

Norwich Highways Agency committee

10:00 to 11:30

24 November 2016

Present: **County Councillors:** **City Councillors:**
 Adams (chair) (V) Bremner (vice chair) (V)
 Morphew (V) Stonard (V)
 Agnew Carlo
 Sands (M) Lubbock
 Shaw Peek

*(V) voting member

1. Public questions/petitions

Question 1 - Road works and contractual arrangements

Councillor Martin Schmierer, Mancroft ward, asked the following question:

“Could the committee provide me with details about the clauses, concerning delays or remedial work when awarding contracts to construction companies, such as Tarmac, please. In particular, what compensation is being provided for the delays in the completion of projects, or remedial work, which, too frequently, is having to be carried out to roads, pavements, etc. in Norwich?”

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

“The county council and the city council when operating the Highways Agency Agreement, generally use the term contract which was awarded to Tarmac, commencing in April 2014 following a competitive tendering process, for all highway works. The contract is a ‘Service Contract’ under the ‘New Engineering Contract (NEC)’ suite of contracts modified as necessary for the purposes of the highways service delivery. Works undertaken for projects are generally completed under an ‘Option C – Target Costed’ arrangement whereby a price for the works is developed from the schedule of rates provided at tender stage. This setting of the target cost then triggers an incentivised approach to deliver the works below the target cost, which provides for a ‘gain’ share under the contract terms. If the cost of the works exceeds the target, then there is a ‘pain’ share that is applied to the contractor, shared with the client. The contract also allows for ‘disallowed costs’ whereby if a failure is demonstrably the fault of the contractor, the costs of correcting the fault rest with the contractor at their cost. An example of this would be the surfacing failures that were seen in the city (such as in

Tombland) last year, which were a result of a defective material supply. The cost of the corrective works, such as for this, are carried by the contractor.”

Councillor Schmierer, as a supplementary question, said that he noted that Tarmac were picking up the costs of the remedial work but asked whether there would be any compensation for retailers and businesses affected by the roadworks. He also asked whether future contracts would include provision to compensate retailers and businesses for loss of business if works were protracted due to the fault of the contractor. The chair asked the major projects manager to provide a written response to Councillor Schmierer. Members of the committee would also receive a copy of the letter.

Question 2 – College Road area permit parking consultation (item 4 below)

Ms Jacqueline Flanders, College Road, asked the following question whilst displaying photographs of parking on the street which she had taken at various dates and times:

“Even given the permit consultation results, is it right for permits to be imposed on a street where photographic evidence shows that they’re not needed and respondents will be disappointed that permits won’t solve the problem they think they will?”

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

“Consultations on extensions to the permit parking schemes are carried out when there is strong evidence that the local community are likely to support such an extension. For many years local residents petitioned this committee and lobbied their local councils asking for this consultation to be carried out.

Every resident in the College Road area was consulted on the proposed permit parking scheme, and every resident was supplied with information about what permit parking can and cannot achieve. In particular, residents were advised that a permit scheme would not resolve parking issues that were caused by residents own parking requirements, and that streets beyond the permit area are likely to suffer some adverse effects.

Permit parking does not resolve all parking problems, but reduces demand for limited parking provision by ensuring that only local residents have access to it. In the case of permit parking operating between 8 am and 6.30 pm, this ensures that all the spaces are available to residents only at the time when most of them are returning home. It is clear from the report that many residents do believe that parking issues are made worse by non-residents parking in the area.”

Ms Flanders, by way of a supplementary question, said she appreciated that the residents nearer the Unthank Road end of College Road wanted permit parking but she considered it was unfair to penalise all the residents and suggested that a fairer solution would be partial permit parking on College Road. The principal transport planner (Norwich City Council) referred to the report and said that the majority of residents in College Road supported the proposed controlled parking scheme on College Road.

Question 3– College Road area permit parking consultation (item 4 below)

Mr Jolyon Gough, The Avenues, asked the following question:

“Based on your report, the increased road side parking is likely to be forced into The Avenues from the CPZ (controlled parking zone) streets nearby.

To prevent accidents and the ongoing destruction of the verges, has consideration been given to the simple and cost effective solution of double yellow lines in the affected areas?”

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

“This part of The Avenues was included in the permit parking consultation in response to concerns previously raised by residents, as the introduction of permit parking would have gone some way to resolving the existing issues there by preventing parking during the day by anyone other than local residents. Double yellow lines are only installed in locations where they are needed or for a traffic capacity reason (such as on the major road network) or for safety and access purposes (at junctions, for example) and would cost more to implement than the permit parking proposal as a further statutory process would be required. Double yellow lines in this location would, therefore, not be considered appropriate.

Residents were made aware of both the potential benefits of permit parking and the potential effects of being outside any permit parking area. The consultation material it clear under what circumstances double yellow lines are introduced.”

Mr Gough reiterated his concern that the CPZ would force cars from the side streets into The Avenues. He said that commuter parking was not a problem but there was significant concern about school drop-off and pick-up times and he considered that yellow lines could resolve this, whilst protecting the verges. The principal planner (transport) replied on behalf of the committee and referred to the report. He said that the issues surrounding taking children to school and collecting them could not be resolved by either of the waiting restrictions; permit parking or double yellow lines.

Question 4 - Salisbury Road Area Permit Parking Consultation (item 5 below)

Dr Graham Hopkins, Matlock Road, said that he was concerned that the Salisbury Road area controlled parking zone would displace parking into the neighbouring streets and asked the following question:

“What provision there will be for monitoring displacement effects and knock-on problems from the 24-hour permit proposals? How, as a nearby resident, could I initiate a consultation for 24-hour parking on Matlock and nearby Thorpe Road if my predictions are correct?”

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

“There is no formal monitoring as a result of introducing new permit parking schemes; previous experience shows that local people and ward members raise issues as they occur.

Currently Matlock Road is within a controlled parking zone which operates 8am to 6:30pm Monday to Saturday. There are a number of areas in the city where requests have been made to change the hours of operation of a CPZ. Any such change would need to be supported by the local ward members and there would need to be a demonstration that there is likely to be majority support among residents before any consultation is undertaken. A consultation would not be initiated by one individual alone.”

Dr Hopkins commented on the response but did not ask a supplementary question.

Petition

Petition in favour of permit parking in Wellesley Avenue South and Cintra Road

Chris Dunn, Wellesley Avenue South, presented a petition on behalf of residents, and asked the committee to consider the application of permit parking to the areas of Wellesley Avenue South and Cintra Road. He explained the problems residents were experiencing from commuter and match day parking, which included abuse from drivers asked to move their cars when parked over driveways. All the occupied properties in Wellesley Avenue had been approached and 93 percent had signed the petition. All the properties in Cintra Road had been approached and 90 percent of households had signed the petition. The signed petition therefore represented residents from 56 properties in favour out of 61 properties in total. Residents from five properties refused to sign the petition. There were 74 signatures on the petition.

The wording on the petition stated:

“We the undersigned ask the Norwich Highways Agency committee to apply permit parking to the areas of Wellesley Avenue South and Cintra Road.

Without permit parking, the problems currently experienced of commuter and non-resident parking will further increase owing to the limited availability of free parking spaces in the Thorpe Hamlet area. This is severely heightened on match days when inconsiderate parking does not allow for the free movement of emergency vehicles and restricts many residents from leaving their homes in a car.”

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

“Thank-you for presenting this petition to the committee.

The committee is well aware of the parking issues facing residents in many parts of the city, and you will see from today’s agenda that we are considering two extensions to permit parking schemes. However such extensions require extensive consultation and the production of legal documentation, mean that they are expensive and time consuming to carry out. Wellesley Avenue South and Cintra Road have been offered permit parking on a number of occasions

in the past and there has not been majority support among the residents to allow us to proceed with the implementation of a scheme.

I am happy to ask the officers to add Wellesley Avenue South and Cintra Road to the list areas where permit parking extensions have been requested. However I must warn you that the list already includes several areas where there have been requests to implement new schemes or change the hours of operation of existing permit schemes. Currently the demand for this work far exceeds the resource there is available to do it, so I cannot give you a timescale for when any consultation is likely to be undertaken.”

Mr Dunn thanked the chair for his response and said that he hoped that the process for a controlled parking zone in Wellesley Avenue South and Cintra Road could be progressed as soon as possible.

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 15 September 2016.

4. College Road Area Permit Parking Consultation

The principal planner (transport) introduced the report and explained that there was an inconsistency between the body of the report and the plans (appendix 3) and confirmed that there would be no permit parking on The Avenues.

Councillor Carlo, local member for Nelson Ward, said that she did not own a car and did not have a view on the proposals, but noted that the majority of residents supported the proposed controlled parking scheme in the College Road area and that the majority of residents in The Avenues were opposed to permit parking. She then drew members' attention to a number of issues which included 24 hour permit parking at the Unthank Road end of College Road, calling for the extension of double yellow lines in The Avenues; asking what could be done to protect the verges and whether two oak trees on The Avenues could be protected. In response, the principal planner (transport) referred to the report and said that the adjacent controlled parking schemes operated from 8:00 am to 6.30 pm. There had been no request for 24 hour permit parking from the residents and it would be inconsistent with the adjacent schemes. There was currently a review of verge and pavement parking across the whole city and the issues raised by residents in The Avenues would be considered as part of this wider piece of work. The proposals would need to be re-advertised if double yellow lines were to be extended.

Councillor Bremner, the vice chair, spoke in support of the scheme which he said reflected residents' responses to the consultation. He said that he supported Councillor Carlo's concern about the oak trees and asked officers to ensure that the city council's arboricultural officer assessed the trees. .

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

- (1) note the responses to the permit parking consultation;
- (2) agree to implement an 8.00 am to 6.30 pm (Monday to Saturday) permit parking scheme in College Road from its junction with Unthank Road to its junction with The Avenues; Glebe Road from its junction with Unthank Road to its junction with Jessopp Road; Recreation Road from its junction with Jessopp Road to its junction with The Avenues; Jessopp Road from its junction with College Road to its junction with Christchurch Road; Unthank Road from its junction with Glebe Road to its junction with College Road, Girton Road and Bensley Road, as shown on the plans, attached to the report, in Appendices 2 and 3 (subject to noting that there is no proposal for permit parking on The Avenues and to amend the plan Appendix 3 accordingly);
- (3) agree not to implement permit parking on The Avenues between its junction with College Road and Christchurch Road;
- (4) ask the head of city development services to complete the statutory procedures to implement the permit parking scheme as shown on the plans attached in Appendices 2 and 3 (as amended)

5. Salisbury Road Area Permit Parking Consultation

The principal planner (transport) said that a couple of late representations had been received from residents but the comments their comments did not alter the recommendations in the report.

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

- (1) note the responses to the permit parking consultation;
- (2) agree to implement a 24 hour permit parking scheme in Cremorne Lane, Salisbury Road, The Sidings, Thorpe Road and Roseville Close as shown on the plan attached to the report in Appendix 4;
- (3) ask the head of city development services to complete the statutory processes to implement the proposals shown on the plan attached to the report in Appendix 4.

6. Transport for Norwich – Eaton and Cringleford area

Councillor Lubbock, on behalf of the local members for Eaton Ward/Division thanked the officers for the comprehensive consultation on the proposals and asked whether members, the Eaton Residents' Association and other stakeholders could be consulted again at the design stage. She then asked the following question on behalf of Councillor Brian Watkins, the county councillor for Eaton Division, who had been unable to attend the meeting due to other council business:

'In view of the responses from Eaton councillors and 60 Eaton residents against the shared cycle and pedestrian facility on Eaton slip Road and Eaton Street, is there not another option of keeping the current segregation as it is at the moment, and with the 20 mph speed limit added in, still making it safer for cyclists?'

Councillor Lubbock then referred to a number of issues raised by residents and local businesses in response to the consultation. The principal planner (transport) referred to the report and explained there were constraints and that it was not possible to accommodate segregated facilities but the use of contrasting surface materials would reduce conflict between pedestrian and cyclists in key areas. The 20mph signage for this scheme would be situated at the top of the slip road. The opening up of the link between Sunningdale and Greenways was not being considered. The transportation and network manager (Norwich City Council) apologised and said that that the proposal for four parking bays on Church Lane had been removed from the scheme and therefore the recommendation (as set out in the report) should be amended. It was anticipated that because of other projects, work on this scheme would commence in April 2017 with completion anticipated by July 2017. Works would be programmed to minimise the effect on local businesses.

During discussion members commented on the use of shared facilities and noted the comments of the Norfolk and Norwich Blind Association. It was considered that proficient cyclists could continue to use the road but the shared facilities would attract new and less confident cyclists.

The chair moved the recommendations which were set out in the report, as amended by the deletion of the following bullet point under recommendation (4) -

“Providing four new parking bays opposite to Barclays Bank on Church Lane as alternative parking to the parking bays removed from Eaton Street.”

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

- (1) note that the scheme for Eaton and Cringleford crosses the city boundary.
- (2) approve the changes required to implement the scheme within the city boundary, including:
 - (a) Reducing traffic speeds by the introduction of traffic calming and the implementation of a 20mph Zone.
 - (b) Installing traffic signals either side of the Cringleford Bridge that respond to the amount of traffic crossing in each direction. This will manage queuing and reduce anxiety caused by cars driving towards cyclists over the narrow bridge. The footbridge would also be lit so people feel more secure.
 - (c) Enabling cyclists heading towards the city to reach the recently installed signal controlled crossing and off-carriageway track on Newmarket Road (A11) directly along Eaton Street, rather than

crossing traffic lanes under the flyover and up the slip lane. This would be achieved by:

- (i) widening the footway on the south side of Eaton Street and changing its status so it can be used by cyclists and pedestrians.
 - (ii) narrowing the entrance to Waitrose car park and putting an informal crossing for cyclists and pedestrians on a raised table.
 - (iii) widening the cycle track that leads up the hill from the Cellar House Public House.
- (d) Simplifying pedestrian crossings in the centre of Eaton, providing a crossing for cyclists across Church Lane.
- (e) Widening pavements in the centre of Eaton with more attractive surfaces, planting and the removal of redundant street furniture to improve the look of the conservation areas.
- (f) Moving the stop line back in Bluebell Road so buses can turn left from Eaton Street more easily.
- (g) Providing a toucan crossing on Church Lane to give a crossing point for pedestrians and cyclists.
- (h) Planting 6 new trees to be within the large verge area just west of the access to Waitrose, to replace two that will be lost as a result of the footway widening.
- (4) asking the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory processes to complete the following Traffic Regulation Orders as shown on Plan No. PE4118-HP3-011 attached in Appendix 1 which have the effect of:
- (a) Retaining the existing parking area on Eaton Street outside the old Post Office, increasing the maximum stay to two hours.
 - (b) Installing double yellow lines on the remainder of the slip road and extend these further into Eaton Street.
 - (c) Introducing a 20mph Zone along Newmarket Road, Cringleford and Eaton Street, Eaton extending into the junctions of Bluebell Road, Church Lane and Colney Lane, the effect of which is that no vehicle, other than an emergency vehicle, may proceed at a speed in excess of 20 miles per hour on those roads.
 - (d) Providing short sections of mandatory cycle lanes centrally in the carriageway to enable right turning and ahead movements by cyclists travelling east and an on-carriageway cycle lane for cyclists travelling west towards Cringleford Bridge.

- (e) Providing for the shared cycle/footway facility and segregated cycle path on Eaton Street and a shared cycle footway on Bluebell Road on Bluebell Road.

7. Transport for Norwich – Newmarket Road; Eaton Slip Road to Daniels Road

The principal planner (transport) introduced the report and said that there had been a further 11 responses had been received since the closing date, of which four had been in support of the proposal. All of the issues had been covered in the report and there were no changes to the recommendations.

During discussion the transportation and network manager, together with the principal planner (transport) referred to the report and answered members' questions. The committee noted the concerns of residents about the junctions with the side roads and that Sunningdale required a different approach to mitigate the wider pavements and reduced visibility. Members noted that the change in priority to give way to cyclists would have an impact on road users.

Councillor Lubbock referred to the shared use of the footpath and cycle part and said that cyclists had a responsibility to ensure their own safety and that of the other users to avoid conflict. The transportation and network manager said that she would raise the issue of educating users of the new facilities on road safety with colleagues at the county council.

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

- (1) approve the changes required to implement the scheme (as shown on plans PE4120-HP-0100-011 to 014, contained in Appendix 2 of the report) , including:
 - (a) Improvement of the existing shared use footpath/cycle path between Unthank Road and Daniels Road roundabout by widening, where possible, and re-surfacing with asphalt.
 - (b) Provision of a new raised table priority cycle and pedestrian crossing in the Sunningdale side road junction, offset 5.0m into the junction bellmouth.
 - (c) Removal of the existing vehicular priority accesses at numbers 164 to 172 and 182 to 186 Newmarket Road, replacing these with dropped vehicular crossing accesses to provide cycle priority at these locations.
 - (d) Provision of a continuous footpath across the side road junctions of Branksome Road, Camberley Road and Claremont Road, giving priority to cyclists at these locations.
 - (e) Provision of a priority cycle crossing point at Elveden Close.
 - (f) Alterations to existing road markings and signage to denote cyclist priority at the side roads.
- (2) ask the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory processes to confirm the following notice:

“Propose to install a raised table priority cycle crossing on Sunningdale to assist with traffic calming.”

8. Transport for Norwich - A11 Newmarket Road project (Daniels Road to Hanover Road)

During discussion members commented that the proposal was for consultation and that a report on the outcome of the consultation would come back to committee in due course.

In reply to a member's question, the transportation and network manager referred to the report and in response to a question from a member explained the reasons for removing the signalised junction at the Christchurch Road and Lime Tree Road junction and the benefits that replacing it with a straight across toucan crossing would provide. The signalled crossing had been installed during the 1990s as part of a cycle improvement route but had the effect of creating a rat-run for general traffic on Christchurch Road and Lime Tree Road.

Councillor Lubbock welcomed the proposals but pointed out that on the sections where cyclists shared the bus lane with taxis and buses, it was not a pleasant experience for cyclists.

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

- (1) agree to consult on the scheme to provide an inbound cycling facility segregated from vehicles and pedestrians between the Daniels Road roundabout and the footpath link to Hanover Road, improving the provision for cyclists on this section of Newmarket Road;
- (2) ask the head of city development services to advertise the necessary notices to implement any raised tables required as part of the scheme, pedestrian crossings and for conversion of the existing footway into a shared use footway/cycleway facility where required.
- (3) note that any objections received will be considered by a future meeting of the committee.

9. Transport for Norwich – Changes to the access restrictions in pedestrianised areas in the city centre

RESOLVED, unanimously, having considered the report and with all four voting members voting in favour, to:

- (1) agree to consult on the scheme to improve and rationalise loading and access restrictions and access for cycling within the city centre. The options being:
 - (a) Access to the existing time restricted areas in the city centre being rationalised, so that access for all vehicles (including cyclists) is only available outside the hours of 10am until 5pm seven days a week;

- (b) Access by vehicle in the time restricted streets rationalised to 10am until 5pm seven days a week, with cycling permitted at all times;
- (2) note that any representations received will be considered by a future meeting of the committee.

10. Transport for Norwich - St Crispin's shared use crossing

During discussion members commented that the scheme should be considered in the context of the emerging proposals for Anglia Square and the north of the city, and asked officers to ensure that reference was made to this in the consultation papers.

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

- (1) agree to consult on the scheme to improve the existing cycling facilities, and improve the provision for cyclists & pedestrians across St Crispins Road as shown on Plan Nos. PE4112-HP-7000-001 PR GENERAL ARRANGEMENT attached in Appendix 1
- (2) ask the head of city development services to advertise the necessary notices to implement a signal controlled crossing required as part of the scheme
- (3) note that the consultation responses received will be considered by a future meeting of the committee.
- (4) note that the subway, which was stopped up (highway rights removed) in 2009 as part of redevelopment proposals will be filled in.

11. Transport for Norwich – Angel Road / Waterloo Road cycling Improvements

During discussion a member asked for details of the consultation pointing out that the proposals covered a large area and would be difficult to do. The transportation and network manager referred to the plan, shown as appendix 3, and said that the consultation would be a targeted to consult on specific elements of the scheme. This would include writing to residents and speaking to local members.

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

- (1) approve for consultation the proposals for the Shipstone Road/Angel Road/Waterloo Road project, including:
 - (a) two options to reduce traffic speeds and improve pedestrian/cycle facilities at the Angel Road/Shipstone Road/ Waterloo Road junction:
 - (i) The removal of the signalled crossing and the provision of 2 parallel cycle / zebra crossing on Waterloo Road to the immediate north and south of the Angel Road junction

- (ii) The replacement of the existing signalled pedestrian crossing with a Toucan crossing
 - (b) Introduction of a 20mph speed restriction along Waterloo Road, Eade Road, Patteson Road, Buxton Road, Alma Terrace, Albany Road, Temple Road, Long Row, Traverse Street, Clare Road, Taylors Building, the western end of Shipstone Road with associated traffic calming features. Extend the existing 20mph zone on Angel Road southwards from where it terminates just south of Angel Road Infant School to its junction with Waterloo Road including the installation of a sinusoidal speed hump.
 - (c) Introduction of an advisory cycle lane between Magpie Road and Angel Road.
 - (d) Reconfiguration of the Angel Road/Catton Grove Road/Elm Grove Lane/Catton Grove Road junction and implement a raised table to reduce speeds and improve pedestrian/cycle facilities.
 - (e) Provide a flat top hump in Shipstone Road and extend the existing 'At Any Time' waiting restrictions in Shipstone Road by approximately 5 metres to ease the movement of cyclists in and out of the junction.
 - (f) Install no waiting 'At any time' restrictions outside 61 Angel Road, opposite the junction with Rosebery Road for a length of approximately 14m to ease the movement into and out of Rosebury Road.
 - (g) Replacing two groups of speed cushions outside 163 & 182 Angel Road with sinusoidal humps that span the full width of the carriageway.
 - (h) Reconfiguration of the Shipstone Road closure point to remove the narrow two-way cycle path and allow the installation of two one-way cycling paths either side of a central planting strip with an additional 2m wide segregated footway.
 - (i) Extend the existing shared use facility on the north side of Waterloo Road near its junction with Magpie Road by approximately 20 metres.
 - (j) Shorten bus cage south of Elm Grove Lane.
- (2) asks the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory procedures associated with advertising any traffic regulation and speed restriction orders and notices that may be required for the implementation of the scheme as described in this report
 - (3) agree that the outcome of the proposed consultation will be reported to a future meeting of the committee.

12. Transport for Norwich –Mile Cross Lane (Fiddlewood to Catton Grove Road) cycling Improvements

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

- (1) approve for consultation the proposals for the Mile Cross Lane project, including:
 - (a) Widening the footway to the north side of Mile Cross Lane, the west side of Catton Grove Road and the footpath between Mile Cross Lane and Blackthorn Close to a nominal 3.0m where possible
 - (b) Transfer of strips of land from Norwich City Council ownership to adopted highway to facilitate the above
 - (c) The configuration of the existing traffic island on Mile Cross Lane, at the Catton Grove Road/St Faiths Road junction, to allow use by cyclists
 - (d) Completing legal processes including statutory consultation(s) to convert all of the above to shared cyclist and pedestrian use;
- (2) ask the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory procedures associated with advertising any Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) and Notices that may be required for the implementation of the scheme as described in this report;
- (3) agree that the outcome of the proposed consultation will be reported to a future meeting of the committee.

13. Review of Permit Parking and Pricing

A member suggested that in future the review of permit parking was aligned with other off-street and on-street parking fees. The transportation and network manager agreed that it was a good idea to review all off-street and on-street parking fees on an annual basis at the same time and pointed out that it would not necessarily mean that fees were increased at each review.

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

- (1) note the report;
- (2) agree changes to the prices of permits and dispensation vouchers to have the following effect:
 - (a) Increase the standard permit charge and minimum transaction fee to £12;
 - (b) Increase the monthly parking fee by the following amounts:
 - (i) Resident Short Vehicle/ 4 hour Visitor and Blue badge -5p;
 - (ii) Resident medium Vehicle 10p;
 - (iii) Resident long vehicle 15p;

- (iv) Business permits 50p;
- (c) Increase the charges for dispensation vouchers to £8.50, making a book of five (minimum purchase) £42.50;
- (d) Introduce a new dispensation permit, valid for between one and four days with a minimum charge of £12 (for one day) but otherwise costing the same as the dispensation vouchers per day.

14. Major Road Works – Regular Monitoring

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

CHAIR