park Lane to access Unthank Road block the passage of cyclists and both pedestrians and cyclists experience the unpleasant effects of exhaust fumes.

The area is already traffic calmed, and subject to a 20mph speed limit; there is little scope to reduce speeds further. It is firmly believed that reducing traffic volumes in the area is the only way to see major improvements for cyclists.

As the plan in the supplementary report shows, the mechanism for introducing the road closures will be by way of bollards and street trees. These will be designed to be sympathetic to the environment and enhance the existing block work table at the junction of Park Lane and Avenue Road, creating a greater sense of place.

It is acknowledged that the road closures may result in slightly longer journey times and distances for local residents who choose to use their cars. This has to be balanced against the major improvements that will be made to those residents who choose to walk or cycle. Similarly the displaced traffic from local people using surrounding roads may see a small increase in traffic on some streets, but given the wide variety of alternative routes available it is unlikely that any one street will see a significant increase in traffic. These local residents know their area well and will quickly adjust their journeys to avoid the closures when they make journeys by car.

Inevitably there will be some confusion in the first few days of any closures being introduced but experience shows that this soon settles down and with adequate advance signing, drivers will soon find alternative routes.

With regard to how large vehicles will be accommodated, it is envisaged that the numbers of these will be very low; the weekly bin collections and the occasional delivery vehicle. These will be expected to enter via Park Lane and exit via Mill Hill Road or vice-versa. Most vehicles will be able to make the turn at the junction of Park Lane and Mill Hill Road in one manoeuvre but it is acknowledge that the largest vehicles may take more than this.

In response to the petitioner's request that the committee reconsiders the Park Lane closures, I would say that significant amounts of work have taken place since the last August when the announcement that we had been successful in securing the cycle ambition grant was made. Numerous options for this area have been considered by the delivery board and executive board for the cycle ambition project and the three options presented at the recent consultation are the only ones that offer significant benefits for cyclists, which is the focus of the project.

The consultation we undertook clearly shows a preference for the double road closure option, both among all respondents and those living in Park Lane and the surrounding streets. I have delved deeper into the online questionnaire results identifying those responses that are from Park Lane addresses. We had 19 responses from postcodes in Park Lane, and from these 17 supported the double road closure and two wanted none of the options. There is clearly a contradiction between the results we collected through a remote survey and the response to the petition.

I must remind members that today we are seeking permission to carry out the statutory consultation on the proposed road closures; we are not asking your permission to implement them. I would therefore ask that you allow this consultation to go ahead as planned.”

Mr Bryan Lingwood asked the following question:

“The comments I have made, both at the consultation event(s) and subsequently in writing, do not appear to have been addressed in the report by officers (item 8) and therefore may not be given sufficient consideration by the Norwich Highways Agency committee in making its decision.

- The route chosen does not meet the stated project aim: “to create a safe, enjoyable and direct cycling route from the east of Norwich to the west, which can be ridden by people of all ages”:
- the shortest, most direct route between Avenue Road/ Park Lane (near Maida Vale) and Pottergate (near Upper Goat Lane) is the long-established, very popular, signposted cycle route to/from the UEA which follows Mill Hill Road and West Pottergate (via the ‘underpass’ which avoids having to navigate the ‘inner ring road’). This is also the route currently recommended in all ‘circumstances’ via the city council website;
- Accident data (Feb. 2008 to Feb 2013) demonstrates that the long-established route via West Pottergate is also the safest route: the only major intersection is with Earlham Road, where there has been only two slight cycle incidents, compared to the two serious and three slight cycle incidents around the junction of Park Lane and Unthank Road, and the multiple cycle incidents around the Grapes Hill roundabout and Chapelfield Road crossing at Vauxhall Street;
- The long-established route via West Pottergate is also a more enjoyable route: being largely traffic-free; with significantly improved air quality due to the absence of buses; involving uninterrupted flow from West Pottergate (compared to at least seven ‘stops’ on the proposed route); and little, if any, potential for conflict with (or danger to) pedestrians.

The proposals presented will make conditions worse for pedestrians. Directing cyclists diagonally across the centre of Chapelfield Gardens, via the busy crossing to/from Vauxhall Street, has already resulted in conflict and accidents with pedestrians in this historic park (as stated in consultation documents).

Although consultation documents suggest that “the new paths and entrances will *encourage* cyclists to ride around the edge” inside the park, these are the paths that are very popular with dog walkers, joggers and, of course, pedestrians including those who would previously have used the pathway on the south side of Chapelfield North. Additional cyclists on this route would further worsen the conditions for pedestrians and visitors to this historic park.

The consultation stated that funding has been made available to “improve the conditions for cyclists” in an attempt to double the number of cycle journeys in Norwich by 2023. And yet, the proposals fail to improve the conditions, particularly at the accident ‘hot-spots’.

- The accident data highlights the risks to cyclists at roundabouts (Grapes Hill: 8 incidents; Earlham Road/Gypsy Lane: 9 incidents), and have prompted proposals to remove the roundabout at the Maids Head, so it seems unreasonable to think that a new mini-roundabout on Unthank Road would

make it safer for cyclists at the junction with Park Lane (particularly if combined with the re-location of the crossing, and the removal of the central 'refuge', which would create delays, and make it more hazardous, for cyclists turning right into Essex Street);

- Closure of Park Lane south of its junction with Avenue Road, would: increase the flow of traffic turning right from Mill Hill Road to Park Lane (and left into Mill Hill Road from Park Lane), where little, if any, currently exists; and/or cause more vehicles to turn-around in Mill Hill Road and Park Lane (north) i.e. the section between Avenue Road and Earlham Road; and, add to the hazards on Park Lane on the much narrower section between Denbigh Road and Earlham Road (particularly with heavy goods vehicles and others exiting Denbigh Road into Park Lane); all of which would create new dangers for the many cyclists who currently use this route;
- None of the measures to address what were identified to be issues affecting cycling on Essex Street (and Vauxhall Street) are now included in the proposals presented in the report (*agenda* item 8)

Therefore, the proposals presented will not improve the conditions for cyclists, in particular those who are inexperienced; and, if anything, conditions are likely to become worse for cyclists, and pedestrians, increasing the risks to all.

Given that the consultation is about "how the council can *best* create direct, safe and enjoyable pedalways through the area" (paragraph 25.), and taking into account that initial proposals to supposedly address the unfavourable conditions for cyclists on Essex Street (45-48) and Vauxhall Street (54-56) are now not to proceed, how does the council consider that: promoting a longer, evidently more dangerous route, which entails frequent interruption to flow, greater potential for conflict with pedestrians and motorists, and almost inevitable interaction with buses; would lead to a sustainable increase in the number of people choosing to cycle (or walk)?"

The transportation and network manager responded on behalf of the committee as follows:

"Mr Lingwood did indeed provide a very detailed response to the consultation and I would apologise that it did not receive more recognition in the report. I can assure you that all responses have been read and considered, but in writing this report the focus was on the issues that had been raised by more than one individual. The use of the West Pottergate route was raised only by Mr Lingwood. If the report had included every single detailed point made it would have been very unwieldy. Members are of course welcome to view any of the consultation responses in full if they wish.

As I explained in my response to the petition, we have a network of pedalways for the city linked by connecting neighbourhood routes. The route through West Pottergate is part of that green pedalway that links Bowthorpe in the west to Broadland Business Park in the East. We do not expect that many cyclists will ride from one end of a pedalway to another; instead they will make use of sections of one or more pedalways depending on their destination. For example a cyclist travelling along The Avenues and wanting to get to the Notre Dame School on Surrey Street is likely to follow the pink pedalway but the same cyclist wanting to get to the Jane Austen School in Colegate would choose the green pedalway for most of their journey. In recognition of this fact

we are now proposing to sign Mill Hill Road as a neighbourhood route linking the green and pink pedalways.

The inner ring road forms one of the key barriers to cycling across the city and it is vital that there are a number of crossing points to make the cycle network effective and safe. If the pink and green pedalways both shared the route through West Pottergate that would leave a long section of the southern ring road between Brazengate and West Pottergate without a dedicated pedalway crossing it. I completely agree that the West Pottergate route is valuable for cyclists, but we also need a route that crosses Chapel Field Road, as the pink pedalway does.

I cannot agree that the pink pedalway will make conditions worse for pedestrians; the improvements we are planning seek to improve conditions for both pedestrians and cyclists. For example Mr Lingwood raises the issue of Chapel Field Gardens; cyclists already use the narrow route through the middle of the gardens, our project encourages them to use a more suitable route through the Gardens.

Responding to the final point of why nothing is now proposed for Essex Street and Vauxhall Street. The case for improvements in this area is more marginal given that these streets carry a third of the traffic that Park Lane does, and the proportion of through traffic is significantly less. Apart from the lack of a contra flow facility in Essex Street current conditions here are less problematic than in the Park Lane area and therefore while the road closure that was proposed in Vauxhall Street would have limited benefits for cyclists, the closures on Park Lane will see significant improvements for them."

By way of response, Mr Lingwood thanked the officer for the response and said that he appreciated that not all comments received as part of the consultation could be incorporated. He expressed concern that there was potential for the number of accidents occurring in Chapel Field Gardens to increase and that he did not intend to use that cycle route but drive in instead.

Reverend David Hares asked the following question:

"Am I correct in understanding that, in the light of the feed-back in the consultation process, the proposal to have a 'Vehicle closure point with cycling access' in Vauxhall Street, near to the junctions with Trory Street and Walpole Street, has been removed from the scheme?"

The transportation and network manager responded on behalf of the committee as follows:

"Yes, that is correct. The public consultation showed little appetite among the respondents and particularly the local people for a closure. Given the low traffic flows in the area officers have concluded that the benefits for cyclists do not outweigh the concerns of the people living in the area."

The transportation and network manager referred to the report and presented the supplementary report which had been circulated at the meeting.

The vice chair spoke in support of the scheme and said that there had been extensive discussions with the residents of Park Lane. The next stage of the consultation would give residents a further opportunity to state their views.

In response to Councillor Carlo's concerns that local members had not been provided with details of the scheme before the publication of the report, the transportation and network manager apologised and said that the tight timescale for implementation of the project meant that any delay could jeopardise the scheme. It was unusual for the committee to be presented with a supplementary report comprising alternative proposals for schemes at its meeting. The vice chair suggested that the supplementary report demonstrated that the authority was listening to the comments of people received in response to the consultations on the scheme. The transportation and network manager undertook to contact local members and notify them of the proposals following the meeting.

During discussion the transportation and network manager answered members' questions and referred to the report. During discussion a member said that one of the objectives of the scheme was to provide cycle tracks that were suitable for the use of twelve year olds. The committee was shown a graph showing the traffic flows through Mill Hill Road, Avenue Road and Park Lane area. Discussion ensued on the proposed road closure and members were advised that a partial road closure during peak times would not be enforceable. It was acknowledged that the junction of Park Lane with Unthank Road was not ideal but the road closure would significantly reduce traffic. Traffic modelling showed that 80% of the current traffic would be distributed on to the road network, with around 20% of drivers seeking alternative routes in the area. The narrow streets of terraced houses were not attractive to drivers. Emergency vehicles carried bolt cutters and would be able to access the closed street. Residents and delivery vehicles would be able to access dwellings in Park Lane. All options had been explored for the best solutions for the pink and orange pedalways. The proposed introduction of a contra flow cycle lane in Essex Street and the proposal to designate Essex Street as set out in the supplementary report alleviated concerns about the scheme.

The chair expressed concern about the closure of Park Lane, reminded the committee that motorists paid road tax and their needs should be taken into consideration as well as residents, pedestrians and cyclists.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to:

- (1) note the results of the consultation on the options for the Park Lane to Vauxhall Street area;
- (2) ask the head of city development services to carry out public consultation and the necessary statutory procedures in relation to introducing the proposals shown on plan number 301739-ca08-500 and listed below:
 - (a) The introduction of a road closure on Park Lane to the immediate north of the junction with Avenue Road and a road closure on Avenue Road to the immediate east of Maida Vale. Cyclists and emergency vehicles will be exempt from those closures.

- (b) The introduction of a no waiting at any time restriction on the entire length of the northern side of Avenue Road, including the removal of the bus stop cage, the replacement of the bus stop cage and a 9m length of double yellow line on the southern side of Avenue Road with a permit parking restriction and the transfer of Maida Vale from parking zone R to parking zone P.
 - (c) The realignment of the junction of Park Lane with Unthank Road to provide wider shared-use footpath cycleways in the vicinity of the junction.
 - (d) The removal of the existing signalled crossing on Unthank Road by Essex Street and the provision of a new type of shared-use pedestrian / cyclist crossing on a raised table on Unthank Road between Park Lane and Essex Street.
 - (e) The introduction of contra flow cycling on the section of Rupert Street between Trinity Street and Cambridge Street
 - (f) Introduce a signed only contra flow cycle lane on Essex Street and explore the possibility of designating Essex Street as a Cycle Street.
 - (g) Extend the existing 20mph restriction on Unthank Road to the north of the Essex Street junction.
- (3) consider the solution for the routing of the pink pedalway in a southwest direction between Vauxhall Street and Park Lane that will be presented at the meeting and ask the Head of city development services to undertake public consultation and any necessary statutory procedures required in relation to those proposals, including the extension to the 20mph zone on Unthank Road.

9. Push the Pedalways – 20mph

Councillor Bearman, local member for Mancroft division, and also on behalf of Councillor Brociek-Coulton, local member for Sewell division and ward, asked the following question:

"Does the City Centre 20mph zone include Bull Close Road, between the junction with Charlton Road and Magdalen Road, and if not, could it please be added as it is directly outside Magdalen Gates primary school entrance?"

The senior transportation planner, Norwich City Council responded on behalf of the committee:

"The proposals in this report do not include a 20mph speed restriction on Bull Close Road. This was subject of much debate among the design team who came to the conclusion that given that the primary function of Bull Close Road as a local distributor road and therefore a 20mph restriction was not appropriate. However, on reflection, given the presence of the school, a part time 20mph advisory restriction could be employed at this location. This could be signed using an electronic flashing sign.

If members are minded to support this approach then the recommendation will need to be amended to include reference to a part time 20mph restriction on Bull Close Road.”

Councillor Bearman said that the survey data obtained by the community speed watch team gave an average vehicle speed in Bull Close Road as currently being 19.5mph and that a 20mph speed limit would be effective. He would prefer it to be a permanent 20mph speed limit rather than a part time school related 20mph speed limit.

Discussion ensued in which the senior transportation planner advised members that a flashing sign that would be used with a part time 20mph restriction would be more effective as drivers approaching the junction were concentrating on where they were going unlike in a quieter residential area. The estimated cost of implementing a flashing sign was around £1,000 and could be incorporated into the city centre scheme. In response to a question she advised that the permanent 20mph limit would cost less to introduce.

Councillor Stonard moved and Councillor Harris seconded that the consultation should include the permanent 20mph restriction on Bull Close between Magdalen Road and Charlton Road and with 3 voting members voting in favour (Councillors Stonard, Harris and Bremner) and 1 voting member voting against (Councillor Adams) the amendment to the recommendations in the report was carried.

During discussion on the proposed 20mph scheme, Councillor Shaw said that on behalf of residents in Woodside division, he was opposed to the proposals for the east of the city unless there were significant improvements to bus services.

Councillor Bremner, local member for University division and ward, said that there had been a positive response from residents in George Borrow Road to the proposals.

The vice chair said that the report helped achieve the city council’s objective to extend the 20mph speed limit to residential streets across the city.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to ask the head of city development services to carry out the necessary legal consultation in regards of a 20mph Speed Restriction Order for the areas shown on plan nos PL/TR/4142/225/1, 2 and 3, with the addition of Bull Close Road between Magdalen Road and Charlton Road and for a consolidation Speed Restriction Order for the whole of the Norwich area.

10. Push the Pedalways – Magdalen Street and Cowgate cycle contraflow

RESOLVED, having considered the report of the head of city development services, to:

- (1) note the results of the consultation on the proposals to introduce contra flow cycling on Magdalen Street between Edward Street and Bull Close Road and on Cowgate between Magdalen Street and Peacock Street.

- (2) ask the head of city development services to progress statutory procedures associated with implementing the legal orders and notices that are associated with the scheme as shown on Drawings 301739 CA11 PE4080 PRE-02b & 03b – and plan PL/TR/4142/224.2 & 3, which will have the effect of:

- (a) banning the right turn from Magdalen Street into Bull Close Road;
- (b) introducing a mandatory southbound cycle lane on Magdalen Street; between Bull Close Road and Edward Street and an advisory westbound cycle lane on Cowgate between Peacock Street and Magdalen Street;
- (c) amending the position of the parking and loading bays on Magdalen Street and the disabled bay on Cowgate;
- (d) removing the signalled crossing on Magdalen Street by Magdalen Close.

11. Sprowston Road ALDI Traffic Regulation Order representations received

RESOLVED, having considered the report of the head of city development services, to authorise the head of city development services to arrange for the necessary statutory procedures to implement waiting restrictions to extend the existing double yellow lines on Sprowston Road south to a point 16 metres south of the new access road to the ALDI store, and along the entire length of the new access road as shown on Plan No. A1-12062 S278/38 in Appendix 1.

12. Annual report of the Norwich City Highways Agency 2013-14

RESOLVED, having considered the report of the head of city development services, and the director of environment, transport and development to approve the highways agency annual report for 2013-14.

13. Roadworks Regular monitoring report

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

CHAIR