



NORWICH HIGHWAYS AGENCY COMMITTEE

10am to 11.20am

27 September 2012

Present:

County Councillors:

Adams (chair) (V)

Plant (V)

Bearman

Scutter

Shaw

City Councillors:

Bremner (vice-chair) (V)

Harris (V)

Carlo

Grahame

Stonard

*(V) voting member

1. PETITIONS

Grass verges – Mile Cross Estate

(Councillor Edwards was permitted to present both petitions at the discretion of the chair.)

Councillor Richard Edwards, Mile Cross Division, presented the following petition on behalf Mrs Lynne Barrett of Bignold Road (55 signatures):

"We the undersigned ask the city council and NHAC to replace the broken kerb stones and fill in the hole on the grass verge on the corner of Rye Avenue and Appleyard Crescent or at least cut away and resurface a small piece of the edge of the verge like what you have done at the other end of Rye Avenue on the corner of Bloomfield Road in Mile Cross Estate".

Councillor Edwards then presented the following petition on behalf of residents in Mile Cross (52 signatures):

"We the undersigned ask the city council and NHAC (Norwich Highways Agency committee) to fill in the big holes on the grass verges on the edges of the roads of Bloomfield Road/Kirkpatrick Road/Oxnead Road and Bassingham Road by the mini roundabout in Mile Cross Estate."

The head of citywide development, Norwich City Council, said that notice of the petitions had been received the day before and there had not been sufficient time to inspect the grass verges and kerbs mentioned in the petitions and identify what repair work was needed. This would be carried out and a written response would be provided to the petitioners.

Councillor Edwards then addressed the committee and spoke of his concern and that of local residents, that, despite writing to the council and raising the issue at the neighbourhood walkabout, the situation had not improved. He was particularly concerned for road safety in relation to Kirkpatrick Road and Oxnead Road because of the proximity to the Mile Cross primary school and asked that the city council resolved the issues as soon as possible.

2. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Grass verge at the junction of Lime Tree Road and Newmarket Road

Councillor Stephen Little asked the following question on behalf of Councillor Ash Haynes, ward councillor for Town Close Ward:

"The grass verge on the north side of the junction of Lime Tree Road and Newmarket Road has become severely denuded, largely by large vehicles turning off the main road. The council has suggested a wooden bollard for the corner but I share residents' concerns that this could quickly become damaged or ruined. Could the committee consider a 'bell-bollard' solution for the junction such as those at the start of Little Bethel Street? And additionally, could the white lines on the junction be reinstated as soon as possible?"

The head of citywide development said that he was unable to provide a conclusive response to this question as the proposal to install a "bell-bollard" was still being examined. The junction had been designed in a previous age and the problem was large vehicles turning into Lime Tree Road. There was a considerable cost for bell-bollards and therefore an assessment would need to be made to justify the cost against the benefit. The white lines for the junction were on order and would be reinstated soon.

Councillor Little said that he was concerned about traffic incidents and pointed out that the works needed to be implemented as soon as possible.

New powers for councils for minor traffic offences

The chair referred to a letter received from Mr Agombar, Tour Operator Sightseeing Tour of Olde Norwich, which had been circulated to all members of the committee and referred to the Local Government Association's proposal to extend new powers for councils to issue fines for minor traffic infringements, and other issues. Mr Agombar's letter concluded as follows:

"Could the council please join in with the other 13 councils applying for these new powers? Could you please consider the above proposals to help make the heritage city of Norwich safer for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport drivers. Thank you."

The chair replied that the contents of the letter had been noted and that his comments had been "taken on board". He asked officers to respond in writing to Mr Agombar.

Review of non-residential on street parking permits

The chair agreed that the two questions regarding business parking permits have been received could be taken under agenda item 5 (below) "Review of non-residential on street parking permits".

3. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor Harris declared a personal interest in item 9 (below), "Transport for Norwich – St Stephens' Road" because her workplace was in St Stephens Street.

Councillor Grahame declared a personal interest in item 5 (below), "Review of non-residential on street parking permits" because she used business parking permits in the course of her work.

4. MINUTES

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 26 July 2012.

5. REVIEW OF NON-RESIDENTIAL ON STREET PARKING PERMITS

(Councillor Grahame declared an interest in this item.)

Ms Becki Matthews, Ashby Street resident, asked the following question:

"The new regulations state that the business permits are not to be used for commuting. This wording was very evident on the previous regulations. This committee has said in the past that it was not possible to enforce/"police" this; how is it going to be possible now?"

The principal planner (transport), Norwich City Council, replied that the general business parking permits that could be used on any vehicle had been subject to misuse. The proposal was to replace these with business parking permits that were vehicle specific and businesses would need to demonstrate why the vehicle was needed for the business.

Councillor Little, ward and divisional councillor for Town Close Ward, asked the following question:

"I note that the solution proposed enables businesses to apply for 4 permits overall and in the particular case of Ashby Street, whose residents initiated the review and where businesses are currently restricted to 2 permits, this could mean an increase in business related parking. Could the committee consider a solution to this such as maintaining the two permit limit (with a choice of short stay or long stay) for businesses in the Queens Road/ Ashby Street area?"

The principal planner (transport) said that at the proposals introduced a significant change to the way that business parking permits operated in controlled parking zones and that it would be inappropriate at this stage to introduce restrictions to the

Queens Road/Ashby Street area. It was reasonable to expect that businesses in this area would demonstrate the criteria for business parking permits specific to a vehicle. Short stay permits allowed visitors to business premises but were restricted to a two hour stay to prevent on street parking all day. The recommendation was to review non-residential on street parking permits again in 18 months' time.

Councillor Little suggested that it was worth considering a different approach for some areas if it was not too difficult to administer.

Mr Bradbroke, Ashby Street resident, suggested that applicants for business parking permits should be required to show their insurance documents to check if operating vehicle for business rather than private/domestic use or for commuting to work.

Members of the committee considered that this was a good suggestion. The principal planner (transport) said that the proposal was for businesses to demonstrate the need for business parking permits and officers might ask for insurance documents as part of this process.

Councillor Adams, the chair moved the recommendation as set out in the report and it was seconded by Councillor Plant. Councillor Bremner commended the proposals, which would also support businesses in their operation, and said that the introduction of controlled parking zones had greatly reduced the misuse of commuter parking in these areas.

During discussion members of the committee commented on the need to ensure that business parking permits were issued in line with criteria; that in some cases businesses could apply for more permits than previously and that permit use could be abused still. It was also pointed out that it was important that people could see paper permits on vehicles parked in the street rather than issuing "virtual" ones. It was suggested that a reminder should be given to permit holders to advise them that a permit did not guarantee parking outside their premises.

Discussion ensued on the use of carers' permits and the substantial proposed cost increase and the effect that this would have cash strapped statutory providers and voluntary organisations. The principal transport (planner) said that during the review it had become apparent that the carers' permit was one of the most abused categories. Consultation with Age UK and groups representing disabled people showed that it was rare for a carer to require a visit of more than two hours at a time. He suggested that there was no reason why there could not be a two tier pricing system in place. Councillor Grahame suggested that two hours was sufficient but the increased cost could be difficult for self-employed carers and asked whether consideration could be given to not making the carers' permit vehicle specific. Discussion ensued with concern expressed that if the city council reduced the cost of the community Q it would be cross subsidising National Health Service providers and other local authorities.

Councillor Carlo, moved, seconded by Councillor Bearman, that the community Q permit was not withdrawn. The principal transport (planner) proposed that, following further research, a report could be considered on options for community Q permits at

the next meeting of the committee. The chair then moved the recommendations as amended.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) agree the following changes to the non residential on street permit types and permit eligibility:
 - (a) Withdraw the current Statutory Q business permits;
 - (b) Introduce four new permits:
 - (i) a zone specific short stay business permit (maximum stay 2 hours);
 - (ii) a multi zone specific short stay business permit (maximum stay 2 hours);
 - (iii) a zone specific, vehicle specific long stay business permit;
 - (iv) a zone specific property renovation permit;
 - (c) Allow all business located within the outer area controlled parking zones to purchase:
 - (i) a maximum of two long stay zone specific, vehicle specific permits;
 - (ii) one short stay zone specific business permit;
 - (iii) additional short stay permits, either zone specific or multi zone, justified on the basis of operational need;
 - (d) Allow any business or caring organisation that operates within a controlled parking zone to purchase short stay business permits, either zone specific or multi zone, justified on the basis of operational need;
 - (e) Allow any person or company to purchase a property renovation permit for any property they own outside of the city centre but cannot occupy due to renovations being undertaken. Permit to be used only by persons present at the property when the vehicle is parked. Maximum permit duration 6 months.
- (2) agree the following charges for non-residential on street permits:

Permit Type		6 month	12 month	18 month
Business	Short stay zone specific	£70	£130	£190
	Short stay any zone	£100	£190	£280
	Long stay	£70	£130	£190
	Guest House	£70	£130	£190
	Property renovation	£70	Not available	

- (3) agree that a no refund policy should be introduced for permits, but an allowance for any unexpired monthly fee will be made against a new permit in the case of a vehicle change.

- (4) ask the head of city development services to arrange the necessary statutory processes to introduce these changes to non-residential on street parking permits.
- (5) ask the head of city development services, Norwich City Council, to arrange the necessary statutory processes to ensure that the definitions and articles for all controlled parking zones are standardised.
- (6) agree the terms and conditions of use for short stay and long stay business permit as set out in appendix 3 of the report.
- (7) consider a further report on the options for community Q permits at the next meeting of the committee.

6. REVIEW OF ON STREET PAY AND DISPLAY TARIFFS

Councillor Adams, the chair moved the recommendation as set out in the report and it was seconded by Councillor Plant.

Discussion ensued on increasing the charge for the core area to 50p per 15 minutes as it would be more practical to use a single coin could be used rather than using small change to make up 45p. They considered that this would provide a balance between on and off street parking tariffs. The transportation and network manager, Norwich City Council, said that a 45p charge for 15 minutes for the core area had been recommended as it was considered that an increase to 50p per 15 minutes would be too large an increase. The cost of on street parking in the core area would total £2 for the hour: an increase of 40p or 25%.

Councillor Plant moved and Councillor Bearman seconded that the charge be increased to 50p for 15 minutes in the core area and that it should be reviewed in 2014. Councillor Bremner spoke against increasing the cost of the on street parking tariff for the core area to 50p and said that he considered that it was too large an increase and should be reviewed annually.

RESOLVED on the chair's casting vote, with 2 members voting in favour (Councillors Adams and Plant) and 2 members voting against (Councillors Bremner and Harris) to amend the tariff for the core area to 50p per 15 minutes.

The chair then moved the recommendations as amended.

RESOLVED, with two members voting in favour (Councillors Adams and Plant) and 2 members abstaining (Councillors Bremner and Harris) to ask the head of city development services, Norwich City Council, to carry out the necessary statutory procedures to change the on street pay and display parking tariffs to:

- (a) Core area - £2.00 per hour, (50p per 15 minutes);
- (b) Secondary area - £1.20 per hour, (30p per 15 minutes).

7. PROPOSED CAR PARK FEES AND CHARGES

In reply to a question from Councillor Harris, the head of city development services, said that he was unable to give more specific information on the uptake of season

tickets and would provide her with the information after the meeting. St Giles multi-storey car park was a short stay car park and there was usually some under occupancy for the majority of the year with the exception of the Christmas period where there was some queuing.

RESOLVED to support the proposed revised fees and charges as set out in appendices C and D of the report, to take effect from 19 November 2012.

8. PROVISION OF BUS LAYOVER FACILITIES AND COACH / DEMAND RESPONSE TRANSPORT PICK-UP AND DROP-OFF POINTS IN NORWICH

Mr Anthony Williment, Secretary of the Norwich Hackney Trade Association, said that the association supported the proposals in the report and that it accepted that there was insufficient space in Castle Meadow for a taxi rank to accommodate three hackney carriages and considered that the proposals for the taxi rank at Tombland would be beneficial to its members.

During discussion the senior planner (transport), Norwich City Council, referred to the report and answered members' questions. The bus companies had been consulted on the use of the bus layover in Wherry Road so companies would know when there were spaces available and that it would not be available when there were football matches. In response to a question that the disabled parking spaces being removed as part of the proposals were replaced first, the senior planner (transport) confirmed that this referred to the proposal to introduce waiting restrictions on the double yellow lines on the southern half of Surrey Street because the practice of disabled and delivery drivers parking on these yellow lines obstructed buses going into the bus station causing delays. There were proposals for parking spaces for disabled drivers being considered as part of the next agenda item "Transport for Norwich – St Stephens Street and Surrey Street removal of general traffic". (A plan showing the provision of parking spaces for disabled drivers was circulated at the meeting.)

Councillor Bearman said that he welcomed the proposals but pointed out that all road users' needs should be taken into consideration. He suggested that the proposals for Surrey Street could potentially cause problems for the parents of children at Notre Dame High School and this issue had been raised by the staff of the school. The transportation and network manager said that she had been unable to contact the bus companies regarding limiting the hours of operation of the bus layover to 9am to 2.45pm on weekdays for their views but suggested that, subject to this being acceptable to the operators, this should be advertised as such in the traffic regulation order.

RESOLVED to ask the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory procedures associated with securing the traffic regulation orders relating to:-

- (a) proposed bus layovers as detailed below:

- (i) Lower Clarence Road – Plan No. PL/TR/3356/127-3
- (ii) Rouen Road – Plan No. PL/TR/3356/127-2
- (iii) Surrey Street - Plan No. PL/TR/3356/127-8
- (iv) Wherry Road – Plan No. Plan No. PL/TR/3356/127-1
- (b) proposed alteration of the existing short term coach parking facilities in Norwich City Centre, to change the spaces into coach parking for a maximum stay of 10 minutes, operational 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and to allow use by vehicles with Section 19 permits:-
 - (i) All Saints Green, 2 spaces – Plan No. PL/TR/3356/127-11
 - (ii) Ber Street, 2 Spaces – Plan No. PL/TR/3356/127-11
 - (iii) Castle Meadow, 2 spaces – Plan No. PL/TR/3356/127-15
 - (iv) Palace Street, 2 spaces – Plan No. PL/TR/3356/127-16
 - (v) Surrey Street, 1 space – Plan No. PL/TR/3356/127-8
 - (vi) Theatre Street, 3 spaces – Plan No. PL/TR/3356/127-14
- (c) Proposed DRT parking place on Castle Meadow as detailed on Plan No. PL/TR/3356/127-15
- (d) Proposed changes to disabled parking, bus stop, car club, loading, pay and display, and hackney carriage stand restrictions as detailed below:
 - (i) Bank Plain - Plan No. PL/TR/3356/127-12
 - (ii) Surrey Street - Plan No. PL/TR/3356/127-8
 - (iii) Tombland - Plan No. PL/TR/3356/127-13

9. TRANSPORT FOR NORWICH – ST STEPHENS STREET AND SURREY STREET REMOVAL OF GENERAL TRAFFIC

(The chair said that a letter had been received from the Norwich Society, which had been circulated to members of the committee, commenting on the proposals and suggested that it should be put forward as a response to the consultation.)

(A plan showing the provision of parking spaces for disabled drivers was circulated at the meeting.)

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

Councillor Plant pointed out that the report was asking for approval to consult on the proposals and cautioned members against pre-determining the outcome of the consultation.

The transportation and network manager apologised that details of the provision for parking spaces for had not been finalised in time for inclusion with the papers for the meeting and said that these would be advertised as part of the traffic regulation orders.

In response to a question, the major project manager, Norfolk County Council, said that traffic modelling had been carried out and the network could deal with displaced traffic. The proposals were part of the development of the Norwich area transport strategy (NATS).

The City Agency and NATS manager, Norfolk County Council, advised members that subject to committee approval, both this scheme and the Chapelfield North scheme would be consulted on together. The consultation would be as thorough as possible and would be for a four week period commencing in the first week of November. Councillor Scutter expressed concern that the four week consultation period could be insufficient. Members were advised that the consultation would be intensive and include exhibitions and advertisements in shop windows. It was important to conduct the consultation to meet the timescales required for the funding. Members noted that a lot of the proposals had been in the public domain for some time and that there was interest from the local media.

RESOLVED to ask the head of city development services to carry out:

- (1) the necessary statutory procedures associated with securing the traffic regulation orders relating to the access restrictions and changes to waiting and loading restrictions listed below and shown on plan to be displayed at meeting (an indicative plan has been included in this report for reference):
 - (a) Allow only buses, hackney carriages, private hire vehicles, commercial vehicles and pedal cycles to enter St Stephens Street from its junction with Chapelfield Road.
 - (b) Allow only buses, hackney carriages, private hire vehicles, commercial vehicles, vehicles accessing off street parking facilities and pedal cycles to enter Surrey Street from its junction with All Saints Green.
 - (c) Change the existing disabled parking bay on the northwest side of St Stephens Street to a bay to be used exclusively by demand responsive transport (DRT) vehicles for pick-up and drop-off, remove the disabled parking bay on Surrey Street and investigate alternate disabled parking provision in the city centre.
 - (d) Review the use of the loading bay on Surrey Street.
 - (e) Relocate disabled parking spaces.

- (2) consultation with the public and key stakeholders on these proposals and report back to a future meeting.

10. TRANSPORT FOR NORWICH – CHAPELFIELD NORTH SCHEME

(The chair said that a letter had been received from the Norwich Society, which had been circulated to members of the committee, commenting on the proposals and suggested that it should be put forward as a response to the consultation.)

In response to a question from Councillor Bearman, who was concerned that small schemes for cyclists and pedestrians that would be funded from LTP (local transport plan) funding would be lost if the city council used £50k from its discretionary LTP budget, the transportation and networks manager said that the budget allocation for small schemes had not been determined and would be considered at the committee's next meeting.

RESOLVED to note that Norfolk County Council and Norwich City Council intend to move forward with consultation on the Chapelfield North project starting November 2012.

11. MAJOR ROAD WORKS – REGULAR MONITORING

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

CHAIR