

Norwich Highways Agency committee

Date: Thursday, 24 November 2016 Time: 10:00 Venue: Mancroft room, City Hall, St Peters Street, Norwich, NR2 1NH

Members:		For further information please	
County	City Councillors:	contact:	
Councillors:		Committee officer: Jackie Rodger	
Adams (chair)*	Bremner (vice chair)*	e: jackjerodger@norwich.gov.uk	
Morphew*	Stonard*	e. juokierouger@norwion.gov.uk	
Agnew	Carlo		
Shaw	Lubbock	Democratic services	
Sands (M)	Peek	City Hall	
* voting members		Norwich NR2 1NH	

www.norwich.gov.uk

Information for members of the public

Members of the public and the media have the right to attend meetings of full council, the cabinet and committees except where confidential information or exempt information is likely to be disclosed, and the meeting is therefore held in private.

For information about attending or speaking at meetings, please contact the committee officer above or refer to the council's website



If you would like this agenda in an alternative format, such as a larger or smaller font, audio or Braille, or in a different language, please contact the committee officer above.

Agenda

1 Public questions/petitions

To receive questions / petitions from the public (notice to be given to committee officer in advance of the meeting in accordance with appendix 1 of the council's constitution) that is by 10:00 on Monday, 21 November 2016 for questions

2 Apologies

To receive apologies for absence

3 Declarations of interest

(Please note that it is the responsibility of individual members to declare an interest prior to the item if they arrive late for the meeting)

4	Minutes	5 - 12
	To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2016	
5	College Road area permit parking consultation	13 - 26
	Purpose - To advise members of the responses to the recent consultation in the College Road area and recommend the implementation of permit parking in part of the area.	

6 Salisbury Road Area Permit Parking Consultation 27 - 38

Purpose - To advise members of the response to the recent consultation in the Salisbury Road area and recommend the implementation of permit parking in the area.

- 7 Transport for Norwich Eaton and Cringleford area 39 70
 Purpose To consider the results of the consultation linked to the wider Transport for Norwich proposals for the Eaton Village Centre and Cringleford project and to agree to implement the scheme.
- 8 Transport for Norwich Newmarket Road; Eaton slip 71 86 road to Daniels Road

	Purpose - To consider the results of the consultation linked to the proposals for improvements to the existing footpath/cycleway between Daniels Road and the slip road into Eaton Village and to agree to implement the scheme.	
9	Transport for Norwich - A11 Newmarket Road project (Daniels Road to Hanover Road) Purpose - To agree proposals for a segregated inbound cycleway and associated highway alterations between the Daniels Road roundabout and the footpath link to Hanover Road.	87 - 106
10	Transport for Norwich – Changes to the access restrictions in pedestrianised areas in the city centre	107 - 118
	Purpose - To see approval to consult on the proposed changes to access restrictions in the city centre pedestrianised areas.	
11	Transport for Norwich - St Crispin's shared use crossing Purpose - To seek agreement to consult on proposals for a wide conspicuous at grade crossing over St Crispin's Road from St George's to Botolph Street and to note that the subway will be filled in.	119 - 128
12	Transport for Norwich – Angel Road-Waterloo Road cycling Improvements	129 - 144
	Purpose - To see approval to consult on the proposals for the Shipstone Road / Angel Road / Waterloo Road project. Members are also asked to approve the advertisement of Traffic Regulation Orders that would be required to enforce the final scheme.	
13	Transport for Norwich - Cycling improvements Purpose - To seek approval to consult on the proposals for the Mile Cross Lane to Fiddlewood cycling improvement scheme.	145 - 162
14	Review of Permit parking and pricing Purpose - To note the effectiveness of the new permit parking scheme, and to review the current pricing structure to ensure that the scheme is self-financing.	163 - 170
15	Major road works – regular monitoring Purpose - This report advises and updates members of current and planned future roadworks in Norwich.	171 - 176

Date of publication: Wednesday, 16 November 2016



MINUTES

Norwich Highways Agency committee

10:00 to 11:30

15 September 2016

Present:

County Councillors: Adams (chair) (V) Morphew (V) Agnew Sands (M) Shaw

City Councillors: Bremner (vice chair) (V) Stonard (V) Carlo Lubbock Peek

*(V) voting member

1. Public questions/petitions

Hotblack Road

Mr Liam Calvert, Hotblack Road, to ask the following question:

"Currently a large volume of traffic travels from Waterworks Road to the ring road via the small residential streets Hotblack Road and Bowthorpe Road due to the low capacity of the Dereham Road/Ring Road roundabout and the poorly designed Waterworks/Dereham Road junction.

As you consider improvements to the roundabout, what consideration has been given to improving the Waterworks/Dereham Road junction that could discourage rat running (for example lights or a mini roundabout)?

Does the committee consider the volume of traffic using Hotblack and Bowthorpe Roads acceptable when their width and residential nature is taken in to account?"

The chair replied, on behalf of the committee, as follows:

"It is the policy of both the county and city councils to encourage traffic onto major routes and discourage the use of more minor ones; and this is one reason why we are proposing major changes to the Dereham Road/ Guardian Road roundabout.

Waterworks Road, Hotblack Road and Bowthorpe Road are not considered major routes.

Redesigning junctions (such as Waterworks Road/ Dereham Road) to improve traffic capacity would only encourage more traffic to use Waterworks Road which is not something that we would wish to encourage.

The local geography is such that motorists tend to use Hotblack Road as part of the route between Heigham Street via Bowthorpe Road to the Ring Road. Hotblack Road already has the benefit of traffic calming measures in an attempt to limit its attractiveness. Currently, there is no funding available for any additional measures for traffic calming or traffic management in any residential areas in the city and our experience is that only major interventions (such as road closures) are effective in preventing through traffic. Any proposals, were we to be in a position to make changes (which as I have said we are not) would need to be considered over a much wider area than just Hotblack Road to avoid any knock-on effects."

By way of a supplementary question, Mr Calvert asked why priority could not be given to Hotblack Road to prevent traffic on it and sought clarification on the classification of roads. The transportation and network manager explained that all roads were classified as A strategic routes such as the ring roads; B roads were main roads (for example, Earlham Road); and C roads were local distributer roads. Waterworks Road, Bowthorpe Road and Hotblack Road were categorised as C roads for local traffic and therefore treated equally. If would be difficult to downgrade Hotblack Road to unclassified, given that it had a signalled junction onto the main road network.

St Clements 20mph zone

(The chair agreed that Councillor Brociek-Coulton, local member for Sewell Ward and Division, could present the results of a survey of 54 households in St Clements Hill and Millcroft Lane without providing a written statement. Copies of the survey sheets were circulated at the meeting.)

Councillor Brociek-Coulton referred to the proposals set out in item 4 (below) Transport for Norwich – Cycling Improvements St Clements Hill and reported the outcome of the survey. She said that 36 of the respondents had opposed the proposal to plant a tree outside the Whalebone Public House because it would be detrimental to road safety and access to the public house. All 54 of the respondents disagreed with the proposal to remove the railings across the road from the Millcroft Lane junction because they considered that it would not be safe for children and dogs. The majority of the respondents agreed with the proposal for double yellow lines to provide a safe haven for people approaching the brow of the hill and to prevent parking close to the St Clements Hill and Millcroft Lane junction. She asked members to consider the survey results when they considered the report.

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 21 July 2016.

4. Transport for Norwich – Cycling Improvements, St Clements Hill

The senior transportation planner, Norwich City Council, introduced the report with the aid of plans and slides. The transportation and network manager referred to the outcome of the local members' survey, which indicated that residents opposed the removal of the guard rails and explained that guard rails were no longer considered necessary and added to street clutter and maintenance costs. She suggested that the scheme, which had been safety-audited, could be implemented without the rails and reviewed if there were still concerns, as part of the post implementation safety audit. The tree outside the Whalebone Public House could be omitted from the scheme. Councillor Brociek-Coulton confirmed that residents were satisfied with the proposals for yellow lines.

During discussion the transportation and network manager referred to the report and answered members' questions. There had been full consultation on the scheme. Tactile paving would be used at the corners of St Clements Hill and Magdalen Road to prevent potential conflict from cyclists and pedestrians. Following discussion with the Norwich Cycling Campaign the planned cycle bypass in front of the Whalebone PH had been omitted from the scheme.

Members noted the concerns about the tree obstructing access and views and were advised that there was not room to move the tree nearer the public house because of utilities and as a member pointed out, concern about tree roots being too near the foundations of the building. The design of the cycle racks could be amended to omit the tree.

Discussion ensued on the proposals to remove the guard rails across the road from the Millcroft junction and that there was local opposition to this proposal. Members noted that guard rails had been removed several years' ago at the junction of Park Lane and Unthank Road and despite similar public concerns there had been no problems and the streetscene was more attractive. The entrance to the school near the Millcroft junction was not the main one. The major projects manager, Norfolk County Council, said that a similar scheme had been implemented in Kings Lynn several years ago where guard rails were removed at a major junction with schools in the vicinity. There had been no incidents recorded. The committee commented on the residents' opposition to the removal of the guard rails and the function of guard rails to manage pedestrian flow. The transportation and network manager said that the guard rails were in a poor state of repair and would need to be replaced if retained as a feature of the scheme.

The transportation and network manager confirmed that speed humps on Elm Grove Lane would be full road width and would be implemented in accordance with the specification on the drawings.

Discussion ensued in which the voting members considered that the concerns of the residents should be taken into account. The chair moved and the vice chair seconded that the planting of a tree outside the Whalebone Public House be

removed from the scheme and with all four voting members voting in favour the motion was carried. The chair moved and Councillor Morphew seconded that the railings should be retained and replaced as necessary and therefore the proposal to remove the railings should be deleted from the scheme, and on being put to the vote with all four members voting in favour the motion was carried.

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

(1) note the responses to the consultation;

(2) approve the installation of:

- (a) Traffic calming on Elm Grove Lane as shown on plan no.CCAG2-36-025;
- (b) Improvements to the junction of Millcroft with St Clements Hill, consisting of a raised table, kerb realignment and amended proposals for double yellow lines as shown on plan no.CCAG2-36-027, subject to the existing guard railing being replaced rather than removed;
- (c) Install the existing zebra crossing at the Magdalen Road and St Clements Hill junction on a raised table and provide a raised table on St Clements Hill to the north of that junction as shown on plan no.CCAG2-36-026. This arrangement includes kerb realignment and the provision of cycle racks, but the tree will be omitted;
- (3) ask the head of city development services to complete the necessary statutory process associated with the installation of the 20mph Speed restriction Order for the area shown on plan no. CCAG2-36-028 and the Traffic Regulation Order for the proposed waiting restrictions on St Clements Hill and Millcroft.

5. TRANSPORT FOR NORWICH – EATON AND CRINGLEFORD AREA

The principal planner (transport) presented the report with plans and slides.

During discussion the principal planner (transport) together with the transportation and network manager and the NATS manager (Norfolk County Council) referred to the report and answered members' questions. Consultation on this scheme was welcomed by members, including Councillor Lubbock, Eaton ward councillor. Members were advised that the consultation would start as soon as possible and that there would be a leaflet drop to residents in Eaton and Cringleford next month. Members noted that blanket 20mph zones in residential areas was more effective than piecemeal provision and would be achieved as schemes came forward It was noted that the proposals for a 20mph restriction in the wider Eaton village area would form part of the 20mph project associated with the blue pedalway. There was a lot of pedestrian activity in the Eaton centre. The scheme had been developed with early consultation of local members and stakeholders in July and key stakeholders would be kept informed as the project progressed.

Councillor Lubbock thanked the officers for the involvement of local councillors and residents' groups and said that the pre-consultation had been useful.

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

- (1) note that the scheme for Eaton and Cringleford crosses the city boundary;
- (2) agree to consult on the scheme to improve cycling facilities, and improve the junction and pavements in Eaton Village Centre and provide light controls on the Cringleford Bridge as shown on Plan No. PE4118-HP-010;
- (3) ask the head of city development services to advertise the necessary traffic regulation orders and notices to:
 - (a) introduce a 20mph Zone in Eaton Centre extending from the City boundary into Church Lane, Bluebell Road and the slip road from Newmarket Road;
 - (b) provide a series of road humps throughout this 20mph Zone;
 - (c) provide mandatory cycle lanes outbound from the City on the approaches to Cringleford Bridge, and inbound to facilitate access to facilitate cycle access to a revised Eaton Crossroads junction;
 - (d) widen existing footways along the slip road and Eaton Street to extend the existing shared use cycle track form Newmarket Road through the village centre;
 - (e) remove the parking bays on the slip road and the extension of double yellow lines on the slip road and into Eaton Street as shown on Plan No. PE4118-HP-010;
- (4) note that any objections received will be considered by a future meeting of the committee.

6. A11 Newmarket Road project (Daniels Road to Eaton Slip Road)

During discussion the NATS manager and the principal planner (transport) referred to the report and answered members' questions.

Members noted that the proposal was for a shared cycle and footpath and were advised that consideration of surface signage could be considered as part of the detailed design. Members were advised that there was a similar crossing to the proposed Sunningdale/Claremont Road junction on Earlham Road at West Pottergate, which had the same detail but although was for pedestrians not cyclists. The committee also noted that the existing cycle-footpath would be resurfaced in asphalt.

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

- agree to consult on the scheme to improve the existing cycling facilities, and improve the provision for cyclists on the junctions of Elveden Close, Sunningdale, Branksome, Camberley and Claremont Roads as shown on Plan Nos. PE4120-HP-0100-011 to PE4120-HP-0100-014 attached in Appendix 1
- (2) ask the head of city development services to advertise the necessary notices to implement any raised tables required as part of the scheme

(3) note that any objections received will be considered by a future meeting of the committee.

7. Transport for Norwich – Dereham Road/Guardian Road/Sweet Briar Road Junction Improvement

The principal planner (transport) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. He said that the allotment holders had been advised of the proposals and their initial response was relatively supportive.

Discussion ensued in which the principal planner (transport), the NATS manager, the major projects manager and the project engineer, referred to the report and answered questions. Members commented on the scheme and in general considered that it would address existing traffic congestion at this junction and improve safety. The provision of a crossing for pedestrians and cyclists was welcome. Cyclists could use the crossing though more experienced cyclists could choose to use the highway.

The NATS manager said that the works would ease congestion at the junction and would future proof the roundabout to reduced length of queues from all directions. He confirmed that the land was not a 'site of special scientific interest' (SSSI) as had been suggested by a member and that the land for the embankment was mostly from the allotment car park and that allotment holders affected would be assisted to move to another plot. Following consultation, and subject to the scheme being approved, the road would be widened first off the highway to minimise congestion and impact on the network by keeping traffic moving. Signalled options had been considered but would have a negligible impact. A roundabout was considered to be the best option. The scheme would improve bus rapid transit and customer confidence in bus journeys.

As part of the discussion members commented that this scheme was part of the Transport for Norwich programme and noted that the Northern Distributor Road (NDR) would reduce traffic on the outer ring road in the north of the city. There was acknowledgment that there remained a section from the A1067 (the end of the NDR) to the A47 and southern bypass that was not being delivered as part of the NDR. The major projects manager said that a report to the county council's environment, development and transport committee on 8 July 2016 set out the current position (<u>http://norfolkcc.cmis.uk.com/norfolkcc/Meetings/tabid/70/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/397/Meeting/423/Committee/18/Default.aspx</u>) and confirmed that traffic would be monitored following construction and opening of the NDR.

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

- approve for consultation the proposals included in the Dereham Road/Guardian Road/Sweet Briar Road Junction Improvement project, including:
 - (a) provision of a new enlarged (48 metre diameter) roundabout in place of the existing (38 metre diameter) roundabout.

- (b) provision of a controlled pedestrian crossing on Dereham Road, immediately east of its junction with Hellesdson Road;
- (c) provision of a controlled pedestrian crossing on Guardian Road, Road, approximately 42 metres south of the roundabout;
- (d) A reduction in the length of the existing Dereham Road city bound bus lane by approximately 59 metres;
- (2) note the following Traffic Regulation Orders/pedestrian crossing notices that would be required for the implementation of the scheme as described in this report, including:
 - (a) the reduction of the existing Norwich bound 24-hour, 7-days a week bus lane on Dereham Road by approximately 59 metres;
 - (b) the provision of the new pedestrian crossing on Dirham Road immediately to the east of the junction with Hellesdson Road;.
 - (c) the provision of the new pedestrian crossing on Guardian Road;
- (3) ask the head of city development services at Norwich City Council to begin the necessary statutory procedures associated with dedicating part of the existing Bellacre and Woodland allotment land to the northwest and northeast of the junction to highway; as required by the proposed scheme;
- (4) agree that the outcome of the proposed consultation will be reported to a future meeting of the committee.

8. 'A' Board Policy

The vice chair said that the city council's cabinet had adopted the 'A' Board policy at its meeting on 14 September 2016.

Councillor Lubbock said that she considered that the policy could have been bolder and that the policy should have allowed no 'A' boards at all, especially as, in a growing technological age, the use of boards obstructing the street seemed outdated.

RESOLVED, unanimously, with all 4 voting members voting in favour, to support the adoption of the A board policy, as outlined in the attached cabinet report.

9. Proposed Variations to Car Park Fees and Charges

Councillor Carlo referred to the city council's car park fees and charges competing with charges for Park and Ride and asked that the committee had an update on the Park and Ride scheme at a future meeting. The major project manager confirmed that the contract for the Park and Ride sites was with the county council but agreed that a 'for information' update report could be provided to a future meeting of the committee.

RESOLVED to support and recommend the proposed revised fees and charges to the city council's cabinet, as set out in appendices C and D of the report, to take effect from 14 November 2016.

10. 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

Report to	Norwich highways agency committee	ltem
	24 November 2016	~
Report of	Head of city development services	5
Subject	College Road area permit parking consultation	

Purpose

To advise members of the responses to the recent consultation in the College Road area, and recommend the implementation of permit parking in part of the area.

Recommendation

Members are recommended to:

- (1) Note the responses to the permit parking consultation
- (2) Agree to implement an 8am to 6.30pm (Mon to Sat) 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 in Appendix 2 and 3.
- (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 to complete the statutory procedures to implement the permit parking scheme as shown on plans attached in Appendix 2 and 3.

Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to meet the corporate priority to provide a safe, clean and low carbon city and the service plan priority of implementation of the Transport for Norwich strategy.

Financial implications

The operational and installation costs of the scheme will be funded through income form the permit parking scheme. Installation costs are estimated at £22,000

Ward/s: Nelson

Cabinet member: Councillor Bremner – Environment and sustainable development

Contact officers:

Ed Parnaby, Transportation planner	01603 212446
edparnaby @norwich.gov.uk	
Bruce Bentley, Principal transportation planner	01603 212445
brucebentley@norwich.gov.uk	

Background documents

None

Background

- Currently, the city council operates and enforces controlled parking zones (CPZs) throughout the city centre, the inner suburbs of the city and around the university. These permit schemes operate either 24 hours a day seven days a week in and around the city centre, whilst the more suburban ones operate between 8am and 6:30pm Monday to Saturday. Some parts of the University scheme only operate between 10am and 4pm Monday to Friday.
- 2. Following representations from local residents and members, including a petition to this committee, consultation was undertaken in the College Road area to extend the south western CPZ. Residents were asked whether they wanted permit parking 8am-6.30am, Monday to Saturday. The permit parking extension area and associated waiting restrictions that were included in the consultation are shown in Appendix 1 and 2. Residents were also invited to comment on the suggested scheme

Response rate

3. The following table details the response rate form each area and the level of support for permit parking received.

Area	No of households	Response rate	In favour
College Road	183	55%	63%
Glebe Road	150	51%	48%
Girton Road	4	50%	100%
Bensley Road	3	100%	0%
Jessopp Road	27	59%	56%
Recreation Road	18	72%	46%
Unthank Road	18	39%	100%
The Avenues/ Avenue Rd	31	87%	30%

Discussion of proposed extent of scheme

4. Historically it has usually been recommended that permit parking schemes are only implemented when there has been a response rate in excess of 50% over an area, and over 50% of those respondents have supported the proposals. This

is a high threshold for consultation responses and has in the past led to repeated extensions of a CPZ as residents experience the knock on effects of CPZ implementations. This is costly and causes frustrations to local residents who may have to wait many years for the next CPZ review.

- 5. There is a clear majority in favour of permit parking in College Road.
- 6. In the southern section of Glebe Road residents were strongly in favour of permit parking, however the northern sections of Glebe Road leading into Recreation Road were against.
- 7. Bensley Road has three households who all responded against permit parking. However it is neither practical nor favourable to the residents of this road to be excluded from the permit parking area.
- 8. Unthank Road and Girton Road residents were 100% in favour of permit parking.
- 9. By a narrow margin, a majority of Jessopp Road residents voted in favour of permit parking
- 10. The response rate from The Avenues was high and a clear majority were against permit parking.
- 11. Three households in the southern side of Unthank Road (outside the residents' consultation area) have requested to be included in any permit parking extension that includes Glebe Roads and College Roads owing to no suitable alternatives in their current zone.

The extent of the recommended permit parking area

- 12. Whilst overall along Glebe Road, the overall approval for permit parking was 48%, there is significant concern amongst officers that leaving just this short section of Glebe Road out of the permit scheme will result in significant additional parking pressure in this area, where parking is already at a premium and into the short section of recreation road. This creates a coherent area as an extension to the existing CPZ
- 13. Consequently, it is recommended to progress permit parking in all areas, except The Avenues. Members should be aware that this could result in additional parking pressure on adjacent streets as is usual on the edge of a permit parking area. This was made clear to residents in the consultation.
- 14. In the proposed permit parking area the response rate is 54% of households with 57% in favour of permit parking.

Responses to the detailed proposals

15. Issues raised by a significant number of respondents are discussed in the paragraphs below, and a table detailing other comments made on the proposals is included in Appendix 4, together with an officer response.

24 Hour Permit Parking

- 16.56 respondents said that they would have preferred 24 hour permit parking, many voting against the current proposals on that basis. The concern is that parking issues are at their most difficult in the evenings. This is an issue in all areas, whether the permit parking operates 24 hours a day, or over a more limited period, as this is the time when most residents are at home, and in areas where it is residential parking pressure that is the issue, permit parking cannot resolve this.
- 17. All the adjacent areas operate between 8am and 6.30pm Mon -Sat, and this prevents commuter parking, ensuring that the maximum number of parking spaces are available when most residents return home. Unlike some parts of the city (particularly those zones very close to the city centre and the Football Club) where we regularly receive requests to extend the operational hours of the zones, there appears to be little desire in the zones adjacent to this area for any change, which suggests that they are operating effectively over the shorter period.
- 18. In addition, this area is significantly further away from the main causes of evening external parking pressure, we would expect to have introduced 24 hour permit parking in those areas close to the city centre before implementing it here.

School pick-up and drop off

19. Permit parking will not effectively deal with issues surrounding school pick up and drop off, except that it might mean that more space on street was available during these times. Picking up or dropping off goods or people does not require a permit; it is only extended parking that does. In reality, it is only an effective school travel plan that will help to deal with this issue, and that is beyond the control of the council

Verge parking

- 20. Members will recall the recent report, consequent on work by residents of The Avenues that some minor parking controls were agreed, but that no further work would take place on verge protection until such a time as we had the resources to do a city wide review of pavement and verge parking. The report advised that this review was dependent on resources (which are currently not available) and would be likely not to result in the use of bollards, as these are a significant cost, both in installation and maintenance terms
- 21. That position has not changed, but in the interim, and in consultation with local members we consulted residents of a part of The Avenues about the permit parking option.

- 22. Whilst this does not in itself restrict parking on the verges, what it would do is prevent anyone other than a permit holder form parking there. In our experience, in other locations where most of the adjacent housing has off-street parking the effect of the permit scheme is to substantially reduce verge parking although not eliminate it completely. Consequently as this option is available now it was felt appropriate to offer residents this as a partial solution to the problems that they currently experience.
- 23. A majority of residents in The Avenues opposed permit parking but will have been aware of the earlier report, consequent on the work that they themselves did. Although it is recommended that permit parking does not extend into The Avenues, members do need to be aware that work on verge parking is unlikely in the near future, and there is no guarantee of the outcome of that review. The proposals omitting the permit parking in The Avenues are shown on the plan included as appendix 3.



El Sub Sta		
105 105	This map is reprode material with the pe on behalf of the Cor Stationery Office c (Unauthorised repro copyright and may l proceedings.	uced from Ordnance Survey rmission of Ordnance Survey troller of Her Majesty's Crown Copyright. duction infringes Crown ead to prosecution or civil
401	Licence No: 2016	
		NORWICH City Council
	2016 Sout Sheet 1 of	DRAWING TITLE h West CPZ Extension 2
urs Mon-Sat	SCALE	1 : 1500
nk	DATE	24/08/2016
	DRAWING No.	
	DRAWN BY	
rkings		





Comment	Number of responses	Officer response
The problem is after 6.30pm when everyone returns from work/ we want 24 hour permits *	56	See report; Paragraphs 16-18.
The problem is school pick-up/drop-off	18	See paragraph 19
There's no problem parking here	14	Views have been recorded as part of the consultation, and are reflected in the overall response rates
We need protection for the verges from parking/verge parking creates dangers for pedestrians and cyclists	11	See paragraphs 20-23.
The problem is the number of residents cars	8	Partly it is. Permit parking will limit on street parking to two cars per household which helps to tackle this. We also have numerous reports that there are substantial numbers of non-residents parking in these roads. See also paragraph 15 of the report
Scheme needs to be enforced	8	All permit schemes are enforced by the city council's Civil Enforcement Staff
Other areas should be included in parking permit consultation	7	The consultation area is based on information from residents and councillors. Implementing permit parking in areas to the north of the consultation area would create a pocket of non-permit parking immediately to the east.
More double yellows/double yellow the Avenues	6	There is a need to strike a balance between keeping junctions and roads clear and the provision of enough permit parking area for residents' needs.
Fewer double yellows	2	
It's a money making scheme for the Council	4	The costs of permits are intended to cover only the costs of running the permit scheme, and this was made clear in the consultation information sent to residents.

Comment	Number of responses	Officer response
Lincoln Street residents choose not to buy a permit and park in College or Glebe Road	4	If implemented, permit parking will require that they do to obtain a permit to park in these roads which we would expect to discourage this issue.
Taxi drivers park on the verge and sleep. This causes damage and safety issues	4	Any restriction to the highway will also cover the verge.
Multi-lets creating an issue with parking demand	4	Only two residents' permits are granted per council taxable unit.
Glebe and College Road are used as airport parking with taxis been seen picking up from parked cars	3	If implemented, permit parking will prevent this in these roads.
Permit spaces will block private accesses	3	Permit parking will not encourage parking over driveways more than the current lower level of waiting restriction.
Make the roads around Unthank Road one-way	3	Outside the scope of this consultation
Make the limited waiting area at Heigham Park longer than 2 hours	3	If The Avenues proposals go ahead the limited waiting time could be increased to 4 hours
Cannot afford permits	3	The four hour visitor permit is issued free to those on reduced incomes. The cost of a resident permit is only a fraction of the cost of running a car.
Permits should only be Monday to Friday	3	This is outside the scope of this consultation and would potentially create parking issues in this area where all other local roads to the south and east had restrictions on Saturday. It would be potentially confusing if each street had variations that were not essential.

Comment	Number of responses	Officer response
We live in house with more than two adults that need to drive	3	Permit parking if implemented will limit each household to two cars plus permit. Residents in this situation to make alternative parking arrangements for their third and subsequent vehicles
Regardless of the permit parking consultation results, permit parking is needed over the whole area	2	Noted. However, there has been little pressure from other areas for permit parking
There should be some limited waiting bays for visitors	2	Will need to see how many residents request this as space for residents parking will be in high demand
If there was no fee I would support it	2	Noted
More Car Club needed as would fit well with what your trying to achieve	2	Agree, we aim to strike a balance as many residents still prefer to run their own car and many need more than one car.
Flyers placed by residents could affect the vote	2	This situation is not ideal. The flyers appear to have been placed towards the end of the consultation. The majority of people had already voiced their decision (most people would probably not be swayed by this) so the effect should be minimal.
An area should be left clear of restrictions	2	In a controlled parking zone, controls must be in place on all parts of the highway.
Disabled bays needs to be provided	2	Blue badge holders can utilise any city permit zone for up to 3 hours plus will be able to purchase any residents parking permit for £19 per year. Specific demand for dedicated blue badge spaces in each residential street would inevitably be changeable.
60 visitor permits is not enough.	2	Residents can also use a 4-hour clock permit which has unlimited uses.

Comment	Number of responses	Officer response
The difference in price between large more polluting cars and smaller generally less polluting cars is too small	2	These have been set prior to this consultation in-line with the rest of the city and need to strike a balance. The differential in price is increasing incrementally.
It's unfair to penalise on car length	1	This is a long established policy which seeks to maximise available spaces in permit parking areas
Not happy with Car Club bay location	1	These were agreed as part of previous consultation and have been included on the permit parking consultation plan purely for the sake of clarity.
Temporary residents get a vote but will be moving on	1	On a practical level this is an unavoidable part of the consultation process.

*A significant proportion of these respondents voted no to permit parking in the hours described within the consultation despite showing support for permit parking

Report to	Norwich highways agency committee
	24 November 2016
Report of	Head of city development services
Subject	Salisbury Road Area Permit Parking Consultation

Purpose

To advise members of the responses to the recent consultation in the Salisbury Road area, and recommend the implementation of permit parking in the area.

Recommendation

Members are recommended 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 in Appendix 4;
- (3) ask the head of city development services to complete the statutory processes to implement the proposals shown on the plan contained in Appendix4.

Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to meet the corporate priority to provide a safe, clean and low carbon city and the service plan priority of implementation of the Transport for Norwich strategy.

Financial implications

The operational and installation costs of the scheme will be funded through income from the permit parking scheme. Installation costs are estimated at £18,000

Ward/s: Thorpe Hamlet

Cabinet member: Councillor Bremner – Environment and sustainable development

Contact officers:

Bruce Bentley, Principal transportation planner 01603 212445 bruce.bentley@norwich.gov.uk

Background documents

None

Item

Background

- Currently, the City Council operate and enforce controlled parking zones (CPZs) throughout the city centre, the inner suburbs of the city and around the university. These permit schemes operate either 24 hours a day seven days a week in and around the City Centre, whilst the more suburban ones operate between 8am and 6:30pm Monday to Saturday. Some parts of the university scheme only operate between 10.00am and 4pm Monday to Friday.
- 2. Following representations from local residents and members, including a number of petitions and questions submitted to this committee, consultation was undertaken in the Salisbury Road area to extend the eastern CPZ. Residents and businesses were asked whether they wanted permit parking, and if they did, whether they wanted it to operate 8am-6.30pm, Monday to Saturday, or 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The information provided as part of the consultation is contained in Appendix 1 and included initial proposals for permit parking areas and associated waiting restrictions. Residents were invited to comment on the suggested scheme

Response rate

3. The following table details the response rate form each area and the level of support for permit parking received. Residents were asked firstly whether or not they wanted permit parking, and if they said they did, then asked if they wanted the 24/7 option, or just Mon-Sat, 8am – 6:30pm

Area	No of h/holds	Response rate	In favour	Want 8-6.30 M-Sa	Want 24/7
Cremorne Lane (west) (Thorpe road to Salisbury Road	24	17%	50%	0%	100%
Salisbury Road	78	55%	81%	8%	92%
Cremorne Lane (east) (Salisbury Road to Frogs hall Lane)	50	20%	50%	40%	60%
Roseville Close	49	16%	63%	20%	80%
The Sidings	40	28%	55%	17%	83%
Thorpe Road (Residential & Canton restaurant)	12	58%	29%**	0%	100%

*Only one response was received from Thorpe Road businesses which supported permit parking 8-6.60

**2 respondents did not support the scheme because of the details, but said that they liked the idea of permits. This would make the support rate in principle 57%

Discussion of proposed extent of scheme

- 4. Historically it has usually been recommended that permit parking schemes are only implemented when there has been a response rate in excess of 50% over an area, and over 50% of those respondents have supported the proposals. This is a high threshold for consultation responses and has in the past led to repeated extensions of a CPZ as residents experience the knock on effects of CPZ implementations. This is costly and causes frustrations to local residents who may have to wait many years for the next CPZ review.
- 5. 4 streets saw a response rate of less than 50%. The response rate in Cremorne Lane (east) and The Sidings is low but a majority of those who responded did support permit parking. However, omitting these streets from the scheme would require a large sign at the entrance to Cremorne Lane (east) advising of the end of the permit parking zone. Once the availability of parking here is known, these areas would become subject to increased parking demand by non-residents. The low response rate may be due to the fact that almost all the properties on these streets have private off-street parking.
- 6. Cremorne Lane (west) is dominated by the rear accesses to premises on Salisbury Road, and to omit it from any scheme would be inappropriate leaving accesses open to fly parking with no controls in place. Although the response from the flats on Cremorne Lane (west) was low, this development has extensive off-street car parks, and probably a significant level of rental properties which might have affected response rate.
- 7. In Roseville Close, none of the properties face onto the public highway and have access off a private road to off street car parking. This may explain the low response rate. However, omitting this very short section of highway, immediately adjacent to a major route would almost certainly result in a significant increase in general parking here, if permits were to be introduced everywhere else. This would result in obstruction to the close, and to adjacent accesses to premises on Thorpe Road
- 8. Aside from Thorpe Road, at least 50% of respondents supported the introduction of permit parking. In Thorpe Road 2 respondents did not support permit parking only as a result of some details of the proposals. A clear majority across the area as a whole preferred 24 hour permit parking
- 9. Consequently, it is recommended to progress permit parking in all areas

Responses to the detailed proposals & amendments made

10. The detailed comments made on the proposals are included in Appendix 2, together with an officer response.

- 11. As a result of the responses received and following agreement from local members and the chair and vice chair of NHAC, three amendments to the proposed scheme were advertised in the press and by street notice on Friday 22 October, with a closing date for response of Friday 15 November. Immediately affected residents were also written to. These amendments were
 - Moving the proposed permit parking from the west to the East side of Cremorne Lane in the section that backs onto Salisbury Road. Residents have been advised that we would be unable to take action against any permit holder that did obstruct the garages
 - Introducing evening and Sunday only permit parking on the section of Cremorne Lane west of the Salisbury Road junction. The original proposal was for double yellow lines along this section to protect access to the Transco site at their request. However, they have since indicated that the restriction is only required during the working day
 - Remove the proposed short stay parking outside the Canton Restaurant, extending the double yellow line adjacent to Frogshall Lane slightly, and extending the proposed permit parking area

12. These proposals are shown on the plan contained in Appendix 3

Responses

- 13. There were no specific responses to the proposals to add the permit parking area in Cremorne that would operate in the evenings and on Sunday. As this proposal is consistent with the needs of the commercial operators in the area, and provides additional parking for residents it is recommended that this proposal is included in the agreed scheme
- 14. The changes on Thorpe Road were supported by 3 households, with a fourth objecting on the grounds that there was still not enough permit parking. However, there is no opportunity to provide any more permit parking in front of these properties. It is recommended that this change is included in the agreed scheme
- 15. The proposals to move the permit parking behind the garages was not supported by 8 respondents and supported by 4 respondents. However, the original request for the change was made by 8 respondents (See Appendix 2). Residents particularly cited maintenance and cleaning as a reason for wanting to park by their garages. Those objecting to the suggested permit parking were more concerned to ensure that they had unhindered access to their garages.
- 16. One resident objected to both proposals suggesting instead leaving the arrangements as they are outside the garages, and placing a single yellow line on the other side of Cremorne Lane. This, however, would negate the benefits of the permit parking scheme as this area would effectively be uncontrolled for much of the time, and consequently likely to take the brunt of any non-local parking
- 17. It is the officers view that the original proposals offered the better solution as the spaces proposed would be available to any permit holder at all times, whereas

placing them behind the garages limits their use effectively to the garage owners only. The proposals aim to provide permit parking for residents whilst ensuring that access is available to the Commercial operators that only have access via Cremorne Lane, and consequently a heavily parked street during the day is not appropriate.

- 18. It is therefore recommended that 24 hour permit parking is installed on Cremorne lane on the west side, with the east side (behind the garages) subject to a 'No Waiting' restriction 8am-6.30pm Mon-Sat allowing use by permit holders at all other times. This would give resident opportunity to park close to their garages in the evenings and on Sunday, whilst maintaining access during the working day, and ensuring that permit spaces available for use by all permit holders are routinely available.
- 19. The scheme has therefore been amended to reflect these recommended changes, and the details of it are contained in Appendix 4

Conclusions

20. Given the results of the consultation and the responses received it is proposed to implement the extension to the eastern CPZ as shown in appendix 4. Subject to the agreement of this committee the proposals will be implemented in Spring 2017.



Comment	Number of responses	Officer response		
Football Parking is a problem	11	Permit parking schemes are intended to ensure that parking is made available in a particular area solely for the benefit of		
Commuter parking IS a problem	9	local residents and businesses. The proposed scheme would help to alleviate this problem		
Wants permit parking at the rear of the garages on Cremorne Lane	8	See Report paragraph 11		
Does not want extra double yellow lines on Cremorne Lane	5	See report para 11		
Roads are not wide enough for spaces to be put on both sides	4	This is a misinterpretation of the plans. There are currently no waiting restrictions at all in the streets in this area, and the only change will be to require the display of a permit to park. There will be no spaces marked out on the street		
Permit spaces will block private accesses	3			
It's a money making scheme for the council	3	The costs of permits are intended to cover only the costs of running the permit scheme, and this was made clear in the consultation information sent to residents		
Commuter parking is NOT a problem	3	Noted, but responses suggest that this is an issue for many residents		
Not enough permit parking on Thorpe Road	3	See report para 11		
Problems are caused by residents	2	Permit parking does not overcome issues caused by residents themselves		
Football parking is NOT a problem	2	Noted, but responses suggest that this is an issue for many residents		
Scheme needs to be enforced	2	All our permit schemes are enforced by the city council's civil enforcement officers		
Salisbury Road should be made one-way	2	This is outside the scope of this project		

Comment	Number of responses	Officer response
No need for limited waiting outside restaurant	1	See report – para 11
Cremorne Lane is private.	1	Parts of Cremorne Lane and The Sidings are private. Permit parking has only been proposed on those sections that are public highway
There shouldn't be any double yellow lines	1	In a controlled parking zone, controls must be in place on all parts of the highway. Double yellow lines are proposed to keep junctions clear and to ensure access is maintained
Would like double yellow lines all down one side of the road (The Sidings)	1	The introduction of permit parking would reduce parking pressure in this area
Layby in the sidings should be for visitors only	1	The introduction of permit parking would restrict the use to residents' and their visitors. Currently anyone can park there
Permit should all be the same price	1	The permit parking scheme is operational across the city, and has been subject to significant review.
Disabled people should get free permits	1	The four hour visitor permit is issued free to any resident on reduced income. Permits for Blue Badge holders are issued at the lowest price, irrespective of the size of the vehicle
Might not use all the scratchcards, so that would be expensive	1	Cards cost 50p each, and are available in a minimum purchase of 20 cards (£10). This only covers the cost of issuing, so is the minimum charge we can reasonably make.
Cannot afford permits	1	The four hour visitor permit is issued free to those on reduced incomes. The cost of a resident permit is only a fraction of the cost of running a car.
Frogshall Lane should have double yellow lines	1	Frogshall Lane is not a public highway




Report to	Norwich Highways Agency Committee	ltem
	24 November 2016	-
Report of	Head of City Development Services and Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services	
Subject	Transport for Norwich – Eaton and Cringleford area	

Purpose

To consider the results of the consultation linked to the wider Transport for Norwich proposals for the Eaton Village Centre and Cringleford project and to agree to implement the scheme.

Recommendation

- 1) Note that the scheme for Eaton and Cringleford crosses the city boundary.
- 2) To 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:
 - Widening the footway on the south side of Eaton Street and changing its status so it can be used by cyclists and pedestrians.
 - Narrowing the entrance to Waitrose car park and putting an informal crossing for cyclists and pedestrians on a raised table.
 - 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.
- 3. 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. Ask 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:
 - Retaining the existing parking area on Eaton Street outside the old Post Office, increasing the maximum stay to two hours.
 - Installing double yellow lines on the remainder of the slip road and extend these further into Eaton Street.
 - Providing four new parking bays opposite to Barclays Bank on Church Lane as alternative parking to the parking bays removed from Eaton Street.
 - 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.
 - 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.
 - 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.

Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to meet the corporate priority to provide a safe, clean and low carbon city and the service plan priority to implement the Local Transport Plan and Norwich Area Transportation Strategy.

Financial implications

The budget for the scheme is £700,000 to be funded from:-

£475,000 DfT cycle city ambition (held by Norwich City) £300,000 LGF (held by Norfolk County) £100,000 CIL (held by Norfolk County)

The scheme was successful in receiving a contribution from the Local Growth Fund as the area along with the A11 corridor into the city has been highlighted as a priority for the Greater Norwich Growth Board.

The development and implementation costs of the scheme will be refined as the detailed design is progressed.

Ward/s: Eaton

Cabinet member: Councillor Bremner – Environment and sustainable development

Contact Officers

Billy Fox, Project engineer billy.fox@norfolk.gov.uk	01603 222987
Bruce Bentley, Principal transportation planner bruce.bentley@norwich.gov.uk	01603 212445
Andrew Wadsworth, Project engineer andrew.wadsworth@norfolk.gov.uk	01603 223986

Background documents

Consultation returns

Report

Strategic Objectives

- Norwich and its surrounding area is becoming an increasingly popular area to live, work and visit. It is the number one shopping destination in the Eastern Region and becoming one the Nation's premier cultural centres. To ensure the Greater Norwich Area continues to be popular and grow, the transport systems need to be able to cope with the increased demand.
- 2. Norwich is a medieval city with a narrow road system; incorporating a 21st century transport system to cope with the increased demand without sacrificing highway space for a particular transport mode or at the expense of green space and historic buildings is challenging.
- 3. The Norwich area Transportation Strategy (NATS) now more widely known as Transport for Norwich (TfN), is the adopted strategy which will deliver the transport improvements needed over the next 15 plus years. The strategy recognises everybody's journeys are different and does not look to force people to use one particular mode. It does look to give people viable options on how they choose to travel and actively promote sustainable transport. To do this in some areas of the network there needs to be a re-balance of the highway space available.
- 4. The Strategy details the plan for future delivery of improvements in order to develop sustainable transport, reduce congestion and improve air quality within the Greater Norwich area. The strategy has already delivered key improvements such as the award winning Norwich Bus Station, St Augustine's Gyratory, a network of Park & Ride facilities, St Stephens and Chapel Field North and various Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) improvements. It also includes the recently completed Postwick hub and the Northern Distributor Road which is due for completion late 2017.
- The implementation plan for the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy (NATSIP) was agreed by Norfolk County Council in April 2010 and updated in November 2013 (see link for updated implementation plan http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/view/NCC158241). The plan sets out the range of transport measures, together with their general intended phasing, for delivery over the short to medium term.
- The plan has now been updated to take account of what has been delivered since 2010, and to reflect the latest position on future scheme delivery, given progress with implementation, and now that the growth plans for the area are more clear <u>(see joint core strategy document:</u> http://www.greaternorwichgrowth.org.uk/dmsdocument/1953).
- 7. Cycling is on the increase for both recreation and commuting nationally and the area has a thriving cycling community. The implementation of a City wide cycling network (see link to cycle map: http://www.norwich.gov.uk/TransportAndStreets/Transport/Cycling/Documents/C

<u>yclingMapFront.pdf</u>) is a key part of the Transport for Norwich Strategy as by delivering a comprehensive city network this reduces a number of short distance car journeys removing pressure on the network, as well as offering improving quality of life and the health benefits that have been well documented.

8. The Greater Norwich area is one of eight urban areas across the country that has been successful in bidding for Cycle Ambition funding from the Department for Transport to comprehensively improve the quality of cycling infrastructure across the Norwich cycle network a copy of the application documents can be found here

http://www.norwich.gov.uk/TransportAndStreets/Transport/Cycling/Pages/CycleC ityAmbitionGrant2015.aspx.

Background

- 9. The cycle network highlights the importance of the centre of Eaton and Cringleford for cyclists. Two strategic routes (called Pedalways) pass through the project area. The blue pedalway connects Wymondham, Hethersett and Cringleford to the city centre. The purple pedalway encircles the city and connects the Tuckswood / Hall Road area to NRP and Bowthorpe. A neighbourhood route on Bluebell Road intersects with the Pedalways in the centre of Eaton.
- 10. The A11 / Newmarket Road corridor has been designated a bus rapid transit route. Increasing the reliability and frequency of services and the comfort and accessibility of bus stops are key to encouraging more use of buses. A piece of work was undertaken in 2011 to identify mobility hubs, which would allow interchange between buses and other modes of transport at focal points for community activity. The centre of Eaton was identified as a good location for develop a mobility hub. This was further developed in the Newmarket Road BRT Place Making and Landscape Strategy.
- 11. Considerable housing development is planned for Cringleford, Hethersett and Wymondham. The Joint Core Strategy allocated 1,200 homes to Cringleford, 1,000 to Hethersett and 2,200 to Wymondham. This will be combined with employment development around the Norwich Research Park to place pressure on the transport network. Part of the strategy for dealing with this pressure is to try and divert many of the journeys that would otherwise involve a car onto public transport and bicycles
- 12. The pressure of traffic on the junction in the centre of Eaton and the pinch point on Cringleford Bridge is partly caused by two features of the road network in the area. Firstly, the quickest route to UEA from the A11 is via the centre of Eaton because there is no direct link from the A11 and the alternative via the southern bypass and Watton Road is longer both in time and distance. Secondly, vehicular access to and from all of the homes in Eaton south of Church Lane can only be gained via the junction in the centre of Eaton as there is no access between Greenways and Sunningdale to prevent through traffic, and undue pressure on the Sunningdale junction (which is a simple priority junction). Waitrose also has

for a wide a catchment of customers, most of whom are car-borne.

Early consultation

- 13. In October 2015, a consultation took place with the residents and businesses of Eaton and Cringleford, and other key stakeholders. The purpose of this consultation was not to present proposals, but to help to identify issues that needed to be taken into account in any forthcoming plans. The principal issues raised were the operation of Cringleford Bridge, where there are substantial tailbacks during peak hours; and the operation of the junction of Eaton Church Lane and Bluebell Road where improvements for motor vehicles (and in particular left turning movements into Bluebell Road) were requested as well as improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. There was also significant support for the idea of a 20mph zone in the area. The proposals before this committee have taken account of these concerns and seek to address them as effectively as possible.
- 14. In July draft proposals were discussed with local stakeholders and members working group and appeared to be well received by those who attended. Following the meeting, all the comments and queries raised at the meeting where collated and investigated by the project delivery team. A 'Working Group Questions and Feedback Report' has been prepared and distributed to local stakeholders which summarises the outcomes of the queries raised. This is contained in Appendix 2 and informed the proposals that were approved for consultation by this committee in September 2015, which included:
 - Introduce a 20mph Zone in Eaton Centre extending from the City boundary into Church Lane, Bluebell Road and the slip road from Newmarket Road.
 - Provide a series of road humps throughout this 20mph Zone.
 - Provide mandatory cycle lanes outbound from the City on the approaches to Cringleford Bridge, and inbound to facilitate access to facilitate cycle access to a revised Eaton Crossroads junction
 - Widen existing footways along the slip road and Eaton Street to extend the existing shared use cycle track form Newmarket Road through the village centre
 - Remove the parking bays on the slip road and the extension of double yellow lines on the slip road and into Eaton Street.

Public consultation

- 15. The consultation started on the 5 October 2016 and ran for 4 weeks, until 04 November; this was one week longer than the statutory minimum three week period for traffic regulation order consultation.
- 16. The details of the consultation were publicised in the local press and radio both before and during the consultation in order to inform as many people as possible. Norwich City Council issued a media release to all media in Norwich and South Norfolk on 13 October 2016. The project has also had a webpage (www.norfolk.gov.uk/eatoncringleford) setup to help publicity, which was also added to both Norwich City Council and Norfolk County Councils' consultation web pages.
- 17. A letter accompanied with two enclosed plans, one showing the whole scheme area and another showing a close up of the centre of Eaton (see Appendix 3) was distributed to some 1900 properties, businesses and other stakeholders across both the ward of Eaton and parish of Cringleford.
- 18. Copies of the full size plan showing the whole scheme area where displayed at Waitrose in Eaton along with the Willow Centre and the church hall in Cringleford. All of the consultation material was also available online on Norfolk County Council's website at www.norfolk.gov.uk/eatoncringleford.
- 19. The consultation results have been analysed, of the 212 responses received, 51 expressed support of the proposals, either unreservedly or with some concerns and 25 objected to the proposals.
- 20. City and County Officers attended an evening AGM meeting for residents of Eaton held at Eaton Golf Course on 20 October 2016 to answer questions on the scheme proposals. The main issue raised by the local businesses was the proposal to remove both sections of parking bays on Eaton Street. As a result, the issue was discussed with Norfolk County Councils safety engineers and subsequent to investigation, the following recommendation of widths were identified in order to retain the parking bays outside the post office from a safety perspective:
 - (a) Retain a 1.8m wide, 31.5m long parking bay outside the old post office, and extend the waiting time to 2 hours.
 - (b) Retain a 5.0m wide road width adjacent to the parking bays to allow a 2.0m wide cycle lane suitable for uphill cycling and a 3.0m wide clearance for opposing downhill traffic.
- 21. A representative for 11 of the local businesses (Adrian Rowe of Adrian Rowe Haircutters) confirmed that they are more likely to support the proposals of the scheme with the larger section of parking bays on Eaton Street being retained along with an increase in waiting time of up to 2 hours, as fears of loss of trade will be minimised by this proposal. This would also mean that some on street parking will be maintained within the village centre of Eaton. This proposal looks

to address one of the main concerns raised by both residents and businesses in attendance and from the consultation responses received.

- 22. The main concern of the residents present at the AGM was the proposed conversion of the existing footpath to a shared use facility outside the shops on Eaton Street. The cycle provisions on Eaton Street between Church Lane and the Waitrose access have been looked at in detail. Due to the existing built environment and regulatory required minimum widths for both cycles and vehicular traffic it is not possible to construct any segregated facilities along this stretch of road. It was discussed that the likely users of the combined facilities would be the slower less confident cyclists and that the cyclist who currently cycle on the road will continue to do so.
- 23. A meeting was held with Norwich Cycling Campaign and Norfolk and Norwich Blind Associated (NNAB) on 13 October 2106 where the scheme proposals were presented. The feedback from the meeting was that they had concerns over the shared use facilities outside the shops on Eaton Street and the potential for pedestrian/cyclist conflict on by the bus stop on the slip road.
- 24. Discussions have been held with the bus operator in the area who has concerns over delays to the bus service over other highway users. It was noted that the new traffic model does not have a significant impact on traffic flows or traffic capacity and this was satisfactory.
- 25. The current proposal includes junction narrowing at the entrance / exit of Waitrose, which sits outside of the highway boundary. Waitrose are in favour of the scheme have requested some minor additional footway works as shown in Appendix 4.
- 26. The consultation responses have been recorded and queries raised answered please see Appendix 5 for full correspondence breakdown. The most common responses to the consultation were:

Ref	Times Raised	Issue	Officers Comments
2a	46	Not in favour of speed cushions (Disagree – Retain Proposal)	Traffic calming is required in a 20mph zone. This does not necessarily mean speed cushions but these are a very good self- policing option when compared to signage etc. and a self-policing methodology is requested in the project brief. We recommend to retain the speed cushions but if required we can use 20mph repeater signs along the length of the zone.

Ref Times Issue Officers Comments Raised		Officers Comments	
3а	60	Not in favour of shared use facilities on Eaton Street (Disagree – Retain Proposal)	There is insufficient space available in this built up area to accommodate segregated facilities along the entire length of the site. We are able to widen the existing footway to create the shared use facility and are planning on using contrasting materials to create the impression of segregation around the shopping areas. A key consideration/requirement of the scheme is that the vehicular capacity is not significantly reduced though traffic lanes and width have been reviewed. A critical change is the left hand turn from Eaton Street into Bluebell Road with the stop line being moved back and the radius being improved along with the lane being widened. These factors combine to ensure that HGV's can make the turn without blocking the forward and right turn lane which would reduce capacity. This is why there is insufficient room to create a segregated cycleway as we cannot reduce the width of the other two running lanes and maintain traffic flows. (NNAB reject the scheme proposals based upon the shared use facilities and Norwich Cycling Campaign are in favour of the proposals, however have some slight concerns regarding the bus stop detail)
4a	4a35We have reviewed the tracking of veh this junction and we are confident that proposals would still allow traffic to us junction as it does now. That said we at that a computer tracked model may de different to that "in the real world" and that the proposals revert the junction to similar previous incarnation which was previously changed. Our recommendat drop this aspect of the scheme, due to high percentage of concern from local residents and key stakeholders.		We have reviewed the tracking of vehicles at this junction and we are confident that the proposals would still allow traffic to use the junction as it does now. That said we accept that a computer tracked model may de different to that "in the real world" and can see that the proposals revert the junction back to a similar previous incarnation which was previously changed. Our recommendation is to drop this aspect of the scheme, due to the high percentage of concern from local residents and key stakeholders.

Ref	Times Raised	Issue	Officers Comments
4e	24	Narrowing Waitrose exit will slow traffic leaving and create queues (Disagree – Retain Proposal)	The same 2 exit lanes will remain after the work so no impact of traffic flows is anticipated. The change is intended to slow turning movements to improve safety, and is consistent with the city design guide. There would appear to be some confusion by some of those who raised this issue during the consultation, particularly that the exit is being reduced to one exit lane. Our recommendation is to retain this proposal. Whilst we haven't received a formal response from Waitrose during the consultation period, Billy and Tarmac are due to meet with Waitrose on Wednesday to discuss this element of the scheme further.
8c	56	Removal of on street parking will be detrimental to businesses and property prices/not in favour of removal (Agree – Amend Proposal)	A proposed change as a result of the consultation is to retain the 5 parking bays at the top end of the slip road and only remove the 3 parking bays near the cross roads, and make the retained parking bays a maximum 2 hour stay. An additional proposals for 4 relocated parking spaces on Church Lane has now been included in the scheme but it is recommended that these are not implemented.
8i	10	Parking outside Barclays bank causes traffic hold ups ,needs addressing (Agree – Remove Proposal)	Formal parking bays are planned on Church Lane, outside Barclays Bank. They will still allow cars to pass as 2 way traffic. HGV's will have to queue but this is considered acceptable is a village setting. Although not raised by many, this objection has been raised by the Eaton Councillors and several other stakeholders. Our recommendation is that we do not go ahead with this proposal.

The amended proposals

27. Following the consultation officers have reviewed a range of options for the Eaton Cringleford area, but there are space constraints which mean that it is not possible to provide both adequate capacity for motorised vehicular movement

and fully segregated facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. The following amended proposals are recommended as the best balance within the constraints of the area, and provide improved facilities for all users. The proposals include the following:-

- 28. The slip road from the Newmarket Road onto Eaton Street will be reduced from two lanes to a single lane. This enables significant widening of the footway on the south side, providing opportunity to widen the existing segregated cycle path to become 2 way between the newly installed Toucan crossing on Newmarket Road which terminates just before the northern vehicular access into the Cellar House Public House. This will the transition from the existing southern footpath which is to be converted to a shared use facility that will continue along Eaton Street which eventually terminates just before the Cringleford Bridge. This will necessitate the removal of the first section of parking bays situated on Eaton Street immediately north of the Hairdressers and Financial Planning businesses.
- 29. The crossroads in Eaton village centre will have a new light controlled junction incorporating pedestrian crossing points. The new shared use path on the slip road will connect with a pedestrian / cycle crossing point to a widened shared use path along Eaton Street. The existing shared use facility on Bluebell Road that terminates under the flyover is proposed to be extended south by a short length towards the junction with Eaton Street.
- 30. Areas of the existing carriageway and footway surfaces at the crossroads junction are worn and deteriorating, which will require resurfacing as part of the works. The exact extent and required treatment will be determined during detailed design.
- 31. The entrance into the Waitrose service yard adjacent to Red Lion PH is tightened to reduce the width that pedestrians and cyclists have to cross over. The access into the Waitrose car park will have a similar treatment with separate left and right turn lanes on exit. Proposed table at junction with Eaton Street and corner radii tightened up.
- 32. New speed humps are proposed throughout a proposed 20mph zone, extending into Cringleford.
- 33. Additional cycle facilities are provided within the Eaton Street, Church Lane, Bluebell Road junction, so that more confident cyclists can remain on the road within this traffic calmed area. New cycle parking in the village centre is also proposed. The new mandatory cycle lane to the advanced stop line (ASL) on Eaton Street will require the extension of the existing double yellow lines.
- 34. At Cringleford bridge it is proposed to introduce traffic lights to manage the flows. This was an issue raised by a significant number of respondents to the original consultation. This arrangement will allow traffic to be prioritised in different directions during the morning and evening peak periods, thus reducing delays and queuing. The lights will, however, need to operate all day on safety grounds, but this also has the advantage that the structure of the bridge, which is a 2*

listed building and a scheduled ancient monument will be much better protected from vehicle strike, which is an issue at the moment. Consequently, this proposal has been supported by Historic England. Proposed options for low level lighting on the bridge are being investigated, which will need approval from Historic England.

Timescales

- 35. Subject to Committee approval, construction would start in April 2017, and is anticipated to be completed by July 2017. The exact scope of the works will be identified during detailed design which will determine the overall length of the programme.
- 36. Although the detailed programme of works is yet to be finalised, construction would be carried out using a phased approach. This would be managed collectively with city and county officers working collaboratively with the contractor and street works coordinators to mitigate impacts on the local network to avoid key embargo times with common aims to minimise disruption where possible.

Conclusions

- 37. The proposals represent a balance between the various demands in the area and achieve improvements for all transport modes. They provide solutions to issues raised by local residents and stakeholders. Detailed design work will iron out any minor issues, and take account of any responses received as a result of the consultation where appropriate.
- 38. The brief received for the scheme will be met based upon the proposals set out above. There are some smaller elements of work to finalise during the detailed design process, but it is not envisaged that any outstanding work will require public consultation to be carried out or traffic regulation orders to be advertised.
- 39. The consultation responses include a large amount of issues which were raised either once or twice. These responses were generally unrelated to the scheme being advertised or very specific to the respondent, and as these represent a tiny percentage of the issues raised from the consultation letters sent, they generally did not result in a change to the proposals.

Resource Implications

40. Finance: The TfN programme forms an integral part of strategic infrastructure as set out in the Joint Core Strategy. The delivery of this work is funded through a number of sources including additional government grants e.g. City Cycle ambition, Community Infrastructure Levy, and mainstream capital funding LTP and allocated funding from the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). The overall funding of the programme has been agreed through the Greater Norwich Growth Board.

- 41. Staff: The project will be delivered through joint team working involving both County Council and City Council officers.
- 42. Property: The proposals can be provided within the existing highway boundary. Subject to a small proportion of the works which will need to be carried out within the Waitrose carpark to amend their access which falls outside of the highway boundary. Ongoing discussions to agree the exact extent and phasing of the works will take place with Waitrose to agree this.
- 43. IT: None.

Other implications

- 44. Legal Implications: None.
- 45. Human Rights: None.
- 46. Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA): An EqIA has been completed for the NATS Implementation Plan (TfN). An Equality Impact Assessment for this scheme has been carried out as part of the detailed development, after discussions with the appropriate groups.
- 47. Communications: None.

Section 17 - Crime and Disorder Act

48. The scheme will be designed to ensure it has a positive effect on crime and disorder where possible. Care will be taken during construction to minimise opportunities for crime and disorder, for instance the secure storage of construction equipment and materials.

Risk Implications/Assessment

49. A risk assessment has been undertaken for development of the NATS Implementation Plan (TfN). The key risks for delivering this are around funding, timescales and planning. These risks are being managed through active project management and ongoing engagement with stakeholders.









Eaton / Cringleford Project – Push the Pedalways

Working Group – Questions and Feedback Report

(Venue: Red Lion Pub in Eaton, Norfolk – Held on Friday 1st July 2016 from 10am)

August 2016

Introduction

This document contains Norfolk County Councils responses / feedback in conjunction with questions and queries that where raised by attendees of the Working Group meeting that took place at the Red Lion Pub in Eaton on Friday 1st July 2016 at 10am which lasted around 2 hours.

During the meeting a series of detailed discussions took place with a range of questions and queries raised by individuals. Concluding the meeting each point has been investigated and considered by the Project Delivery team. A summary of responses have been prepared which are presented within this document.

Questions and Responses

Question: Consider 3 way traffic lights at Intwood Road / Eaton Street junction, with pedestrian crossing points.

Response: This would have a negative impact to the traffic (flow capacity) using Newmarket Road and Eaton Street as the required green time for the Intwood Road green stage would have to come from Newmarket Road / Eaton Street green time, as would any pedestrian green man time and clearance periods.

Question: Can there be a single lane heading on Eaton Street east / north onto Bluebell Road? Currently busses turning left have to wait for traffic turning right to move before they can proceed due to the tail swing.

Response: The proposed new layout includes a much wider nearside lane now at 3.2m wide (was previously about 2.5 / 2.6m), this combined with a new constant 12m corner kerb radius and relocated stop line on Bluebell Road allow a large bus to make the left turn manoeuvre within the lane space provided. See the vehicle track diagram PE4118-TS-100 track 34.

It is beneficial in terms of capacity to have a separate left turn lane from Eaton Street into Bluebell Road as this relatively heavily traffic movement is able to run on green during more than one traffic signal controller stage whilst the ahead / right turn

adjacent lane does not.

Question: Can part time signals be considered? Can the signals at Cringleford Bridge be on demand on at off peak times? Is there any data on predicted travel times past along Eaton Street as a result of the new layout?

Response: Part time signals would not be a desirable option because:

- This would leave no formal traffic management arrangement during the time period when the traffic signals are not in operation which may pose a risk of conflict between any vehicles travelling in opposite directions over the narrow bridge.
- A 'no formal traffic control' option over the bridge was discounted as unacceptable with safety concerns at a previous progress meeting during the preliminary design process.
- There would be an inconsistent situation if sometimes when approaching there are signals and sometimes not, which may be confusing for some drivers.

During quieter times when there are lower traffic flows, the signals would rest in the absence of any demands on All Red, i.e. red signals shown at the same time on both approaches, when a vehicle is detected approaching from either direction the traffic signals would respond by providing a green signal allowing that vehicle to proceed. This is beneficial in terms of traffic calming as it removes the temptation for a vehicle arriving at the site to race to get through a green signal already showing before it changes to red, and also beneficial in terms of an approaching vehicle seeing a red signal not having to wait as long for it to change to green from an all red stage as opposed to the time needed for the signal to change if green were being provided to the opposing direction, which would then need to allow time for any vehicles already on the bridges to clear.

During busy periods the signals would likely be continuously changing from green to all red to green at the other end of the bridge section and back again to respond to continuing demands from vehicles and cycles with the green time being varied by the controller within predefined amounts depending on the traffic and gaps in traffic detected on the approaches. **Predicted travel time data:** The performance of the Eaton Street / Bluebell Road / Church Lane junction with the new cycle facilities is expected to be similar to the existing layout. As far as the new signal controlled arrangement over the bridges is concerned, it is anticipated that the existing very long inbound tidal queues which sometimes extend back over Cringleford Bridge over the A11 in the am peak period would be significantly less as the signals would provide a more balanced provision of green time with the less busy outbound traffic flow, with a similar situation for the reverse pm peak period.

Question: Traffic turning right from Bluebell Road onto Eaton Street sometimes stops at the red lights (repeaters from the slip road onto Eaton Street from Newmarket Road)?

Response: The proposed new layout would remove the pedestrian refuge island and the secondary traffic signal mounted on it, a new signal would be provided instead on the new southern footway / cycleway where its signal aspects would be less visible to right turning traffic from Bluebell Road into Eaton Street, additionally visors /hoods/ louvres can be provided if considered necessary during the detail design stage to provide appropriate signal visibility, this should prevent drivers misinterpreting the signal and stopping when not required to do so.

Question: Can a dedicated Right Hand lane with a separate green at the Eaton junction on Eaton Street turning right into Church Lane be implemented?

Response: Due to the very low numbers of vehicles which travel straight ahead from Eaton Street (from south-west) into Eaton Street (north-east toward the A11 slip road) the proposed ahead and right turn lane (as was the existing) is predicted to mostly carry traffic wishing to turn right into Church Lane, so no separate lane is required. It is conceivable that a green right turn indicative arrow could be provided to give some time for waiting right turning vehicles which have been unable complete the turn in gaps in the opposing traffic flow from the slip road during the standard green time (during stage 1), a right green arrow for a few seconds would allow those waiting vehicles to proceed unopposed. This would need to be considered during detail design and included / excluded depending on the results of that process.

Question: Can the proposed zebra crossing outside of the church be moved away from the bend?

Response: The proposed location of the zebra is situated where the existing drop crossing is currently adjacent to the church. The scheme proposals include implementing a 20mph speed limit through this section of Newmarket Road, which will include a series of different traffic calming measures to be implemented such as raised tables to reinforce the proposed speed limit within the environment. The crossing will form part of the Stage 1 Safety Audit review and comments from our Safety Engineers will be fully considered during the detailed design.

Question: Can there be a keep clear box / yellow box implemented opposite Intwood Road to allow cyclist somewhere to go turning right from Intwood Road onto Eaton Street?

Response: Since the working group progress has been made with the design. As part of our proposals we are looking into the feasibility of yellow box / keep clear markings adjacent to the Intwood Road junction. This will be considered as part of the Safety Audit Review along with any impacts on traffic slows this may add.

Question: Outside 18 Eaton Street at the cross roads – there will be a large open space with listed buildings. Can we use special materials to convey the difference between pedestrian and cycle spaces?

Response: The palette of materials used across the scheme will need to be fully agreed with the appropriate conservation officer. This will be considered during the detailed design stage of the project.

Question: Eaton Village sign needs to be relocated during the works. **Response:** All signing will be reviewed as part of the detailed design of the scheme. **Question:** How far foes the 20mph Speed Limit extent into Church Street? **Response:** The exact extents is yet to be fully determined, the general feedback from the working group suggested they would like to see the section up to the Bank implemented as a 20mph in this busy area. This is currently being reviewed and will form part of the Stage 1 Safety Audit.

Question: Can segregation be considered rather than shared use along the Eaton Street Slip Road? How will pedestrians / cyclists / visually impaired pedestrians use this space particularly at the Eaton cross roads junction? Can the tactile's be extended to the building shorelines?

Response: It will not be possible to implement blanket segregation within the entire limits of the scheme, but where the available space allows for segregation it will be implemented. At the Eaton cross roads tactile slabbed areas will be extended to building lines to enable visually impaired to navigate. A palette of materials will be used at the shared areas around the junction to encourage cyclists to naturally separate themselves from pedestrians where there is no alternative to crossing pedestrian and cyclist paths.

Question: Bluebell Road Slip Road up to the A11, paved area on left hand side but wants it on the right hand side for the bus stop.

Response: Any considerations for improvements to Bluebell Road Slip Road do not fall within the extent of works for this brief. There is a separate scheme that is looking at improvements on Bluebell Road that is being delivered by Norwich City Council.

Question: Can the 30mph signs on Newmarket Road be moved further southbound, to be situated before the Newmarket Slip Road (northbound) to slow traffic adjoining the Newmarket Road traffic.

Response: These signs do not fall within the extent of works for this brief so would not be altered as part of the scheme. Norwich City Council are currently looking into this proposal as part of another scheme.

Question: Consider removing the bus lane on Newmarket Road before the Newmarket Slip Road (Northbound) entry as this causes traffic to cut across lanes without looking.

Response: This bus lane does not fall within the extent of works for this brief so would not be altered as part of the scheme.

Question: At the Keswick Road / Intwood Road junction, can some physical traffic calming features be implemented on Keswick Road to slow down traffic.

Response: This junction does not fall within the extent of works for this brief so would not be altered as part of the scheme.



NOTE TBC - Widen cycle track up to new signal controlled crossing to allow two way use by cyclists

Bus shelter to be set further back in verge

Widened path converted to shared-use



Existing kerbline

Existing Trees

Existing footways to be paved, widened and converted to shared-use with cycles.

Speed cushions

Improved footway surface

Feature paving to mark building edge

Footpath surface to match existing asphalt

0

Eaton Village Centre proposals

© Crown Copyright and database right 2014. Ordnance Survey 100019747.





Issue Ref.	l imes Raised	Issue	Officers Comments (how many response
0			
1		General overview of proposals	
1a	51	Generally in favour of proposals	
1b	25	Generally not in favour of proposals	
1c	7	Proposals will cause undue delays and peak times during the day to motorists	Traffic modelling suggests that there will be no s the vehicular traffic in the area.
1d	1	Proposals do not help cyclists	Refer to CLoS score to prove/disprove
1e	1	Construction work must be carried out so that the area does not become grid locked Church Lane is the only exit from Eaton for many	
2		Speed cushions and 20mph	
2a	46	Not in favour of speed cushions	Traffic calming is required in a 20mph zone. The necessarily mean speed cushions but these are policing option when compared to signage etc. methodology is requested in the project brief. W retain the speed cushions but if required we car repeater signs along the length of the zone.
2b	8	20mph limit ends too soon on Church Lane (extend to Greenways)	This is something that can be considered at the stage.
2c	0	Traffic flows will be greatly reduced along Eaton Street	Traffic modelling suggests that there will be no state the vehicular traffic in the area.
2d	7	Extend speed limit proposals to A11	This location is outside of the scheme limits of v not included in the brief for the scheme. This pr addressed as part of this scheme.
2e	6	How will 20mph limit be enforced	Speed cushions are a 'self policing' traffic calmi force traffic to slow down. There is a legal order the 20mph speed limit so any vehicles travelling will be liable to prosecution.
2f	1	Speed cushion outside 8 Newmarket Road adjacent a bus stop and near an access	The bus will be able straddle the bus stop with r There are accesses near to the proposed speed there is sufficient space for leaving traffic to stra reaching them. The location will however, be re design stage.
2g	12	Speed cushions not in correct locations	The speed cushions need to be spread out with to meet the current regulations. Some adjustme but the positions shown are likely to be near the
2h	3	Extend 20mph speed limit along Newmarket Road to Keswick Road	This is something that can be considered at the stage.

Appendix 5

ses for each)
significant effect on
nis does not
e a very good self- and a self-policing We recommend to In use 20mph
e detailed design
significant affect on
works and as such roposal will not be
ing feature which r associated with g above this speed
minimal affect. ed cushions but aighten up before eviewed at detailed
hin a specific range ent can be made e final locations. e detailed design
5

2i	10	Use speed tables instead of speed cushions	Speed tables are a valid alternative to cushions this area. The tables have to be a set height an adjacent footways, but in this area the footways large amount of remedial works will have to be they could be installed. Additional drainage sys needed to prevent localised flooding which mak more expensive than cushions.
2j	17	Not in favour of 20mph zone	A 20mph zone has been specifically requested project brief as this is a feature which can beco through the use of traffic calming features.
2k	3	Traffic calming speed cushions not needed as traffic signals are traffic calming features	Traffic signals can be classed as traffic calming spacing's of these features do not meet the cur additional measures are required.
21	13	In favour of 20mph zone	
2m	3	In favour of speed cushions	
3		Cycle Queries	
За	60	Not in favour of shared use facilities on Eaton Street	There is insufficient space available in this built accommodate segregated facilities along the er- site. We are able to widen the existing footway shared use facility and are planning on using co- to create the impression of segregation around areas. A key consideration/requirement of the s- vehicular capacity is not significantly reduced th and width have been reviewed. A critical chang turn from Eaton Street into Bluebell Road with t moved back and the radius being changed alor being widened. These factors combine to ensu- make the turn without blocking the forward and which would reduce capacity. This is why there to create a segregated cycleway as we cannot the other two running lanes and maintain traffic reject the scheme proposals based upon the sr and Norwich Cycling Campaign are in favour of
3b	7	Turn into Bluebell Road from Eaton Street not clear where cycles should be positioned	The proposals do not include a dedicated cycle this area. The blue pedalway directs cyclist up t Newmarket Road.
Зс	6	Mandatory cycle lane makes turning right out of Waitrose dangerous	Vehicles leaving Waitrose do not cross a mand Cyclists are directed to the shared use facilty to Waitrose exit. This is perhaps not clear on the question.

ns but are not ideal in and be flush with the ys are low meaning a e carried out before stem would also be ake the tables much
d as part of the ome self policing

ng features, but the urrent regulations so

ilt up area to entire length of the y to create the contrasting materials d the shopping scheme is that the though traffic lanes ge is the left hand the stop line being ong with the lane ure that HGV's can d right turn lane e is insufficient room t reduce the width of ic flows. (NNAB shared use facilities of the proposals) le facility for cycles in the slip road to

datory cycle lane. to pass through the plan hence the

			The new cycle facilities are not intended to be
			cyclist but are more aimed at the less confider
3d	1	Not in favour of cycle facilities as likely not to be used	currently don't use the route. Confident cyclist
			road and are highly likely to continue to do so
			finalised.
3e	1	Use a London style bus stop bypass on the slip road	The bus stop on the Eaton slip road is based u
			Cycling Design Standard document.
3f	1	Continue kerb protection of cycle lane down entire slip road	I his is something that can be considered at th
			Stage.
29	4	How are evolute expected to erece Cringleford Bridge?	troffic light phase with the vehicular troffic pa
Sy		How are cyclist expected to closs chingleford bruge?	lianc light phase with the vehicular traffic, no
			Ideally this would be implemented but there is
3h	4	Would like a segregated cycle lane the entire length on the scheme	available in this built up area to accommodate
0.1			along the entire length of the site.
			The mandatory cycle lane are intended to dire
Зi	18	How are mandatory cycle lanes to be used	correct position for onward travel without the n
			cross 2 lanes of traffic at the cross roads.
Si	3	Is there any way to ensure that cyclists use the proposed cycle lanes?	Cyclists do not have to use the cycles lanes if
	5	is there any way to ensure that cyclists use the proposed cycle lanes:	stay in the carriageway with vehicular traffic.
3k	1	Vehicle headlights blind cyclists coming up the slip road at night	This is not something that can be addressed a
			scheme.
			It is anticipated that cyclist would position then
			mandatory cycle lane that starts East of the w
01	3	3 How would cyclists find their way onto slip road when heading into the city	mandatory cycle lane leads cyclists into the sti
31			flow of traffic without baying to cross 2 lange
			would have had to do had the mandatory cycle
			existence
			The survey we had carried out does not agree
3m	2	Cyclist don't cycle up the slip road, the small numbers who do push the bikes up	One of the aims of the project is to increase cy
_			area through the provision of improved facilitie
			ASL's only work when cycles can be safely tak
3n	1	Maintain an ASL at bottom of slip road for evelicts turning right	the queue - in this location the width does not
011			passage to take cyclists to the head of the que
			little purpose.
30	1	In tavour of shared use facilities on Eaton Street	
			ASL'S ONLY WORK WHEN CYCLES CAN be safely tak
Зр	3	Have ASL's at every traffic signal.	the queue - In this location the width does not
			little purpose
			This is not possible as it would significantly red
30	3	Have green phase for cycles only at each traffic signal	vehicular traffic and there is no safe way to ge
59	Ŭ		of the queue to take advantage of the cycle ph
3r	1	Install speed cushions for cyclist coming down slip road	
<u>3s</u>	1	Bus shelter is not being moved to a sensible location	
4		Road Alignment	

used by every nt cyclists who s currently ride in the after the scheme is

upon the London

ne detailed design

ridge on the green longer passing an

insufficient space segregated facilities

ect cyclists into the need for them to

they would prefer to

as part of the

nselves in the /aitrose exit. This raight ahead and he slip road with the of traffic as they e lane not been in

e with this statement. yclist numbers in the es.

ken to the head of allow a safe eue so would serve

ken to the head of allow a safe eue so would serve

duce the capacity for et cyclists to the front nase only.

4a	35	Not in favour of narrowing Intwood Road junction	We have reviewed the tracking of vehicles at the are confident that the proposals would still allo- junction as it does now. That said we accept the tracked model may de different to that "in the r see that the proposals revert the junction back previous incarnation which was previously char recommendation is to drop this aspect of the s
4b	2	Request 3 way lights at Intwood Road Junction	Traffic modelling suggests that 3 way lights at the have a massive impact on traffic flows along E Street/Newmarket Road, with a big reduction in not be implemented.
4c	1	Make Intwood Road one way	This location is outside of the scheme limits of not included in the brief for the scheme. This p addressed as part of this scheme.
4d	4	Ensure enough space on Church Lane between Toucan and existing Keep Clear markings	This is something that can be considered at the stage.
4e	24	Narrowing Waitrose exit will slow traffic leaving and create queues	The same 2 exit lanes will remain after the wor traffic flows is anticipated. The change is inten- movements to improve safety, and is consister design guide. There would appear to be some of those who raised this issue during the consu- that the exit is being reduced to one exit lane. Or recommendation is to retain this proposal.
4f	1	Widen footway on NW corner of crossroads (by retaining wall) and make shared use.	This is something that can be considered at the stage.
4g	4	Footway near church (Newmarket Road) is narrow - widen	This already forms part of the proposals.
4h	1	Look at improving Intwood Road/Keswick Road junction	This location is outside of the scheme limits of not included in the brief for the scheme. This p addressed as part of this scheme.
4i	2	Going to a single lane on Eaton Street will cause traffic to queue back to Newmarket Road	Traffic modelling suggests that there will be no the vehicular traffic in the area.
4j	1	Not in favour of a single lane down slip road as turning traffic will cause hold ups	Traffic modelling suggests that there will be no the vehicular traffic in the area.
4k	10	No dedicated right hand turn lane from slip road will block opposing traffic	There is no dedicated right hand turn phase fo from the slip road, the traffic must wait for a filt
41	9	Ensure traffic turning right from Eaton Street into Bluebell Road has sufficient space to turn	Vehicle tracking has been carried out using spo this confirms that there is sufficient road space vehicular traffic.
4m	1	No need to narrow road by church as this will squeeze traffic and cyclists together	Narrowing of a carriageway is an accepted me traffic down, which is an aim of the project. The sides of the road at the church are very narrow enough for pram/wheelchair. Narrowing the ca southern footway to be widened sufficiently to footway to be constructed to allow a pram/whe
An	15	Move stop line back on Bluebell Road to allow large vehicles a wider turning width/in	This already forms part of the proposals
411	10	favour of moving stop line back	initis alleady ionnis part of the proposals.
40	1	Do away with traffic islands at cross roads	

this junction and we by traffic to use the hat a computer real world" and can k to a similar anged. Our scheme.

this junction will Eaton in capacity so would

f works and as such proposal will not be

ne detailed design

rk so no impact of ided to slow turning int with the city confusion by some sultation, particularly Our

ne detailed design

f works and as such proposal will not be

significant affect on

significant affect on

or traffic turning right ter arrow to turn.

pecialist software and e available for

ethod of slowing te footways on both w and not wide arriageway allows the allow a 1.2m wide eelchair to pass.

4p	1	Maintain traffic island on Eaton Street by cross roads to allow right turns into	
		Tightening Church Lane/Slip Road junction will slow traffic and increase collision	
4q	/	risk/make it difficult for large vehicles	
4r	1	Consider crossing point for pedestrians at Bluebell Road/A11 junction	
4s	2	In favour of narrowing Intwood Road junction	
5		Crossing Points	
5a	1		This is something that can be considered at the detailed design
	•	Make zebra crossing on Newmarket Road a Toucan Crossing	stage.
5b	1	Ensure crossing points are silent i.e. no beeping	Models which do not beep can be specified and installed.
5c	1		There are no plans to remove the crossing by Jewson's as part of
		Will zebra by Jewson's be removed as new ones being installed	the scheme.
			The crossing at the Church is located at an existing crossing point.
5d	4		Positioning can be reconsidered at detailed design stage.
	-	Zebra crossing near church is in wrong place/stops outside house invading on privacy	
Γ.	10		I he crossing on Newmarket Road is located at an existing
be	10	Zebra en Celney I and Newmarket Read net needed	crossing point which is already well used by pedestrians. The
			This is something that can be considered.
5f	1	Have a toucan crossing near Colney lane to allow cyclists travelling to A11 a safer cro	
		Trave a totean crossing hear comey lane to allow cyclists travelling to ATT a safer cit	There is a pre-existing crossing point here that is well used. The
			south footway will be widened but there is insufficient space
5g	2		available to widen the north footway so pedestrians have a desire
		Crossing point at the church will not be needed if the road is narrowed	to cross at this pinch point location
			This is a valid concern, but it is not possible to have the crossing
5h	2		point closer to the junction due to the existing bus stop and road
_		Crossing point on Colney Lane is too far away from the junction to be used	alignment.
5i	12	Zebra crossings are a good idea/supported	
6		Environmental	
60	3	Increase the amount of new tree planting	Tree planting will form part of the scheme, with more trees being
0a	5		planted than are planned to be removed.
6h	4	Reduce lining in conservation area to a minimum	The proposals do intend to use the minimum amount of lining
			possible to create enforceable facilities.
7		Traffic Signals	
			I ne common place survey identified the bridge as an area which
7a	3		causes great concern to both cyclists and vehicles. Formalised
		Charge traffic lights recorded on bridge	traffic control helps to maintain traffic flow capacity through the
		Sname traffic lights needed on bridge	Iraffic modelling.
		Right of the bridge would need to be tidel to match traffic flows in fevering of sizes to	Inte proposed signals are tidal so traffic heading into the city has
7b	54	signals at the bhoge would need to be tidal to match traffic nows/in favour of signals	phonty in the monthing and vice versa in an evening. During the day
		at bridge	approaches which helps speed up traffic flows
		Does new crossroad arrangement allow a dedicated right turn sequence into Church	approaches which helps speed up traffic flows.
7c	3	I ane as filter is not suitable	NO there is not a dedicated right turn only sequence.
	<u> </u>		At rush hour this should not be the case as traffic volume would
		Signals at the bridge will cause frustration and cause drivers to speed up once past	not allow it. During off peak hours the signals are on demand
_ ·			
7d	1	them	which will minimise the red period for vehicles to help reduce
7d	1	them	which will minimise the red period for vehicles to help reduce waiting times.

7e	12	Signals on the bridge not required as traffic flows work well across the bridge	This statement is in opposition to the response received from the common place consultation
7f	3	Traffic light not needed on the bridge as there is sufficient space for 2 way traffic	There is enough space for 2 smaller vehicles to but not for large vehicles which use the route. are regularly struck causing damage which is e consuming to repair as consent for work is requered.
7g	1	Make the crossings so that if one person presses the button the whole junction stops giving people time to cross wherever they are	
7h	2	Make a separate filter left turn out of Church Lane	
7i	1	Traffic signals are too far away from narrow point of bridge	
8		Other	
8a	1	Would like the opportunity to comment on bluebell cycle path	This is something that can be considered at the stage.
			This is something that can be considered at the
8b	2	Temporarily open the access route between Greenways and Sunningdale during the	stage.
			A proposed change as a result of the consultation
			parking bays at the top end of the slip road and
			parking bays near the cross roads, and make t
			bays a maximum 2 nour stay. An additional pro
			relocated parking spaces on Church Lane has
			In the scheme but it is recommended that thes
80	56	Removal of on street parking will be detrimental to businesses and property prices/no	Implemented.
			I his location is outside of the scheme limits of
0.4	4	Extend works systeme Cringleford Crosse (between The Didings and Kerwick Deed)	not included in the brief for the scheme. This p
80		Extend works outside Cringleford Green (between The Ridings and Keswick Road)	This is compatible that can be considered at the
80	1	Slip road poods to be gritted in winter as 2 way evelo path will be dangerous if not	this is something that can be considered at the
00		Silp toad fleeds to be gritted in writter as 2 way cycle path will be dangerous if hot	Sidge. Mandatory cyclo lanos can bo implomented wi
Of	1	Mandatory avela lange do not avist so why using them?	lorder
01			This location is outside of the scheme limits of
			not included in the brief for the scheme. This of
80	1	Consider double vellow lines on Intwood Boad	addressed as part of this scheme
- Og			One of the aims of the project is to improve the
			area (a ranid transport route) so the hope is m
8h	1	No one will use the cycle parking in the areas indicated	these facilities once completes
			Formal parking bays are planned on Church L
			Barclays Bank. They will still allow cars to pass
			HGV's will have to queue but this is considered
			village setting. Although not raised by many, th
			been raised by the Eaton Councillors and save
			stakeholders. Our recommendation is that we
Ri	10	Parking outside Barclays bank causes traffic hold ups, needs addressing	with this proposal
	12	I arring outside Darciay's Darik causes traine noid ups ,needs addressing	The scheme is aimed at improving oveling prov
			Ideterment to other road users. Vehicular traffic
Qi	10	Scheme gives evelists priority over overvene also spend menov alsowhere	significantly affected as a result of the propose
oj	10	locueme dives cyclisis buonty over everyone else - spena money elsewhere	Isignificantly anected as a result of the proposa

es which have been	
to pass side by side The bridge parapets expensive and time	
quired from Historic	
ne detailed design	
ne detailed design	
ation is to retain the 5 nd only remove the 3 the retained parking roposals for 4	
s now been included se are not	
f works and as such proposal will not be	
ne detailed design	
ith a traffic regulation	
f works and as such proposal will not be	
e bus services in the more cyclists will use	
ane, outside s as 2 way traffic. d acceptable is a	
his objection has eral other do not go ahead	
wisions but not at the	
ic capacity will not be als.	

			The footbridge cannot be widened but would have
			This is a very expensive option and not conside
8k	4	Widen footbridge at Cringleford Bridge to allow cycles to use this	money.
			This is something that can be considered at the
81	2	Reopen exit from Waitrose onto Church Lane	stage.
			I his location is outside of the scheme limits of
9m	4	Puild a small stratch of payament along Intward Road which links the east and of R	readdrossed as part of this scheme. This p
0111	I		This is something that can be considered at the
8n	1	Permanently open the access route between Greenways and Sunningdale, maybe	Inis is something that can be considered at the
0.1			This location is outside of the scheme limits of
			not included in the brief for the scheme. This p
80	2	Keswick Road needs to be considered as part of the scheme	addressed as part of this scheme.
			Information requested has been provided by N
8p	1	Please provide further information under freedom of information act	Council's FOI team.
			The consultation is not a statutory requirement
8q	1	Not enough time given for responses	for responses is deemed sufficient.
			Enforcement is a responsibility of Norrolk Cons
			Esten Street parked troffic could significantly of
Qr	2	Double vellow lines cosmotic only as existing ones are not enforced	Leaton Street parked tranic could significantly a
01	2	Double yellow lines cosmetic only as existing ones are not enforced	This location is outside of the scheme limits of
			not included in the brief for the scheme. This p
85	1	Traffic leaving A11 junction at give ways lines not being addressed	addressed as part of this scheme.
	•		This location is outside of the scheme limits of
			not included in the brief for the scheme. This p
8t	1	No provisions made for Intwood Road/Keswick Road junction	addressed as part of this scheme.
			Refer to Clos Scores as to whether the targets
8u	4	Most of the proposed work is a waste of tax payers money	achieved.
			This location is outside of the scheme limits of
			not included in the brief for the scheme. This p
8v	2	Build a slip road from A11 to Eaton Street	addressed as part of this scheme.
			This location is outside of the scheme limits of
0		Deer realizer on Organizer (on the feature)	not included in the brief for the scheme. This pl
8W	1	Poor parking on Greenways (on the tootways)	Bort of the properties are to remove the phone
OX	I		A separate scheme is being delivered to addre
81	1	Cycling facilities on Bluebell Boad do not work so won't fit in with these proposals	lissues on Bluebell Road
Oy	1		This can not be implemented due to the traffic
			The proposed signals allow tidal flows of traffic
			different demands in the day. It is likely that tid
			dominate greatly at peak hours causing queues
8z	2	Narrow bridge to a single vehicle width to allow equal priority crossings	would not easily get chance to disperse.
	1		This location is outside of the scheme limits of
			not included in the brief for the scheme. This p
8aa	1	Spend some of the money on Thickthorn Roundabout to catch red light jumpers ins	e addressed as part of this scheme.

ave to be replaced. ered good value for	
e detailed design	
works and as such roposal will not be	
e detailed design	
works and as such roposal will not be	
orfolk County	
and the time given	
tabulary. The enforced and along ffect the traffic flows parking areas. works and as such roposal will not be	
works and as such roposal will not be	
in the brief are	
works and as such roposal will not be	
works and as such oposal will not be	
box. ss the cycling	
flows in the area. to meet the al flows would s of traffic which	
works and as such oposal will not be	

			This was very strongly supported through the common place
			survey and as such a design will be commissioned for inclusion
8ab	1	Lighting on Cringleford bridge is not necessary	within the final scheme proposals
040	1		The cost of this work would not be justified for the benefit which
820	1	Build a dedicated cycle bridge adjacent to the existing Cringleford Bridge	would be gained. (In terms of an increased CL oS score)
Oac	1		This is something that can be considered at the detailed design
Rad	1	I would like you to provide full statistical evidence that such measures are necessary	
oau 8aa	1	In favour of reducing street clutter	Staye. This is already being included in the scheme proposals
ode			This location is outside of the scheme limits of works and as such
			not included in the brief for the scheme. This proposal will not be
Rof	2	Extend double vellow lines enpesite Greenways to provent parking	addrossed as part of this scheme. This proposal will not be
oai	2	Extend double yellow lines opposite Greenways to prevent parking.	This proposal is already being developed as part of a separate
900	4	Correcteut work to provent people perking on Calpav Long	cohomo
oay	4	Carry out work to prevent people parking on Coiney Lane	This leastion is outside of the scheme limits of works and as such
			not included in the brief for the scheme. This proposed will not be
Qab	4	Correction revenuents at another table on Supplicately	addressed as part of this scheme. This proposal will not be
880		Carry out improvements at speed table on Sunningdale	Addressed as part of this scheme.
			agreement with Nerwich City Council the A11 has been used as
			the out off for the mailing distribution, on these parts of the A11
0 ei		Llove net reactived a consultation letter	are not being cent concultation letters
881	2	Have not received a consultation letter	are not being sent consultation letters.
			Current design guidance is "Cycliste probibited" (TSPCD diagram
			951) should only be used where there is an imminant danger to
			evolists aboad on a on a road loading only towards a meterway or
			into a long uplit road tuppel. Equally The signs "evoligt dismount"
			(a permitted variant of TSPCD diagram 066) and "and of avala
			(a permitted variant of TSRGD diagram 966) and the evolution and end of Cycle
0 ei		Diago "Ne Cycling" signs at each and of factbridge	(TSRGD diagram 1059) and the cycle lane marking End
8aj	2	Place No Cycling signs at each end of footbridge	(ISRGD diagram 1056) should not normally be used.
Ople	0	Come out contentio impressonante outride Advice Douse hoixduccours	cyclists anead, e.g. on a road leading only towards a motorway of
Bak	2	Carry out aesthetic improvements outside Adhan Rowe hairdressers.	This issue is known about but will not be addresses as part of the
			This issue is known about but will not be addresses as part of the
			scheme as there is simply no easy answer to the issue that has
			hou been raised in the bher for the work. The vehicle movements
0	0	La mia a (la ma cualcial a cuandu a un Elatara Otura atouti ila cuaiti na ta cualca al ato Maitura a cuandu a	nave nowever, been taken into account when modelling the new
୪ଌା	2	Lornes/large vehicles park on Eaton Street while waiting to unload at Waltrose, and s	This leastion is outside of the scheme limits of works and as such
			This location is outside of the scheme limits of works and as such
0		Disco a succed company on Opinger Lange to patch traffic on finance	not included in the brief for the scheme. This proposal will not be
8am		Place a speed camera on Colley Lane to catch traffic on flyover	audiessed as part of this scheme.
0		lagrades having the size on Neurosciet Desid	This is something that can be considered at the detailed design
8an		Increase box junction size on Newmarket Road	slage.
880		Extend double white line across Colney Lane/Newmarket Road junction	
8ap	1	Make better use of the grass bank and downslope exit area from the Cellar House.	
8aq		vvnen will something be done about the turning left lane at the Thickthorn roundabour	
8ar		Place a sign near the Waitrose carpark entrance telling HGV,s and Buses to use both lanes when turni	ng left
8as	1	Consider a box junction on Church Lane at car park entrance/exit behind shops	
8at	2	Move 50mph speed limit further along A11	
8au	1	Ensure public transport is maintained during the works	
8av	1	New street light Cringleford side of bridge to increase visibility	
8aw	1	Create barking bay outside of the Church for approximately 3 vehicles for functions	

8ax	1	Make box junction at Intwood Road longer
8ay	1	Widen area of corner of Eaton Street and Church Lane
8az	1	Please install guard railings at Intwood Road/Newmarket Road junction.
8aaa	1	Make sure surface water flow is maintained and not disrupted as part of the works
8aab	1	Timing of the lights from Eaton Street into Church Lane is too short a green phase.
8aac	1	In favour of on street parking on Eaton Slip road
8aad	1	Repaint pedestrian crossing at Waitrose entrance/exit
8aae	1	Ensure at cross roads there is clear signage showing priority for cyclists.
8aaf	1	Create a hard surface on the slip road to A11 to aid crossing

Report to	Norwich highways agency committee	ltem
	24 November 2016	
Joint Report of	Head of City Development Services and Executive director of community and environmental services	8
Subject	Transport for Norwich – Newmarket Road; Eaton slip road to Daniels Road	

Purpose

To consider the results of the consultation linked to the proposals for improvements to the existing footpath/cycleway between Daniels Road and the slip road into Eaton Village and to agree to implement the scheme.

Recommendation

- 1. To 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. To ask the transportation and network Manager at Norwich City Council 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.

Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to meet the corporate priority to provide a safe, clean and low carbon city and the service plan priority to implement the Local Transport Plan and Norwich Area Transportation Strategy.

Financial implications

The budget for the scheme is \pounds 300,000 to be funded from the Cycle Ambition Grant (total funds \pounds 1,100,000 - of which the remaining \pounds 800,000 is allocated for stage 2: Daniels Road roundabout to Hanover Road.)

Ward/s: Eaton

Cabinet member: Councillor Bremner – Environment and sustainable development

Contact Officers

bruce.bentley@norwich.gov.uk	
Bruce Bentley, Principal transportation planner	01603 212445

Nick Woodruff, Project engineer nick.woodruff@norfolk.gov.uk 01603 638085

Background documents

Consultation returns
Report

Strategic Objectives

- 1. Norwich and its surrounding area is becoming an increasingly popular area to live, work and visit. It is the number one shopping destination in the Eastern Region and becoming one the Nation's premier cultural centres. To ensure the Greater Norwich Area continues to be popular and grow, the transport systems need to be able to cope with the increased demand.
- 2. Norwich is a medieval city with a narrow road system; incorporating a 21st century transport system to cope with the increased demand without sacrificing highway space for a particular transport mode or at the expense of green space and historic buildings is challenging.
- 3. The Norwich area Transportation Strategy (NATS) now more widely known as Transport for Norwich (TfN), is the adopted strategy which will deliver the transport improvements needed over the next 15 plus years. The strategy recognises everybody's journeys are different and does not look to force people to use one particular mode. It does look to give people viable options on how they choose to travel and actively promote sustainable transport. To do this in some areas of the network there needs to be a re-balance of the highway space available.
- 4. The Strategy details the plan for future delivery of improvements in order to develop sustainable transport, reduce congestion and improve air quality within the Greater Norwich area. The strategy has already delivered key improvements such as the award winning Norwich Bus Station, St Augustine's Gyratory, a network of Park & Ride facilities, St Stephens and Chapel Field North and various Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) improvements. It also includes the recently completed Postwick hub and the Northern Distributor Road which is due for completion late 2017.
- The implementation plan for the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy (NATSIP) was agreed by Norfolk County Council in April 2010 and updated in November 2013 (see <u>link for updated implementation plan http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/view/NCC158241)</u>. The plan sets out the range of transport measures, together with their general intended phasing, for delivery over the short to medium term.
- The plan has now been updated to take account of what has been delivered since 2010, and to reflect the latest position on future scheme delivery, given progress with implementation, and now that the growth plans for the area are more clear <u>(see joint</u> <u>core strategy document:</u> <u>http://www.greaternorwichgrowth.org.uk/dmsdocument/1953</u>).

7. Cycling is on the increase for both recreation and commuting nationally and the area has a thriving cycling community. The implementation of a City wide cycling network (see link to cycle map <u>http://www.norwich.gov.uk/TransportAndStreets/Transport/Cycling/Documents/Cycling gMapFront.pdf</u>) is a key part of the Transport for Norwich Strategy as by delivering a comprehensive city network this reduces a number of short distance car journeys removing pressure on the network, as well as offering improving quality of life and the health benefits that have been well documented.

 The Greater Norwich area is one of eight urban areas across the country that has been successful in bidding for Cycle Ambition funding from the Department for Transport to comprehensively improve the quality of cycling infrastructure across the Norwich cycle network a copy of the application documents can be found here <u>http://www.norwich.gov.uk/TransportAndStreets/Transport/Cycling/Pages/CycleCityA</u> <u>mbitionGrant2015.aspx</u>.

Background

- Newmarket Road forms one of the main sections of the Blue pedalway which connects Wymondham, Hethersett and Cringleford to the city centre. The Blue pedalway connects with the orbital purple route in Eaton Village, and all other routes in the City Centre. The A11 / Newmarket Road corridor is also designated a bus rapid transit route.
- 10. Considerable housing development is planned for Cringleford, Hethersett and Wymondham. The Joint Core Strategy allocated 1,200 homes to Cringleford, 1,000 to Hethersett and 2,200 to Wymondham. This will be combined with employment development around the Norwich Research Park to place pressure on the transport network. Part of the strategy for dealing with this pressure is to try and divert many of the journeys that would otherwise involve a car onto public transport and bicycles
- 11. There is already a shared footpath/ cycleway on the southern side of Newmarket Road. However, this is routinely interrupted by quiet side junctions which provides priority to a few car drivers over the significant number of cyclists that use the path. In addition, the path is unacceptably narrow in some locations.

Proposals

- 12. At the September meeting this committee agreed to consult on proposals for improving cycling on the section of Newmarket Road between the Eaton Slip Road and Daniels Road. These proposals included:
 - a) To widen the existing facility to a nominal width of 3.0m, where possible, and to resurface the facility to provide an improved shared use footpath/cycle path
 - b) At the junctions with Branksome Road, Camberley Road and Claremont Road prioritise the footpath cycle way across the junction mouth
 - c) At the Elevedon Road junction offset the prioritised footpath cycle path behind the tree line
 - d) At the Sunningdale junction tighten the junction radii and provide a speed table for pedestrians and cyclists to cross the junction mouth. Vehicular priority remains.

These proposals are shown in Appendix 1

Consultation

- 13. Consultation started on 3 October 2016 and ran for 4 weeks, finishing on 1 November 2016. This was one week longer than the statutory minimum three week period for traffic regulation order consultation.
- 14. Details of the consultation were sent out to affected frontages along Newmarket Road and to other relevant stakeholders across the Eaton ward and other outside

organisations. The project also has a dedicated web page <u>www.norfolk.gov.uk/newmarketroad</u> set up to help publicity.

- 15. There were 11 responders to the consultation proposals. Their responses have been recorded and queries raised answered. Responses relate mainly to the interaction between cyclists and pedestrians and cyclists and motor vehicles, with half of the responses being very specific to the individuals' concerned. Please see Appendix 2 for a full summary of responses and Officers comments.
- 16.A meeting was held with both the Norwich Cycling campaign and the Norfolk and Norwich Association for the Blind (NNAB) on 01 September 2016, where the scheme proposals were presented. Both parties appeared favourable to the proposals and deemed that they were an improvement on the existing situation, particularly with relation to the widening of the existing shared footpath/cycleway.
- 17. However, consequent to that meeting, further correspondence was received from the NNAB raising concerns about the proposed junction treatments, and in particular those that provided priority at the junctions to users of the footpath cycleway. A copy of the letter is attached as appendix 3. These treatments are proposed on side junctions that have relatively light traffic flows, and general traffic will be required to yield to users of the footpath/cycleway, with the give way junction markings being set behind the footpath / cycleway. The proposals have been safety audited, and all the junctions provide more than adequate visibility for motorists to see anyone using the route. To maintain the current arrangements, as the NNAB would prefer, would maintain the current arrangements by which cyclists and pedestrians are expected to give way at every side junction, thus substantially reducing the overall benefits of the scheme and making it much less likely that the project would deliver the required increase in cycling that the City Cycling Ambition projects are expected to achieve.
- 18.A meeting was held with Norwich City College on 20 October 2016. The city college support the proposals and feel these would be of benefit to both students and staff.

Traffic Regulation Orders and notices

19. Legal orders will be required for the raised table crossing on Sunningdale.

Traffic Impacts

20. Traffic management will be required during the works and delays to traffic are likely. It is intended to issue a press release for information closer to the start of construction. Work will be programmed to minimise impact on the road network where possible.

Timescales

- 21. If members approve the presented scheme, construction would commence in January 2017 and is anticipated to be completed by April 2017.
- 22. Although the detailed programme of works is yet to be finalised, construction would be carried out using a phased approach, with works progressing along Newmarket Road in sections. This would be managed collectively with city and county council officers working collaboratively with the contractor and street works co-ordinators to mitigate impacts on the local network to avoid key embargo times with common aims to minimise disruption where possible.

Conclusions

- 23. The proposals represent minor adjustments to an existing cycling facility that will make it more coherent and easier to use. The final sections (the junction with Eaton Road and the part of Newmarket road inside the outer ring road) will be presented to a future meeting.
- 24. One of the main objectives derived from the TfN strategy is to increase walking and cycling and the strategy follows a mode hierarchy principal where walking, cycling and public transport are, where appropriate, prioritised above use of the car. These proposals form part of that overall package as it provides a priority cycle route into the city centre, promoting the use of sustainable travel methods.
- 25. Half of the consultation responses were received from residents living on one of the small private access roads and are very specific issues to those respondents. These responses are not related to the wider scheme proposals and as such have not resulted in changes to the scheme proposals.

Resource Implications

- 26. Finance: The TfN programme forms an integral part of strategic infrastructure as set out in the Joint Core Strategy. The delivery of this works is funded by government grants by way of the City Cycle Ambition programme.
- 27. Staff: The project will be delivered through joint team working involving both County Council and City Council officers.
- 28. Property: The proposals can be delivered within the existing highway boundary so there is no requirement for land acquisition.

Other Implications

- 29. Legal Implications: None.
- 30. Human Rights: None.
- 31. Communications: The Communications Project Manager for Transport for Norwich schemes will manage publicity and enquiries.

Section 17 – Crime & Disorder Act

32. The scheme will be designed to ensure it has a positive effect on crime and disorder where possible. Care will be taken during construction to minimise opportunities for crime and disorder, for instance the secure storage of construction equipment and materials.

Risk Implications/Assessment

33.A risk assessment has been undertaken for the development of the NATS Implementation Plan (TfN). The key risks for delivering this are around funding, planning and timescales. These risks are being managed through active project management and ongoing engagement with stakeholders.

Appendix 1







Issue Ref.	No. Times raised	Issue	Officers Comments (how many responses for each)	
		General Comments		
0	4	In favour		
1a	7	Against the proposals		
		Shared use facility queries		
1b	5	Increased risk to pedestrians from high speed cyclists.	The proposals are not a significant change to that which currently exists. The widened cycle facility is proposed in an attempt to encourage more cyclists to use the off carriageway cycle path and to provide a more consistent route. However, it is recognised that cyclists speed may be an issue and that this situation may be worse once an improved facility is constructed. It is not possible to enforce speed restrictions on the cycle track and no legislation exists to allow enforcement. It is also difficult to ensure cyclists are courteous to other users of the facility. Therefore, it is proposed to provide warning signs along the route in an attempt to reduce cyclists speed. In addition the widened facility should provide additional space for both cyclists and pedestrians, potentially lessening the risk of interaction between both parties.	
1c	1	Will the council compulsory purchase third party land?	There are no proposals to compulsory purchase any third party land. The footway will be narrowed where site restraints prevent widening to 3.0m.	
1d	1	Were traffic assessments undertaken?	A 12 hour traffic count was taken at the side road junctions in April 2016. This determined that the flow of traffic from the side roads made up less than 2% of movements along this section of the Newmarket Road corridor.	
1e	1	Impact on of vehicles turning into side roads	The impact on Newmarket Road of vehicles waiting for cyclists to cross the side roads or into accesses will be negligible as traffic counts show minimal traffic flows into the side roads, even at peak times. When exiting Newmarket Road it would be assumed that a driver would exercise due care and attention and ensure there is a sufficient gap in oncoming traffic, that no cyclists or pedestrians were crossing the access or side road and that it was clear and safe to proceed. Under the new arrangement it would still be assumed that a motorist would ensure the cycle facility was clear of both cyclists and pedestrians before crossing it into the service road.	

Issue Ref.	No. Times raised	Issue	Officers Comments (how many responses for each)	
1f	1	Alternative location for cycle path	Budgetary restraints prevented construction of a facility on the opposite side of Newmarket Road.	
1g	1	Provision of separate lanes for pedestrians and cyclists	The scheme is to upgrade the existing shared use footpath/cycle path. There is insufficient width to provide a facility with separate lanes for cyclists and pedestrians (both the Sustrans Handbook for Cycle Friendly Design and the London Cycle Design Standards recommends 4.5m width as a minimum). Therefore it is not appropriate to provide separate lanes.	
1h	1	Resurfacing proposals	It is proposed to resurface the unbound areas with asphalt	
		Private access road to 164-176 Newmarket Road		
2a	2	Is it an offence to wait on the cycleway to pull out onto Newmarket Road?	No offence will be committed if a vehicle has to wait on the cycle facility in order to safely pull out onto Newmarket Road. This situation is no different to a vehicle exiting across the footpath from a singular private driveway to join the main road. The affected parties would need to refer to their own motor insurance policies in the event of an accident.	
2b	2b2Request to review existing risk and consider solutions.The scheme is an improvement on the existing facility and is not considere The scheme has been discussed at length through the design stages and have been provided to any significant risks that have been identified. The does not consider the proposal as high risk.		The scheme is an improvement on the existing facility and is not considered high risk. The scheme has been discussed at length through the design stages and solutions have been provided to any significant risks that have been identified. The safety audit does not consider the proposal as high risk.	
		Side Road Junctions		
3a	4	Interaction between vehicles and cyclists at side roads	It is intended for vehicles to give way to cyclists at the side road junctions and access roads to properties, with appropriate give way road markings and signs indicating that cyclists are crossing the side roads. Proposals for the side roads have been through a rigorous safety audit process which has not highlighted an increased risk to cyclists at the side roads. Cyclists can still choose to give way to motorists if they desire. It is further hoped at all locations that both motorised and non-motorised traffic would use common sense and have reasonable consideration for other road users.	

Issue Ref.	No. Times raised	Issue	Officers Comments (how many responses for each)
3b	5	Visibility concerns at the side road junctions	Visibility splays at the continuous footway treatments on all side roads meet or exceed the required minimum standard of 43.0m for a 30mph road as set out in the Manual for Streets (Chapter 7, pge 91). Existing vegetation will be trimmed back to facilitate widening of the footway which should improve visibility at the private accesses. It appears that the sight stopping distance for cyclists approaching the access roads will achieve the required parameters for a commuter route as specified in the Sustrans Handbook for Cycle Friendly Design.
3с	1	Additional waiting restrictions	It is not proposed to paint double yellow lines on any of the side roads as this falls outside of the scope of works. Rule 243 of the Highway Code states "Do not stop or park: opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space". If parking close to the junction is an issue this should be raised with Norwich City Council who may wish to look into enforcement.
3d	1	Positive support for changes to side road priority	No further comment
3e	1	Provision of a cycle crossing at the Eaton Road junction.	A toucan crossing on Eaton Road will be provided as part of the scheme looking at the Eaton Road/Leopold Road signalised junction.
		Gonoral	
		Could not find information	
4a	1	on the County Council Website	Information was provided on the website in the relevant section.



The Norfolk and Norwich Association for the Blind Please support the local Charity for Blind and Partially Sighted People in Norfolk

Magpie Road Norwich Norfolk NR3 1JH

T: 01603 629 558 F: 01603 766 682 E: office@nnab.org.uk www.nnab.org.uk

11 November 2016

Cycle path improvements: A11 Unthank Road to Daniels Road

The Norfolk & Norwich Association for the Blind (NNAB) attended a meeting on 1 September 2016 where we were shown plans regarding this scheme. We would like to submit the below report in response.

Key to Abbreviations used in the report: VIP(s) = Visually Impaired Person(s)

Having considered these plans, we cannot support these designs as we do not consider them an improvement for the visually impaired. Our concerns are outlined below.

Our biggest concern is safety with the continuous footpath crossing the joining side roads. Some VIPs may not realise they are crossing a road and instead think they are still on the safe refuge of a pavement which could lead to potentially dangerous conflicts. Moreover, we are sceptical that drivers will give way and not wait on these continuous footpaths. If a VIP wants to cross on the continuous footpath, they may not realise a vehicle (who may not be abiding to the design rules for very good reasons) could be obstructing them. Drivers turning from Newmarket Road, particularly into Sunningale and Elveden Close, may also not understand this continuous footpath design, leading to potentially dangerous collisions.

We are aware that this continuous footpath design has been used in one other location in the City, on Earlham Road and West Pottergate. However the locations are not comparable. West Pottergate only leads to a small number of residential properties whereas Camberley Road, Claremont Road, Branksome Road and Sunningdale serve a much bigger catchment, as well as being a cut through by some road users to/from the Ipswich Road via Eaton Road. We therefore anticipate the volume of cars to be significantly higher and of a different nature, being composed of drivers intent on transit. All road schemes are different, we believe that modelling this scheme on a road layout in another part of the city will have a negative result for VIPs.

Furthermore because the design treatments for each junction are not consistent, with some straight across the top of the joining side road and others requiring a dog-leg, there are variations where vehicles may be waiting at different points. This will be extremely challenging for both VIPs and drivers to learn and remember.

We are concerned that if this design goes ahead it will set a precedent for road schemes in other parts of the city, for example the other side the roundabout of Newmarket Road towards the city.

Overall, we feel this scheme is not an improvement to VIPs. Retaining the current layout with definitive footway and road would be safer for the visually impaired.

Edward Bates Equipment & Information Centres Adviser edbates@nnab.org.uk

Also at:

3 North Lynn Business Village, Bergen Way, King's Lynn, Norfolk. PE30 2JG T: 01553 660 808 14/15 Willimet House, Victoria Arcade, Row 70, Regent Street, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk. NR10 1RR T:01493 745 973

Report to	eport to Norwich Highways Agency Committee	
	24 November 2016	
Joint Report of	Head of city development services and Executive director of community and environmental services	9
Subject	Transport for Norwich - A11 Newmarket Road project (Daniels Road to Hanover Road)	

Purpose

To agree proposals for a segregated inbound cycleway and associated highway alterations between the Daniels Road roundabout and the footpath link to Hanover Road.

Recommendation

That the committee:

- (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 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.

Corporate and service priorities

The scheme helps to meet the corporate priority to provide a safe, clean and low carbon city and the service plan priority to implement the Local Transport Plan and Norwich Area Transportation Strategy.

Financial implications

The scheme has been allocated funding of £800,000 from the Department for Transport Cycle City Ambition Grant.

Ward/s: Eaton, Town Close

Cabinet member: Councillor Bremner – Environment and sustainable development

Contact Officers

Bruce Bentley - Principal Transportation planner 01603 212445 brucebentley@norwich.gov.uk

Background documents

None

Report

Strategic Objectives

- 1. Norwich and its surrounding area is becoming an increasingly popular area to live, work and visit. It is the number one shopping destination in the Eastern Region and becoming one the Nation's premier cultural centres. To ensure the Greater Norwich Area continues to be popular and grow, the transport systems need to be able to cope with the increased demand.
- 2. Norwich is a medieval city with a narrow road system; incorporating a 21st century transport system to cope with the increased demand without sacrificing highway space for a particular transport mode or at the expense of green space and historic buildings is challenging.
- 3. The Norwich area Transportation Strategy (NATS) now more widely known as Transport for Norwich (TfN), is the adopted strategy which will deliver the transport improvements needed over the next 15 plus years. The strategy recognises everybody's journeys are different and does not look to force people to use one particular mode. It does look to give people viable options on how they choose to travel and actively promote sustainable transport. To do this in some areas of the network there needs to be a re-balance of the highway space available.
- 4. The Strategy details the plan for future delivery of improvements in order to develop sustainable transport, reduce congestion and improve air quality within the Greater Norwich area. The strategy has already delivered key improvements such as the award winning Norwich Bus Station, St Augustine's Gyratory, a network of Park & Ride facilities, St Stephens and Chapel Field North and various Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) improvements. It also includes the recently completed Postwick hub and the Northern Distributor Road which is due for completion late 2017.
- The implementation plan for the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy (NATSIP) was agreed by Norfolk County Council in April 2010 and updated in November 2013 (see <u>link for updated implementation plan http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/view/NCC158241)</u>. The plan sets out the range of transport measures, together with their general intended phasing, for delivery over the short to medium term.
- The plan has now been updated to take account of what has been delivered since 2010, and to reflect the latest position on future scheme delivery, given progress with implementation, and now that the growth plans for the area are more clear <u>(see joint</u> <u>core strategy document:</u> <u>http://www.greaternorwichgrowth.org.uk/dmsdocument/1953</u>).
- 7. Cycling is on the increase for both recreation and commuting nationally and the area has a thriving cycling community. The implementation of a City wide cycling network (see link to cycle map <u>http://www.norwich.gov.uk/TransportAndStreets/Transport/Cycling/Documents/Cycling gMapFront.pdf</u>) is a key part of the Transport for Norwich Strategy as by delivering a comprehensive city network this reduces a number of short distance car journeys removing pressure on the network, as well as offering improving quality of life and the health benefits that have been well documented.

8. The Greater Norwich area is one of eight urban areas across the country that has been successful in bidding for Cycle Ambition funding from the Department for Transport to comprehensively improve the quality of cycling infrastructure across the Norwich cycle network a copy of the application documents can be found here <u>http://www.norwich.gov.uk/TransportAndStreets/Transport/Cycling/Pages/CycleCityA</u> <u>mbitionGrant2015.aspx</u>.

Background

- 9. Newmarket Road forms one of the main sections of the Blue pedalway which connects Wymondham, Hethersett and Cringleford to the city centre. The Blue pedalway connects with the orbital purple route in Eaton Village, and all other routes in the City Centre. The A11 / Newmarket Road corridor is also designated a bus rapid transit route. Newmarket road is also a designated Conservation Area with protected trees along its entire length on the south side of the road.
- 10. Considerable housing development is planned for Cringleford, Hethersett and Wymondham. The Joint Core Strategy allocated 1,200 homes to Cringleford, 1,000 to Hethersett and 2,200 to Wymondham. This will be combined with employment development around the Norwich Research Park to place pressure on the transport network. Part of the strategy for dealing with this pressure is to try and divert many of the journeys that would otherwise involve a car onto public transport and bicycles.
- 11. The current level of service for cyclists on the blue pedalway has been assessed using the method contained within the London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS), which is seen as the most up to date guidance for cycling infrastructure design. The inner section between the outer ring road and Hanover Road has an overall score of 35 points out of a possible 100. The inner section also scores particularly badly in the safety category, earning 12 points out of 48. A location plan is provided as appendix 1.
- 12. It has been identified that there are three critical safety factors that need to be resolved through delivery of the cycling improvements. These are;
 - A feeling of being unsafe as a result of 85th percentile speeds greater than 30mph.
 - A feeling of being unsafe as a result of there being over 1,000 vehicles per hour without separation for cyclists.
 - A risk of left/right hook collisions at junctions, resulting from heavy streams of traffic cutting across the main cycling stream.
- 13. Accident data shows that there have been 17 accidents on this section of Newmarket Road over the last 5 years 3 accidents were categorised as "serious" and 14 as "slight", 5 of which involved a cyclist.
- 14. Traffic counts were taken on Newmarket Road over a 12 hour period (07:00 to 19:00) on 12 April 2016. Peak traffic and cycle flows at three junctions are summarised in Table 01. Data shows that traffic flows at peak times exceed 1000 vehicles per hour. LCDS advises that "where volume is above 1,000 vehicles during the peak hour, separation for cyclists or reduction of traffic volume is required" (LCDS Chapter 4, page 8) and that cycle flows are currently categorised by LCDS guidance as low flow (LCDS Chapter 4, page 54).

Table 01 : Traffic Counts	0800-0900	1700-1800
Average peak hour traffic flow (A11/Lime Tree Rd/Christchurch Rd junction)	1339	1605
Average peak hour cycle flow (A11/Lime Tree Rd/Christchurch Rd junction)	111	86
Average peak hour traffic flow (A11/Albermarle Rd junction)	1053	1278
Average peak hour cycle flow (A11/Albermarle Rd junction)	74	67
Average peak hour traffic flow (A11/Town Close Rd/Mount Pleasant junction)	1232	1429
Average peak hour cycle flow (A11/ Town Close Rd/Mount Pleasant junction)	91	78

Table 01: Peak traffic and Cycle Flows on Newmarket Road

- 15. There is currently a lack of cycling space that is separate from vehicles on the carriageway and from pedestrians on the footway.
 - Cycling provision between the Daniels Road roundabout and Brunswick Road is currently on the carriageway. There is a narrow, below standard cycle lane, between the roundabout and Mount Pleasant, which is interrupted by a bus stop and keep clear zig-zag markings outside Norwich High School for Girls. This lane stops just before Mount Pleasant and guides cyclists into a position on the carriageway very close to the kerb.
 - Cycling provision between Mount Pleasant and Brunswick Road is provided by a narrow shared bus and cycle lane. The bus lane is 3.0m wide which does not provide sufficient space for a bus to pass a cyclist within the bus lane. This means cyclists using the bus lane can feel intimidated by buses and buses are delayed by cyclists who are riding in the primary position in the middle of the bus lane to maximise their safety.
- 16. The main project objective as identified in the design brief is to redesign Newmarket Road between the outer ring road and Hanover Road so that the standard of cycling infrastructure offers a high level of service as measured using the LCDS analytical method. In numerical terms the score should be raised to at least 70 points by addressing the problems mentioned above.
- 17. The scheme extends as far as Hannover Road because Newmarket Road narrows north of Hannover Road to the extent that it is not possible to continue a segregated cycle track or lane beyond this point without seriously reducing traffic capacity on the approach to the junction with Ipswich Road. It is planned that following the completion of the project the blue pedalway will be rerouted to access the city centre via Hannover Road and Fellowes Plain rather than via Grove Road.

Scheme Proposals

- 18. In order to provide the level of service required it is necessary for the inbound cycling facility to have the following characteristics:
 - Separate protected space for cyclists that is not entered by vehicles (so the route is safe and feels safe).
 - The space for cycling is sufficiently wide for one cyclist to pass another without needing to enter the space for vehicles (to avoid delays for cyclists).
 - Cyclists should not need to ride in the bus lane (to ensure cyclists feel safe and bus passengers are not delayed behind cyclists).
 - Cyclists should not be sharing space with pedestrians.
- 19. In order to address the above issues and to provide a cycling facility that offers a higher level of service a design has been developed that provides an off carriageway, one-way, kerb segregated stepped in-bound cycle facility between Daniels Road roundabout and the Hanover Road link. This design includes the removal of the traffic signals at the Christchurch Road/Lime Tree Road junction, relocation the existing pedestrian crossing at Lime Tree Road, construction of a new toucan crossing at the Hanover Road link (east of the Eagle Public House) and provision of new bus stop bypasses at three locations. This design is shown on the plan PE4120-HP-0100-104 attached in Appendix 2.
- 20. The construction disruption and cost of this option is currently being assessed in relation to alternative approaches that would be less costly and disruptive (e.g. a wide mandatory cycle lane or a widened pavement with separate areas for cyclists and pedestrians). The level of service offered by these alternative approaches would be lower but might be better overall taking into account value for money and the desire to minimise construction disruption. The outcome of this work will be reported to committee along with feedback on the consultation of the segregated cycle track.
- 21. The following sections of the report describe the issues concerning the stepped segregated cycle track but it is important for members to appreciate that the planned consultation will seek feedback on the core design principals in paragraph 18, that the proposals described below and illustrated on plan PE4120-HP-0100-104 are one way of fulfilling them and that further consultation may be needed if another design approach emerges as offering better value for money.

Early Consultation

- 22. Early consultation was held with key stakeholders in October 2016, prior to any public consultation. The purpose of this early consultation was to present initial proposals and seek feedback to identify potential issues which could then be dealt with through the design stages of the project. A summary of stakeholder feedback can be seen below:
- Norwich Cycling Campaign:

Proposals were generally well received. Feedback on the segregated cycle track was positive.

- Norfolk & Norwich Association for the Blind:
 - (i) Concerns expressed about the proposed floating bus stops and a feeling that waiting on an island with traffic going past could feel uncomfortable.
 - (ii) Concerns about changing the southern footpath to a shared use cycleway/footway.
 - (iii) Preferred bus stops with shelters as this gave a place to wait and helped with navigation.
- Norwich City College:
 - (i) Proposals were well received. Feedback was given that the proposals represent a positive step in assisting students and staff to access the college through sustainable methods.
- A meeting was held with Norwich High School for Girls on 10 November.
 - (i) Feedback was generally supportive for the scheme, with the timing of works the main concern. Their preference would be for any works to be undertaken in the summer school holiday period.
 - (ii) Slight concerns were raised regarding removal of the signalised junction at Christchurch Rd/Lime Tree Road. The feeling was that this could make it more difficult for traffic turning right out of Christchurch Road towards the roundabout.
- Town Close School
 - (i) The response from the school was extremely positive. They were very encouraged that improved facilities for cyclists were to be provided along the length of Newmarket Road and hoped that it would encourage more parents and pupils to cycle to the school.
 - (ii) The school supported the stepped segregated cycle facility was well thought out and an appropriate method of providing a safer cycle route to the school.
 - (iii) They also supported the conversion of the southern footway to a shared use facility and provision of a new toucan crossing at the Hanover Road link.

Detailed Scheme Proposals

In-bound segregated cycleway

23. An off carriageway, one-way, kerb segregated stepped cycle facility could be provided between the Daniels Road roundabout and the Hanover Road link. This would be constructed by narrowing the existing footway to a nominal width of 2.0m by setting back the kerb line and building out into the existing carriageway to provide additional width to construct a 2.2m wide cycleway. Carriageway lane widths would be slightly reduced to accommodate the new footway and cycleway but in general these would not be reduced to below 3.0m wide. The existing inbound bus lane would remain and operate more effectively without cyclists delaying buses. Construction of a segregated facility would offer a higher level of service for cyclists because it removes cyclists from the carriageway, lessening the feeling of being unsafe that currently results from sharing space with large numbers of buses travelling around 30mph.. An on-carriageway facility provides no separation for cyclists and as such offers no real

protection from high volumes of traffic. A segregated facility also offers a better level of protection for pedestrians compared to foot/cycleway separated by a solid white line, where both cyclists and pedestrians could wander into the space reserved for each other and where two way use on the foot/cycleway requires more space than one way use on a segregated cycle track. As stated in paragraph 14 of LCDS guidance advises that if traffic volumes are greater than 1,000 vehicles per hour, which is the case on Newmarket Road, that separation of cyclists or reduction of traffic volume is required. The latter is not possible due to the fact that Newmarket Road is a principal primary route in the city centre, meaning the only viable option for providing a cycling facility that will achieve the national and local targets to double usage within ten years is to segregate cyclists from the carriageway.

24. It is proposed to have a level difference between the footway and cycleway which would be separated by a kerb line, similar to the existing facility on Newmarket Road at the Eaton slip road (see photograph 1 below), but without the cobble edging strip and requiring one way use.



Photograph 1: Example of stepped segregated cycle path on Newmarket Road

The cycleway would also be kerbed and raised above the carriageway level. A recently completed scheme at Huntingdon Road in Cambridge adopts this approach. They developed a kerb that is shaped to provide an easy transition from carriageway to cycleway and vice versa – see photograph 2 for details. The footway and cycleway would possibly be finished in contrasting surfacing materials to denote the different spaces for walking and cycling, an example of which can also be seen in photograph 2.



Photograph 2: Example of stepped segregated cycle path including floating bus stop in Cambridge

- 25. An integral part of the proposed cycleway is the provision of bus stop bypasses at the three existing stops on this section of Newmarket Road. At these locations the cycleway will be located between the footway and the bus boarding area. This would remove the need for cyclists to go around stationary buses at the stops and execute a potentially dangerous manoeuvre involving mixing with motor traffic. The footway and cycleway would be narrowed to a width of 1.5m in order to provide sufficient width to construct a bus boarder with a minimum width of 2.0m. The cycleway will be tapered on the approach to the bus stop in an attempt to reduce cyclists speed and potential conflict with pedestrians. A ramped pedestrian crossing point will also be provided linking the footway to the floating bus stop. This will be surfaced in the same material as the footway to reinforce to cyclists that they are entering an area in which pedestrians are present. Tactile paving will be provided on the footpath and bus boarder to ensure that visually impaired pedestrians do not miss the crossing point, which will be positioned downstream of the bus boarding area so that pedestrians are facing the correct way to see oncoming cyclists when dismounting form the bus. Please see drawing PE4120-HP-0100-105 for details of the proposed bus stop bypass.
- 26. Similar floating bus stops have been installed in Manchester and Cambridge as part of their respective Cycling Ambition schemes and by Transport for London. Reports have been produced following implementation of the floating stops by the Cycle Ambition Grant Cities and Sustrans. The report written by the Cycle Ambition Grant Cities details key lessons learned from a trial site containing a one way bus stop bypass, with feedback obtained from bus passengers, cyclists and pedestrians, as set out below;
 - Usage by cyclists the entry alignment (1 in 3 taper with the cycle lane approach directing cyclists towards the bus stop bypass lane) is such that the majority of cyclists were observed to make use of the bus stop bypass lane.

- Interaction between bus users, pedestrians and cyclists there were no recorded "incidents" even during the busiest times indicating that in general terms there is sufficient time and space for bus users, pedestrians and cyclists to interact with each other safely within the bus stop bypass arrangement.
- Capacity of bus stop island the 2.7m island width appeared to be sufficient to accommodate waiting and alighting bus passengers including those with disabilities without interfering with the operation of the cycle track. The video footage obtained supported this view.
- Cycle track width whilst some stakeholders were of the view that the width of the cycle bypass lane should be 2.5m in order to allow cyclists to ride two abreast without difficulty or to allow cyclists to swerve if needed, overall the 1.8m width at the trial site was found to be appropriate as it made overtaking difficult for cyclists and therefore helped to control cycling speeds. The bypass lane width provided adequate capacity when being used by the largest number of cyclists at any one time.
- Speed of cyclists concern regarding the speed of cyclists along the bus stop bypass lane was cited as one of the top five issues raised during the perception surveys. The average recorded cycle speed along the bus stop bypass throughout the survey period was 12.7 mph which is considered to be at the upper end of the acceptable speed range for this facility.
- Recognition of the cycle track feedback from the perception surveys was that the use of coloured surfacing (orange) and a level difference helped to clearly demark the cycle track. This was substantiated by CCTV analysis which indicated that in general pedestrians kept out of the cycle bypass lane apart from when crossing to/from the bus stop island.
- Overall satisfaction the majority of stakeholders were positive when discussing the segregation between buses, cyclists, and pedestrians that the design at the trial site provides. Over 90% of bus users stated that they would be happy to use the stop again, with a similar percentage of pedestrians reporting no difficulties when using the footways around the bus stop. In total 77% of cyclists stated that they would feel confident in using the cycle bypass again, with approximately 18% stating that they would use it with caution.

Figure 01: Cycle Ambition Grant Cities & Transport for London Working Together - Cycling Infrastructure Technical Note Series – Version 1 Page 3, Jan 2016

- 27. The Sustrans report concentrates on the Cambridge bus stops and specifically on the interaction between users of the stops, the main findings of which are:
 - Levels of interaction between cyclists and pedestrians at the floating bus stops are generally infrequent and of low severity. These interactions achieved a low score in the range of 1 to 2 which is generally considered safe and normal behaviour.
 - The low scoring suggests that the floating bus stops pose minimal risk to users with pedestrians and cyclists appearing to take normal and safe precautionary actions when interacting at the site.

Details of the scoring method used by Sustrans can be found in Appendix 3.

Amendments to the existing signalised junction and pedestrian crossings

- 28. It is proposed to remove the existing signalised junction at the Christchurch Road/Lime Tree Road junction and relocate the pedestrian crossing further northeast.
- 29. The current operation of the junction consists of 3 stages, Newmarket Road, staggered pedestrian crossings and then the side roads (Christchurch Road & Lime Tree Road). The traffic signals were originally installed in 1996 as part of a previous Norwich City cycle route scheme, providing advanced cycle stop lines on Christchurch Road and Lime Tree Road. The recent traffic survey for this junction suggests that this route has not been adopted by cyclists as their numbers are low.
- 30. The signals have however attracted more use by motorised traffic as an alternative orbital route to the outer ring road. This effect has been encouraged by increases made to signal maximums set for side road green periods. On site observations have shown that queuing often reaches back into the outer ring road roundabout during the AM peak period as a result of the amount of time given to releasing traffic from the side roads.
- 31. The service to pedestrians wishing to cross Newmarket Road is currently poor due to the maximum wait time of almost 2 minutes due to the cycle time of the signal junction.
- 32. Removing the signalisation of Christchurch Road and Lime Tree Road and replacing the existing junction with a mid-block straight across Toucan crossing would provide multiple benefits:
 - Provide better service for pedestrians/cyclists wishing to cross Newmarket Road by reducing the maximum wait time and providing a single crossing movement
 - Reduce the level of rat-running traffic on Christchurch Road & Lime Tree Road, providing a better environment for residents and for cyclists
 - Reduce the risk of queuing traffic on Newmarket Road reaching the outer ring road roundabout
 - Lower the risk of further cycling accidents
- 33. In order to provide the additional space for a segregated cycle facility it will be necessary to remove the existing refuge island at the pedestrian crossing at the junction of Lime Tree Road. The crossing would be relocated further northeast and would be improved to a signalised straight across toucan crossing. The smaller pedestrian refuges at the uncontrolled crossing points near Albermarle Road and Mount Pleasant are unaffected by the proposals and would remain in-situ.
- 34. It is also proposed to provide a new signalised toucan crossing on Newmarket Road at the Hannover Road link to provide a route across the carriageway for outbound cyclists.

35. It is proposed to continue the cycleway across the side road junctions of Christchurch Road, Albermarle Road and Mount Pleasant. Cyclists will have priority at these locations and it is intended that motorists give way to cyclists using the facility. There is an expectation that the levels of cycling will rise significantly if facilities are improved, and providing priority to cyclists is necessary to achieve the improvement in quality on this route. Drivers leaving the side streets are having to pause anyway to join the main carriageway, and are unlikely to be inconvenienced.

Conversion of the southern footpath

36. An additional measure being proposed is to convert the wide footway on the southern side of Newmarket Road to a shared use footway/cycleway from the Hannover Road link to the existing shared use facility which currently terminates at Lime Tree Road. This section of footpath is very wide and could easily accommodate a shared use facility and would provide an alternative outbound route for cyclists not wishing to travel on the carriageway. There is insufficient space to build a segregated cycle facility for outbound cyclists without removing the bus lane.

Traffic Regulation Orders and notices

37. Legal orders may be required to create the designated cycle track and to convert pedestrian only routes to shared use.

Traffic Impacts

38. Traffic management will be required during the works and delays to traffic are likely. It is intended to issue a press release for information closer to the start of construction. Work will be programmed to minimise impact on the road network where possible.

Environment

39. The city council's Design, Conservation and Landscape manager has offered advice and guidance in relation to the proposed design. A landscape architect is on the design team

Accident Reduction

40. There have been 17 accidents in the vicinity of the proposed scheme in the last 5 years - 5 of these involved a cyclist. By providing an off carriageway route for cyclists this scheme will reduce the potential for conflict with vehicles and resulting accidents.

Timescales

41. Subject to legal processes and approval the scheme is provisionally planned to commence construction in summer 2017, following completion of phase 1 from Unthank Road to Daniels Road

Conclusions

42. The proposals will meet the requirements of the brief by providing benefit to both cyclists and pedestrians and will contribute to the objectives of the cycling ambition programme. The proposals as presented would provide the next phase of improvement on the blue pedalway and will represent significant improvements to the existing cycling infrastructure on Newmarket Road that will make it safer, more coherent and easier to use. It is especially important that this inner section of the blue pedalway is designed to a high standard because a poor quality link would undermine the value of the investment that is being made further out (e.g. Wymondham – Hethersett, Eaton and Cringleford. Detailed design work will formalise the proposals, resolve any outstanding issues and establish the cost and level of construction disruption taking into account any responses received as a result of the consultation. The results of the consultation will be reported back to the committee in March 2017 alongside a review of the value for money (level of service vs cost and disruption) of this proposal compared to other ways of achieving the core design requirement listed in paragraph 18

Resource Implications

- 43. Finance: The TfN programme forms an integral part of strategic infrastructure as set out in the Joint Core Strategy. The delivery of this works is funded by government grants by way of the City Cycle Ambition programme.
- 44. Staff: The project will be delivered through joint team working involving both county council and city council officers.
- 45. Property: The proposals can be delivered within the existing highway boundary so there is no requirement for land acquisition.

Other Implications

- 46. Legal Implications: None.
- 47. Human Rights: None.
- 48. Communications: The Communications Project Manager for Transport for Norwich schemes will manage publicity and enquiries.

Section 17 – Crime & Disorder Act

49. The scheme will be designed to ensure it has a positive effect on crime and disorder where possible. Particular attention will be given to ensure that lighting levels are adequate and foliage trimmed back along both sides of Newmarket Road where appropriate. Care will be taken during construction to minimise opportunities for crime and disorder, for instance the secure storage of construction equipment and materials.

Risk Implications/Assessment

50. A risk assessment has been undertaken for the development of the NATS Implementation Plan (TfN). The key risks for delivering this are around funding, planning and timescales. These risks are being managed through active project management and ongoing engagement with stakeholders.



Appendix 2 – Scheme proposals





Appendix 2 – Scheme proposals



Appendix 3

	Description	Safety consideration	
0	No response required by either road user		
1	Precautionary or anticipatory braking/slowing down when risk of collision is minimal	Green: Generally safe, normal	
2	Controlled braking, slowing down or stepping aside to avoid collision (but with ample time for manoeuvre)	behaviour	
3	Rapid deceleration, stopping or quickly moving aside to avoid collision, resulting in a near miss situation	Amber: Generally	
4	Emergency braking, violent serve or movement to avoid collision resulting in a near miss situation	unsafe; near- miss situation	
5	Emergency action followed by collision	Red: Collision	

² MVA Consultants, 2010 - 'No Entry Except Oycles' Signing Review.

Interaction Scores

Based upon techniques used by MVA Consultants in 2010 for a report commissioned by Transport for London using a scale of 1 to 5 to rank each interaction. The scale ranges from level 0; where two users pass each other on the route but do not have to change their behaviour at all, to level 5; where two users actually collide with each other. Some interactions are within the realms of normal behaviour exhibited while others give rise to varying degrees of conflicts that typically have varying degrees of safety implications.

Report to	Norwich highways agency committee	
	24 November 2016	
Joint Report of	Head of city development services and Executive director of community and environmental services	10
Subject	Transport for Norwich – Changes to the access restrictions in pedestrianised areas in the city centre	

Purpose

To seek approval to consult on the proposed changes to access restrictions in the city centre pedestrianised areas.

Recommendation

That the committee:

- (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.

Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to meet the corporate priority to provide a safe, clean and low carbon city and the service plan priority of implementation of the Transport for Norwich strategy.

Financial implications

There is a budget funded by the Department for Transport (DfT) of £250,000*

The cost to update signage and put in any measures for controlled access will come from this budget. The cost will be dependent on the outcome of any consultation and subsequent decision.

*This project budget includes a second element of works to improve cycle permeability by providing cycle contraflows which will be considered at a later date.

Ward/s: Mancroft

Cabinet member: Councillor Bremner – Environment and sustainable development

Contact officers:

Ed Parnaby, Transportation planner	01603 212446
edparnaby@norwich.gov.uk	
	04000 040445
Bruce Bentley, Principal transportation planner	01603 212445
brucebentley@norwich.gov.uk	

Background documents

None
Report

Strategic Objectives

- Norwich and its surrounding area is becoming an increasingly popular area to live, work and visit. It is the number one shopping destination in the Eastern Region and becoming one the Nation's premier cultural centres. To ensure the Greater Norwich Area continues to be popular and grow, the transport systems need to be able to cope with the increased demand.
- 2. Norwich is a medieval city with a narrow road system; incorporating a 21st century transport system to cope with the increased demand without sacrificing highway space for a particular transport mode or at the expense of green space and historic buildings is challenging.
- 3. The Norwich area Transportation Strategy (NATS) now more widely known as Transport for Norwich (TfN), is the adopted strategy which will deliver the transport improvements needed over the next 15 plus years. The strategy recognises everybody's journeys are different and does not look to force people to use one particular mode. It does look to give people viable options on how they choose to travel and actively promote sustainable transport. To do this in some areas of the network there needs to be a re-balance of the highway space available.
- 4. The Strategy details the plan for future delivery of improvements in order to develop sustainable transport, reduce congestion and improve air quality within the Greater Norwich area. The strategy has already delivered key improvements such as the award winning Norwich Bus Station, St Augustine's Gyratory, a network of Park & Ride facilities, St Stephens and Chapel Field North and various Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) improvements. It also includes the recently completed Postwick hub and the Northern Distributor Road which is due for completion late 2017.
- The implementation plan for the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy (NATSIP) was agreed by Norfolk County Council in April 2010 and updated in November 2013 (see link for updated implementation plan http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/view/NCC158241). The plan sets out the range of transport measures, together with their general intended phasing, for delivery over the short to medium term.
- The plan has now been updated to take account of what has been delivered since 2010, and to reflect the latest position on future scheme delivery, given progress with implementation, and now that the growth plans for the area are more clear <u>(see joint core strategy document:</u> http://www.greaternorwichgrowth.org.uk/dmsdocument/1953).
- 7. Cycling is on the increase for both recreation and commuting nationally and the area has a thriving cycling community. The implementation of a City wide cycling network (see link to cycle map <u>http://www.norwich.gov.uk/TransportAndStreets/Transport/Cycling/Documents/CyclingMapFront.pdf</u>) is a key part of the Transport for Norwich Strategy as by

delivering a comprehensive city network this reduces a number of short distance car journeys removing pressure on the network, as well as offering improving quality of life and the health benefits that have been well documented.

8. The Greater Norwich area is one of eight urban areas across the country that has been successful in bidding for Cycle Ambition funding from the Department for Transport to comprehensively improve the quality of cycling infrastructure across the Norwich cycle network a copy of the application documents can be found here

http://www.norwich.gov.uk/TransportAndStreets/Transport/Cycling/Pages/CycleCi tyAmbitionGrant2015.aspx.

Background

- 9. The City Cycle Ambition Grant (CCAG) was originally awarded to Norwich City Council in 2013 and a further grant was made in 2015. The aim of this scheme is to improve facilities for the cyclist and encourage as many people as possible, even the most vulnerable, to use this sustainable and healthy form of travel. It is the intention of the CCAG to encourage more people to cycle throughout the city, to make cycling enjoyable for all and improve the infrastructure to benefit all kinds of cycling from commuter to leisure.
- 10. As one of 46 different projects the City Centre Access Strategy aims to rationalise and make the restrictions on the pedestrianised streets understandable and enforceable by reviewing the current arrangements for cycling and loading. The project also includes a making a number of streets suitable for contraflow cycling to increase cycle permeability. As two of these streets fall within the City Centre Access review area they will form part of this report. These are Lobster Lane and Little London Street where No Entry signs currently prohibit all vehicle flow including cyclists. Other streets beyond the pedestrianised areas will be considered separately
- 11. As shown on Plan No.1 attached as appendix 1, cycling and access restrictions in the pedestrian areas of the city centre are varied. The existing arrangement has grown as individual pedestrianised schemes have been installed. This means that although they would have been individually considered appropriate at the time of installation, they now form a very complicated and disconnected pattern of restrictions that are in need of review.
- 12. Cycling and loading are either banned 24/7 (e.g. parts of London Street), time restricted on city centre streets (e.g. Gentleman's Walk) or permitted at all times (e.g. Bedford Street). The rules have been introduced incrementally through individual projects without a thorough review. Consequently the time restrictions applied also vary between streets. In some streets there are different restrictions on sections of the same street.
- 13. The network of pedalways established in Norwich all meet at the 'hub' in St Andrews Plain avoiding much of the city centre amenity. At present there is an obstruction for a cyclist accessing the pedalways from other areas in the city centre. If cyclists are banned from certain streets they are forced to cycle on

heavily trafficked roads where accidents do occur. This access problem may deter some more vulnerable cyclists from using the pedalways.

Research

- 14. In 1993 DfT published the Traffic advisory Leaflet of Cycling in Pedestrian Areas. In the main conclusions it states "Observation revealed no real factors to justify excluding cyclists from pedestrianised areas, suggesting that cycling could be more widely permitted without detriment to pedestrians" In the findings it states " Cyclists respond to pedestrian density, modifying their speed, dismounting and taking other avoiding action where necessary"
- 15. Accidents between pedestrians and cyclists are very rarely generated in pedestrianised areas. In Norwich only two pedestrian/cyclist accidents in 5 years in the area of pedestrian streets in this review. This should be viewed against the backdrop that cycling is already seen on these streets and the data shows that the significant numbers of pedestrian and cyclist casualties occur on the surrounding roads and are caused by motorised transport.
- 16. In 2003 Transport Research Laboratory prepared a report for the DfT called "cycling in vehicle restricted areas" where studies were carried out in Cambridge, Hull and Salisbury. The report considered factual information such as the numbers of cyclists and pedestrians and any interactions between the two parties along with the attitude and concerns of those cyclists and pedestrians. In the conclusions it states "The observation surveys showed that the majority of cyclists in VRAs (Vehicle Restricted Areas) modify their behaviour by slowing down or dismounting as pedestrian numbers increase". Concerning the attitude survey the report concluded "The pedestrian attitude surveys showed that the majority of pedestrians were not particularly concerned about cyclists in the pedestrian area..."
- 17. In England most cities and towns have pedestrianised areas where cycling is not permitted at various times of the day. In Kendal an experimental "permitting cyclists" Order was made on the pedestrian areas which came into force in June 2006. In July 2007 a report was taken to committee recommending the order is made permanent. The review of the scheme stated "The order has been in force for a little over 12 months and appears to be working safely. No personal injury accidents have been reported but there is some anecdotal evidence of "incidents" between cyclists and pedestrians." There were no formal objections to the order and so far there had been no evidence of collisions, the police did not object to a permanent traffic regulation order permitting cycling.
- 18. The police have reported they have received concerns from the public about cyclists in the pedestrianised areas in the city centre. We have not been informed of the numbers but this does show that some members of the community consider a pedestrian zone should not have cyclists.

Early consultation

- 19. The Cycle Campaign, Norfolk Police, Norfolk and Norwich Association for the Blind and Norwich Access Group have given comment on the principals of this project. It was noted that there are small number of sections of some streets that are narrow and not particularly suited to cycling.
- 20. The Norwich Business Improvement District and Living Streets were also invited to comment but no responses were received.

Consideration

21. Three possible approaches have been considered. The first is a 'Do Nothing' option, whist the second proposes standardising the time period of the restrictions and allowing cycling in all streets outside peak hours. The final option considers a standardises access restriction for motor vehicles, with cycling access at all times:-

Option 1 – Leave the cycling restrictions as existing in pedestrianised areas (the 'Do Nothing' option).

- 22. The reasons people do not follow restrictions are varied, however it is considered that if the signage is too complicated, the restrictions change too frequently, or the public feel the restriction is not necessary or relevant to them, then compliance is reduced. The plan in Appendix 1 demonstrates just how complicated the current arrangements are, with restriction varying along the length of streets in a number of locations. Due to the number of cyclists that presently cycle in the pedestrian areas during the restricted times, it is clear the existing restrictions do not work.
- 23. All existing restrictions are signed on street in accordance with the DfT Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002. This is standard signage and allows enforcement. It is not possible under the signs regulations to alter or add extra signs for information as this would then make the restriction unenforceable. The existing restrictions send a confusing and negative message to cyclists that they are not welcome in the city and that cycling is not considered a positive sustainable form of transport.
- 24. The existing loading restrictions also require complicated and confusing signage that is poorly understood. It is, therefore inappropriate to leave the existing arrangements in place. Norfolk Constabulary has been cautious in enforcing the cycling regulations in the pedestrian areas as they consider the signage in some locations to be ambiguous.

Option 2 – amend the timings of the restrictions in pedestrianised areas and allow cycling outside peak hours.

25. With this option access by vehicles and cyclists would be rationalised such that they could only have access outside revised operational hours of 10am to 5pm seven days a week (see appendix 2). This would create an easy to follow restriction, allow cycling for most commuter journeys, maintain existing motor

vehicle restriction and utilise an entry plate that would be consistent across the city.

- 26. However there will still need to be standard signs at the beginning of the restriction and these will need to be similar to the existing signs which are considered difficult for the public to understand. In some locations, vehicular access is permitted in a restricted basis to parts of a street, for example access to the Blue Badge spaces within the pedestrianised areas (see motor vehicle restrictions in appendix 4).
- 27. This option would give a better overall picture for the cyclist in pedestrianised areas. It is not possible to determine how many cycling signs will be needed until the loading restrictions have been decided on, however it is likely there will be a similar number as on street now.
- 28. As with option 1, the restriction would also be in place when pedestrian flows are relatively light, and there is therefore a significant risk that cyclists would continue to ignore them and enforcement could continue to be difficult. For cycle access this presents an improvement on option 1 but it could go further to encourage the more vulnerable cyclist.
- 29. Consequently, a change to a uniform restriction to cyclists in the pedestrianised areas would be of some improvement.

Option 3 – Remove the existing restrictions and allow access to pedestrian zones by cyclist at all times.

- 30. In this option, access by vehicles to the time restricted streets would be standardised at 10am to 5pm, seven days a week and cycling would be allowed within the pedestrian areas (see appendix 3).
- 31. Since the existing city centre signage was installed, DfT have approved the updated *Pedestrian and Cycle Zone* signage. If we simply update the timings for motor vehicle access for loading purposes we can utilise this newer and clearer signage on the streets that permits both walking and cycling. This signage has already been put in place on Westlegate and is more succinct and easier to understand. There would be no expectation of the police to enforce unclear cycling restrictions but it would still be possible to take action against unreasonable cycling behaviour.
- 32. It would be a great benefit to the less confident cyclist to allow access to all streets in the city centre. This would allow free access to the pedalway routes, city centre attractions and places of employment.
- 33. Other road users would be aware of the possibility of cyclists in the area at all times which should lead to mutual consideration over time. A publicity campaign, including directions to cyclists to cycle appropriately and with care would assist with this.

It is recognised that some sections of the community may be very wary of this approach, but it is hoped with the correct public information these concerns will

be reduced. Existing research and experience elsewhere has demonstrated that, in reality, these concerns are unsubstantiated (see paragraphs 14-17)

Conclusion

- 34. The existing access, loading and cycling restrictions in the pedestrianised areas are inconsistent, confusing, and the required signage is complex and difficult to understand. Consequently there is a need to rationalise the existing arrangements
- 35. Two possible scenarios for consultation are recommended. Firstly, a standardisation of access hours across all the streets that currently operate under a time restriction, so that no vehicles (including cyclists) would be permitted between the hours of 10am and 5pm on any day. The second option would restrict motorised vehicles only outside of these hours, with cycling permitted at all times.
- 36. The consultation should also include proposals to provide for contraflow cycling west bound on Lobster Lane and north bound on Little London Street where cycling and general traffic is currently allowed in one direction only. These would require the provision on an 'Except Cycles' sub plate.



Cathedral FAITHS LA ST NCE OF RT12m WA 06 ROSE LANE \Box EPW ′ςΤ <u>10</u>

Existing Access Restrictions

No motor vehicles except access

No motor vehicles 11am- 4pm Mon - Friday, 10am - 5pm Sat & Sun ٥V

ffs

No vehicles 10am - 5pm Mon - Sun

No vehicles at any time

~

No vehicles except for access

10x

© Crown Copyright and database right 2016. Ordnance Survey 100019747.

X







Report to	Norwich highways agency committee	ltem
	24 November 2016	
Joint Report of	Head of city development Services and Executive director of community and environmental services	11
Subject	Transport for Norwich - St Crispin's shared use crossing	

Purpose

To seek agreement to consult on proposals for a wide conspicuous at grade crossing over St Crispin's Road from St George's to Botolph Street and to note that the subway will be filled in.

Recommendation

That the committee:

- (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.

Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to meet the corporate priority to provide a safe, clean and low carbon city and the service plan priority to implement the Local Transport Plan and Norwich Area Transportation Strategy.

Financial implications

The budget for the scheme is £900,000 to be funded from the Cycle City Ambition Grant from the Department for Transport

Ward/s: Mancroft

Cabinet member: Councillor Bremner – Environment and sustainable development

Scheme Timescales

- A 4 week public consultation of scheme proposal in February 2017
- Consideration of feedback in March 2017
- Detailed design for committee for approval in April 2017

• Subject to legal processes the outcome of the consultation the scheme is planned for construction in quarter 3 of 2017.

Contact Officers

Bruce Bentley, Principal transportation planner	01603 212445
bruce.bentley@norwich.gov.uk	
Phil Reilly, Project engineer	01603 224203
phil.reilly@norfolk.gov.uk	

Background documents

Options considered and safety audit report on final agreed option.

Report

Strategic Objectives

- 1. Norwich and its surrounding area is becoming an increasingly popular area to live, work and visit. It is the number one shopping destination in the Eastern Region and becoming one the Nation's premier cultural centres. To ensure the Greater Norwich Area continues to be popular and grow, the transport systems need to be able to cope with the increased demand.
- 2. Norwich is a medieval city with a narrow road system; incorporating a 21st century transport system to cope with the increased demand without sacrificing highway space for a particular transport mode or at the expense of green space and historic buildings is challenging.
- 3. The Norwich area Transportation Strategy (NATS) now more widely known as Transport for Norwich (TfN), is the adopted strategy which will deliver the transport improvements needed over the next 15 plus years. The strategy recognises everybody's journeys are different and does not look to force people to use one particular mode. It does look to give people viable options on how they choose to travel and actively promote sustainable transport. To do this in some areas of the network there needs to be a re-balance of the highway space available.
- 4. The Strategy details the plan for future delivery of improvements in order to develop sustainable transport, reduce congestion and improve air quality within the Greater Norwich area. The strategy has already delivered key improvements such as the award winning Norwich Bus Station, St Augustine's Gyratory, a network of Park & Ride facilities, St Stephens and Chapel Field North and various Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) improvements. It also includes the recently completed Postwick hub and the Northern Distributor Road which is due for completion late 2017.
- The implementation plan for the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy (NATSIP) was agreed by Norfolk County Council in April 2010 and updated in November 2013 (see <u>link for updated implementation plan http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/view/NCC158241</u>).
 The plan sets out the range of transport measures, together with their general intended phasing, for delivery over the short to medium term.
- The plan has now been updated to take account of what has been delivered since 2010, and to reflect the latest position on future scheme delivery, given progress with implementation, and now that the growth plans for the area are more clear <u>(see joint</u> <u>core strategy document: http://www.greaternorwichgrowth.org.uk/dmsdocument/1953</u>).

Cycling is on the increase for both recreation and commuting nationally and the area has a thriving cycling community. The implementation of a City wide cycling network (see link to cycle map <u>http://www.visitnorwich.co.uk/assets/Uploads/PDF/Cycling-Map.pdf</u>) is a key part of the Transport for Norwich Strategy as by delivering a comprehensive city network this reduces a number of short distance car journeys removing pressure on the network, as well as offering improving quality of life and the health benefits that have been well documented.

7. The Greater Norwich area is one of eight urban areas across the country that has been successful in bidding for Cycle Ambition funding from the Department for Transport to comprehensively improve the quality of cycling infrastructure across the Norwich cycle network a copy of the application documents can be found here

http://www.norwich.gov.uk/TransportAndStreets/Transport/Cycling/Pages/CycleCityA mbitionGrant2015.aspx.

Scheme Objectives and Benefits

- 8. The route yellow pedal way crosses the ring road at St Crispin's and currently cyclists and pedestrians have no specific crossing facility other than to use the subway which is no longer public highway, after highway rights were in 2009 as part of proposals to substantially redevelop the area at the time. The current subway route is unattractive, indirect and brings users into conflict with pedestrians. In order to make the yellow pedal way more attractive an 'at grade' crossing of the ring road is needed.
- 9. The key objective of this scheme is to provide a wide, conspicuous and direct at grade crossing over St Crispin's Road in order to facilitate easy pedestrian and cycle movements across the inner ring road between St George's Street and Botolph Street. The subway will be filled in and wing walls removed allowing the space to be used for planted areas and segregated cycling and walking paths to the north and south of St Crispin's Road.
- 10. This arrangement will tie in with redevelopment proposals that are currently under discussion-for the Anglia Square area. Weston Homes in association with Columbia Threadneedle have appointed Broadway Malyan to prepare an overarching vison for the site that includes an improved retail offer, an aspiration to deliver around 1000 new homes and improved connectivity within the site. In particular this will strengthen the north south route that links St Georges Street, across this new pedestrian and cycle crossing through the site to link with Edward Street. This route will significantly enhance access from the north of the city to the City Centre for pedestrians and cyclists and the new crossing will provide a much enhanced 'gateway' into the regenerated area
- 11. The subway will be filled in rather than retained in parallel with the crossing for the following reasons:
 - It has already been legally extinguished as a public highway
 - The subway attracts anti-social and criminal behaviour and these would become even worse if very few people used the subway when the new crossing exists
 - Removing the subway and its approaches releases land that can be used to improve the alignment of paths and improve the environment in the area.
 - The subway is difficult for people with mobility problems to use because it involves ascending and descending ramps and steps
 - There is an ongoing revenue budget implication involved in cleaning, repairing, lighting and pumping water out of the subway

Existing Pedestrian & Cycle survey

12. A video survey of subway usage has been undertaken to show typical flows, undertaken on Wednesday 4th November 2015. 07:00 to 18:00.

	Total Count		North Bo	ound	South bound		
	pedestrians	Cycles	pedestrians	Cycles	pedestrians	Cycles	
male	1161 132		522 39		629	93	
female	694	18	331	4	363	14	
children	36 20		24	5	12	15	

13. There is an expectation that the levels of cycling will rise significantly if facilities are improved, and providing priority to cyclists is necessary to achieve the improvement in quality on this route.

Design Proposals

Options Considered

14. Five options were tested as part of the traffic assessment model:

- Option 1 staggered pedestrian crossing and separate straight across cycle crossing in the vicinity of St Georges Street
- Option 2 staggered Toucan crossing in the vicinity of St Georges Street
- Option 3 staggered pedestrian crossing and separate straight across cycle crossing in the vicinity of Calvert Street
- Option 4 staggered Toucan crossing in the vicinity of Calvert Street
- Option 5 staggered pedestrian crossing and separate straight across cycle crossing in the vicinity of Calvert Street. In addition this would result in the closure of the left turn out of Calvert Street.
- 15. Option 1 was discounted following concerns that pedestrians may try to use the straight through cycle phase with insufficient time for them to cross in one movement. Options 3, 4 & 5 were discounted as Calvert Street is off the desire line from St Georges Street to Botolph Street and does not accord with the re-routing of the yellow pedal way away from Magdalen Street. These were modelled however to ascertain any differences with a crossing being further west in terms of traffic flows on the ring road.

Preferred Option & Design Guidance

- 16. The survey shows a peak hour flow of 144 for pedestrians and 22 for cyclists. Assuming an increase of 50% in peak hour cyclists the flow would be categorised 'very low' by London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS) [0-60 per hour], requiring a shared use width of 2.2m. Discussions with the Road Safety, Network Analysis the ITS (traffic signals) teams resulted in a desire to keep the pedestrians and cycles running together, resulting in a blend of options One and Two
- 17. The project proposes construction of the following elements which are shown on the plan attached as appendix 1, Drawing number PE4112-HP-7000-001 PR GENERAL ARRANGEMENT
 - (a) Signalised crossing point on St Crispin's together with a further signalised crossing point to the north to allow users to also cross Botolph Street.
 - (b) Widened central reservation to 4.5m along St Crispin's to accommodate new crossing point of 5.4 m to accommodate shared use pedestrians and cycles.
 - (c) Removal of the existing underpass to create areas for landscaping.
 - (d) Realignment of existing kerblines to the central reservation, southern kerblines and roundabout approaches.
 - (e) Alignment of Botolph Street crossing point to be determined and finalised in conjunction with designs for Anglia Square redevelopment. The detail currently shown on the plan assumes that no changes are made to the current arrangements here, but it is expected that very significant improvement will be forthcoming as part of the Anglia Square proposals
- 18. In terms of traffic modelling and timings the preferred proposal would operate as option Two with the following design principle being adopted. Timing of the pedestrian crossing will be linked to St Crispins signalised roundabout to maximise the capacity of the inner ring road, the result of this would be to ensure that traffic travelling along the inner ring road is not stopped twice. As a result the northern crossing point (Inner Ring Road West to East) would be active when traffic is turning left from Pitt St.

Traffic impact - Inner Ring Road traffic West to East

- 19. In the current situation, at peak times, queues can form on the approach to St Crispin's Road roundabout and often extend back to Barkers St / Barn Road roundabout.
- 20. Testing of the current proposal suggests the addition of a crossing point would be unlikely to incur extra delay in terms of journey time along the inner ring road.

Traffic impact - Inner Ring Road traffic East to West

21. In the current situation, at peak times, queues can form on the approach to Barkers St / Barn Road roundabout and often extend beyond the signalised roundabout at St Crispin's and past the location of the proposed crossing point. 22. Testing of the current proposal suggests the addition of a crossing point would be unlikely to incur extra delay in terms of journey time along the inner ring road

Traffic Regulation Orders and notices

26. Legal processes will be required to implement the crossing.

Traffic impacts

27. Traffic management will be required during the work and delays to traffic are likely. It is intended to issue a press release for information closer to the start of construction. Work will be programmed to minimise impact on the road network where possible.

Environment

28. The city council's landscape architect will be included in design discussions in relation to the proposed design. Further advice will be sought in relation to areas constrained by trees as noted and in relation to the proposed development of Anglia Square.

Accident reduction

29. There have been 1 accident in the vicinity of the proposed scheme in the last 5 years categorised as 'slight'.

Public Consultation

30. A four week public consultation of scheme proposals is planned. Consultation will also be carried out for any TROs or Notices required. The consultation feedback and any objections will be reported to a future NHAC meeting for consideration on how to proceed with the scheme.

Timescales

31. Subject to legal processes the scheme is planned to be constructed during 2017-18 quarter 3.

Stakeholder views

32. Stakeholders, including businesses in the area, local residents and local interest groups, will be included in the consultation.

Conclusion

33. The project is rooted in strategy documents that have been adopted by Norwich City and Norfolk County Councils and the proposals will meet the requirements of the brief by providing benefits to cyclists and pedestrians. The proposals as presented would provide the next phase of improvement on the yellow Pedal way and will improve this section of the cycle network to provide a facility that is safer and more pleasant to use and create landscaping opportunities to link to the new Anglia Square development.

Resource Implications

- 33. Finance: The TfN programme forms an integral part of strategic infrastructure as set out in the Joint Core Strategy. The delivery of this work is funded by government grants by way of the City Cycle Ambition programme and Section 106 funding.
- 32. Staff: The project will be delivered through joint team working involving both county council and city council officers.
- 33. Property: The proposals cannot be provided within the existing highway boundary. Adjacent land is owned by Norwich City Council and strips of this will be acquired as highway in order to provide the shared use facilities.
- 34. IT: None.

Other implications

- 35. Legal Implications: None
- 36. Human Rights: None.
- 37. Communications: Transport for Norwich programme updates are issued monthly to inform the public and stakeholders of current schemes and future programme

Section 17 - Crime and Disorder Act

38. The scheme will be designed to ensure it has a positive effect on crime and disorder where possible. Care will be taken during construction to minimise opportunities for crime and disorder, for instance the secure storage of construction equipment and materials.

Risk Implications/Assessment

- 39. A risk assessment has been undertaken for development of the NATS Implementation Plan (TfN). The key risks for delivering this are around funding, timescales and planning. These risks are being managed through active project management and ongoing engagement with stakeholders.
- 40. A risk register is being maintained as part of the technical design and construction delivery processes.



Page 127 of 176

Report to	Norwich Highways Agency committee	ltem
	24 November 2016	
Joint report of	Head of city development services and Executive director of community and environmental services	12
Subject	Transport for Norwich – Angel Road / Waterloo Road cycling Improvements	

Purpose

To seek approval to consult on the proposals for the Shipstone Road / Angel Road / Waterloo Road project. Members are also asked to approve the advertisement of Traffic Regulation Orders that would be required to enforce the final scheme.

Recommendation

That the committee:

- 1. approves 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
 - e) Lane/Catton Grove Road junction and implement a raised table to reduce speeds and improve pedestrian/cycle facilities.
 - f) 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.

- g) 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.
- h) Replacing two groups of speed cushions outside 163 & 182 Angel Road with sinusoidal humps that span the full width of the carriageway.
- i) Reconfiguration of the Shipstone Road closure point to remove the narrow twoway 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.
- j) Extend the existing shared use facility on the north side of Waterloo Road near its junction with Magpie Road by approximately 20 metres.
- k) Shorten bus cage south of Elm Grove Lane.
- 2) asks the transportation and network manager at Norwich City Council 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) agrees that the outcome of the proposed consultation will be reported to a future meeting of the committee.

Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to meet the corporate priority to provide a safe, clean and low carbon city and the service plan priority to implement the Transport for Norwich Plan.

Scheme Timescales

- A 4 week public consultation of scheme proposals in January 2017
- Consideration of consultation feedback in February 2017
- Refine the proposals where necessary and present the scheme to committee for approval on 16 March 2017
- Subject to legal processes and the outcome of consultation the scheme is planned to be constructed in quarter 2 of 2017-18.

Financial implications

The scheme has been allocated funding of £320,000 from the Department for Transport (DfT) and £20,000 of Local Transport Plan (LTP), Local safety funds.

Wards

Sewell, Mile Cross and Catton Grove

Cabinet member: Councillor Bremner – Environment and sustainable development

Contact Officers

Joanne Deverick, Transportation and network manager – Norwich City Council	01603 212218
Mike Auger, Projects Engineer – Norfolk County Council	01603 228853
Background documents	
None	
Cabinet member for Environment and sustainable development	
Bert Bremner	
Contact Officers	
Joanne Deverick, Transportation Manager – Norwich City Council	01603 212218
Mike Auger, Projects Engineer – Norfolk County Council	01603 228853

REPORT

Strategic Objectives

- 1. Norwich and its surrounding area is becoming an increasingly popular area to live, work and visit. It is the number one shopping destination in the eastern region and becoming one of the nation's premier cultural centres. To ensure the Greater Norwich Area continues to be popular and grow, the transport systems need to be able to cope with the increased demand.
- 2. The Norwich Area Transportation Strategy (NATS), now more widely known as Transport for Norwich (TfN), is the adopted strategy which will deliver the transport improvements needed over the next 15 plus years. The strategy recognises everybody's journeys are different and does not look to force people to use one particular mode. It does look to give people viable options on how they choose to travel and actively promote sustainable transport.
- 3. The strategy details the plan for future delivery of improvements in order to develop sustainable transport, reduce congestion and improve air quality within the Greater Norwich area. The strategy has already delivered key improvements such as the award winning Norwich Bus Station, St Augustine's Gyratory, a network of Park and Ride facilities, St Stephens and Chapel Field North and various Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) improvements. It also includes the recently completed Postwick hub and the Northern Distributor Road which is due for completion late 2017.
- 4. The implementation plan for the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy (NATSIP) was agreed by Norfolk County Council in April 2010 and updated in November 2013: <u>https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/-/media/norfolk/downloads/roads-and-transport/tfn/nats-ip-update.pdf?la=en</u> The plan sets out the range of transport measures, together with their general intended phasing, for delivery over the short to medium term.
- The plan has now been updated to take account of what has been delivered since 2010 and to reflect the latest position on future scheme delivery, given progress with implementation, and now that the growth plans for the area are more clear <u>(see joint</u> <u>core strategy document:</u> <u>http://www.greaternorwichgrowth.org.uk/dmsdocument/1953</u>).
- 6. Cycling is on the increase for both recreation and commuting nationally and the area has a thriving cycling community. The implementation of a city wide cycling network (see link to cycle map https://www.norwich.gov.uk/downloads/file/3107/map illustrating our proposed cycli ng ambition programme) is a key part of the Transport for Norwich Strategy as by delivering a comprehensive city network this reduces a number of short distance car journeys removing pressure on the network, as well as offering improved quality of life with well documented health benefits.
- 7. The Greater Norwich area is one of 8 urban areas across the country that has been successful in bidding for Cycle Ambition funding from the Department for Transport to comprehensively improve the quality of cycling infrastructure across the Norwich cycle network. A copy of the application documents can be found here:

Scheme Objectives and Benefits

- 8. This scheme covers all of Waterloo Road and Angel Road from the Elm Grove Lane junction to its junction with Waterloo Road. Please see drawing PE4122-MP-006 in Appendix 1 for a Site Location Plan.
- 9. The scheme is a key part of the yellow pedalway which links the airport at the north, with Lakenham, to the south. The yellow pedalway runs along Heath Road, Shipstone Road where it crosses Waterloo Road to continue along Angel Road and Catton Grove Road.
- 10. The orange pedalway also combines with the yellow pedalway along part of the route between Roseberry Road and Eade Road.
- 11. A neighbourhood route crosses Angel Road at the junction with Philadelphia Lane and Elm Grove Lane. Another one uses the southern section of Waterloo Road connecting Bakers Road and St Augustine Street to the yellow pedalway at Angel Road.
- 12. The map included in Appendix 2 shows the route of the pedalways through the project area.
- 13. The objectives of the scheme cover three distinct areas, Angel Road and its junction Catton Grove Road / Elm Grove Lane / Philadelphia Lane, the junction of Angel Road / Waterloo Road / Shipstone Road and Waterloo Road itself.
- 14. The Angel Road / Catton Grove Road / Elm Grove Lane / Philadelphia Lane junction has seen 6 injury accidents in 6 years involving a high proportion of vulnerable road users but none recorded since November 2014. The objective of the scheme is to therefore to reduce vehicle speeds through the two junctions and improve the facilities for cyclists and pedestrians to make crossing the junction easier.
- 15. At the Angel Road/Waterloo Road and Shipstone Road junction vehicles approach the junction too quickly from the south due to the width of the carriageway on Waterloo Road south of the junction, endangering cyclists and pedestrians. Parked cars in the entrance to Shipstone Road also make it difficult for cyclists travelling on the yellow pedalway from Angel Road into Shipstone Road across Waterloo Road. The objective of the scheme is to therefore to reduce vehicle speeds as they approach and travel through the two junctions and improve the facilities for cyclists and pedestrians to make crossing the junction easier, especially for cyclists on the yellow pedalway between Angel Road and Shipstone Road.
- 16. Following a recent increase in the number of accidents on Waterloo Road between its junction with St Augustine's Gate and Angel Road, an accident investigation study was undertaken in August 2015. The findings of the report highlighted that the accident trend showed a sharp recent rise, a disproportionate amount of accidents involved cyclists (89%), the cyclist accidents occur during the evening peak in the months of autumn winter and the highway corridor is wide and open and may encourage inappropriate speed.

17. The report therefore proposed measures to improve cyclist provision and visibility along this stretch on Waterloo Road which this scheme aims to deliver as part of the proposed works.

Design Proposals

Angel Road / Catton Grove Road / Elm Grove Lane / Philadelphia Lane junction

18. A reduction in vehicle speeds through the junction should be partially achieved through the extension of the existing 20mph zone on Angel Road to north of the junction delivered as part of the Woodcock Lane/Catton Grove Road roundabout scheme. However, to further reduce manoeuvring speeds through the junction, it is proposed to install a raised table through the junction and reduce junction radii as shown in drawing PE4122-MP-001 included in Appendix 3.

Angel Road

- 19. To provide greater comfort for cyclists and avoid encouraging them to ride in the dooring zone of parked cars, it is proposed to replace the two groups of speed cushions outside 163 & 182 Angel Road with sinusoidal humps that span the full width of the carriageway.
- 20. To ease turning movements into and out of Rosebery Road from Angel Road it is proposed to install a no waiting restriction preventing car parking over a length of 14m outside 61 Angel Road opposite the junction with Rosebery Road.

Angel Road / Waterloo Road / Shipstone Road junction

- 21. For the Angel Road / Waterloo Road / Shipstone Road junction a number of options have been investigated to reduce speeds and improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists. These include tightening the radius of the south-west corner of the Waterloo Road and Angel Road to reduce the speeds of northbound vehicles making and extending the existing no waiting restrictions on Shipstone Road 10m away from the junction.
- 22. In addition to these changes it is proposed to consult on the following two options to help ease the movement of pedestrian and cyclists through the junction.
- 23. Option 1 is shown in drawing number PE4122-MP-001 & 002 included in Appendix 4 and would involve:
 - Installing a raised table through the extents of the junction
 - Installing a zebra crossing south to the south of the junction
 - Replacing the existing signal controlled pedestrian crossing to the north of the junction with a combined pedestrian and cycle 'Tiger' crossing linking into a 2.5m wide shared use facility on the east of Waterloo Road between the crossing and Shipstone Road.
- 24. Option 2 is shown in drawing number PE4122-MP-003 & 004 included in Appendix 5 and would involve:
 - Installing speed cushions to the north and south of the junction to slow vehicles speed

 Upgrade the existing signal controlled pedestrian crossing to a Toucan crossing to incorporate cyclists and link into a new shared use facility between the crossing and Shipstone Road junction

Shipstone Road

25. To improve the Shipstone Road closure point for cyclists, it is proposed to convert the existing narrow two way path into a one-way path with another one-way path on the other side of the planted median strip. A pedestrian only path would also be provided along this section by remove the raised the cobble areas as shown in plan included in Appendix 6.

Waterloo Road

- 26. To address the safety problems for cyclists identified in the accident study for Waterloo Road, it is proposed to implement the recommendations identified in the study and shown in drawing PE4122-MP-003 included in Appendix 3.
- 27. To help reduce vehicles speeds along Waterloo Road it is proposed to extend the 20mph zone at St Augustine's gate through to its junction with Magdalen Road. It is proposed that traffic calming takes the form of speed cushions.
- 28. To improve the cyclist provision and improve their visibility it is proposed to install a northbound advisory cycle lane from St Augustine's Gate to Angel Road. Ideally a southbound facility would also be provided however there is inadequate width to provide this facility that would not be continually overrun by vehicles.

20 mph Zones

29. In addition to the changes to the 20mph zones on Waterloo Road and Angel Road, it is also proposed to introduce 20mph zones on 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 as shown in drawing PE4122-MP-005 included in Appendix 7.

Traffic Regulation Orders and notices

30. Legal processes will be required to convert pedestrian only routes to shared use, additional waiting restrictions and an area wide 20mph speed limit zone with associated traffic calming in the form of raised tables and road humps. The roads proposed to be covered by a 20mph speed limit zone are listed in Appendix 5 along with a plan, drawing PE4122-MP-005.

Traffic impacts

31. Traffic management will be required during the work and delays to traffic are likely. It is intended to issue a press release for information closer to the start of construction. Work will be programmed to minimise impact on the road network where possible.

Environment

32. The city council's landscape architect has offered advice in relation to the proposed design. Further advice will be sought in relation to areas Angel Road/Waterloo road/Shipstone Road junction and the Shipstone Road Closure point.

Accident reduction

33. There have been 17 accidents in the area of the proposed scheme in the last 3 years, 1 categorised as serious and 16 categorised as 'slight'. The proposed measures are expected to reduce the accident rate in the future meeting of this committee.

Public Consultation

34. A four week public consultation of scheme proposals is planned to go ahead during January 2017. Consultation will also be carried out for any TROs or Notices required. The consultation feedback and any objections will be reported to a future meeting for consideration on how to proceed with the scheme.

Timescales

35. Subject to legal processes the scheme is planned to be constructed between July and September 2017.

Stakeholder views

36. Stakeholders, including businesses in the area, local residents and local interest groups, will be included in the consultation.

Conclusion

37. The project is rooted in strategy documents that have been adopted by Norwich City and Norfolk County Councils and the proposals will meet the requirements of the brief by providing benefits to cyclists and pedestrians. The proposals as presented would provide the next phase of improvement on the yellow Pedalway and will improve connectivity to the city centre.

Resource Implications

- 38. Finance: The TfN programme forms an integral part of strategic infrastructure as set out in the Joint Core Strategy. The delivery of this work is funded by government grants by way of the City Cycle Ambition programme and mainstream capital LTP, Local safety funds.
- 39. Staff: The project will be delivered through joint team working involving both County Council and City Council officers.
- 40. Property: The proposals can be provided within the existing highway boundary.
- 41. IT: None.

Other implications

- 42. Legal Implications: None
- 43. Human Rights: None.
- 44. Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA): An EqIA has been completed for the NATS Implementation Plan (TfN). An Equality Impact Assessment for this scheme will be

carried out as part of the detailed development, after discussions with the appropriate groups.

45. Communications: The communications officer for the TfN programme will be supporting the delivery of the project.

Section 17 - Crime and Disorder Act

46. The scheme will be designed to ensure it has a positive effect on crime and disorder where possible. Care will be taken during construction to minimise opportunities for crime and disorder, for instance the secure storage of construction equipment and materials.

Risk Implications/Assessment

- 47. A risk assessment has been undertaken for development of the NATS Implementation Plan (TfN). The key risks for delivering this are around funding, timescales and planning. These risks are being managed through active project management and ongoing engagement with stakeholders.
- 48. A risk register is being maintained as part of the technical design and construction delivery processes.



ED DATE	1	\square	INITIALS	DATE	DRAWING No. PE4122-MP-005		$ \supset $
		SURVEYED BY	O.S	11/16	PROJECT TITLE		
		DESIGNED BY	JT	11/16	Transport		
		DRAWN BY	JT	11/16	Angel Road		
	1	CHECKED BY	MA	11/16	SCALE NTS	FILE No. PE4122	





 Funded by:
 Tom McCabe
 Executive Director of
 Transport
 Community and Environmental Services

 Transport for Norwich
 Department for Transport
 NewANGLIA
 Department for Transport
 NewANGLIA

 Load Enterprise Partnership
 Load Enterprise Partnership
 Load Enterprise Partnership
 Norwich NR1 2SG

REV.	DESCRIPTION	CHECKED	DATE	(INITIALS	DATE	DRAWING No. PF412	2-MP-002	
				SURVEYED BY	OS	2016	PROJECT TITLE		-
				DESIGNED BY	JT	07/16	Transpor	t For Norwich	
				DRAWN BY	JT	07/16	Ang	jel Road	
				CHECKED BY	MA	11/16	SCALE 1:1000 @ A1	FILE No. PE4122	









'	DATE	۱.	(INITIALS	DATE	PROJECT TITLE Transport For Norwich					
				0.0	44/40				PROJECT TITLE Transport For Norwich		
			SURVETED BT	0.5	11/16						
			DESIGNED BY	JT	11/16						
_			DRAWN BY	JT	11/16	Angel Road					
						SCALE	FILE No.				
		,	CHECKED BY	MA	11/16	NTS	PE4122				
Norwich Highways Agency committee	ltem										
--	--										
24 November 2016											
Head of city development services and Executive director of community and environmental services	13										
Transport for Norwich –Mile Cross Lane (Fiddlewood to Catton Grove Road) cycling Improvements											
	Norwich Highways Agency committee 24 November 2016 Head of city development services and Executive director of community and environmental services Transport for Norwich –Mile Cross Lane (Fiddlewood to Catton Grove Road) cycling Improvements										

Purpose

To seek approval to consult on the proposals for the Mile Cross Lane to Fiddlewood cycling improvement scheme.

Recommendation

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) teconfiguration 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) agrees that the outcome of the proposed consultation will be reported to a future meeting of the committee.

Corporate objective and service priorities

The scheme helps to meet the corporate priority 'A safe and clean city' and the service plan priority to implement the Transport for Norwich Plan.

Scheme Timescales

- A 4 week public consultation of scheme proposals in January 2017
- Consideration of consultation feedback in February 2017
- Refine the proposals where necessary and present the scheme to Committee for approval on 16 March 2017
- Subject to legal processes and the outcome of consultation the scheme is planned to be constructed in quarter 2 of 2017-18.

Financial implications

The scheme has been allocated funding of £485,000 from the Department for Transport (DfT) Cycle City Ambition Grant and approx. £15,000 of Section 106 funds.

Ward/s: All Wards

Cabinet member: Councillor Bremner – Environment and sustainable development

Contact Officers

Amy Cole, Project engineer, Norfolk County Council amy.cole@norfolk.gov.uk	01603 638116	
Joanne Deverick, Transportation & network manager	01603 212445	

Background documents

None

REPORT

Strategic Objectives

- 1. Norwich and its' surrounding area is becoming an increasingly popular area to live, work and visit. It is the number one shopping destination in the eastern region and becoming one of the nation's premier cultural centres. To ensure the Greater Norwich Area continues to be popular and grow, the transport systems need to be able to cope with the increased demand.
- 2. The Norwich Area Transportation Strategy (NATS), now more widely known as Transport for Norwich (TfN), is the adopted strategy which will deliver the transport improvements needed over the next 15 plus years. The strategy recognises everybody's journeys are different and does not look to force people to use one particular mode. It does look to give people viable options on how they choose to travel and actively promote sustainable transport.
- 3. The Strategy details the plan for future delivery of improvements in order to develop sustainable transport, reduce congestion and improve air quality within the Greater Norwich area. The strategy has already delivered key improvements such as the award winning Norwich Bus Station, St Augustine's Gyratory, a network of Park and Ride facilities, St Stephens & Chapel Field North and various Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) improvements. It also includes the recently completed Postwick hub and the Northern Distributor Road which is due for completion late 2017.
- 4. The implementation plan for the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy (NATSIP) was agreed by Norfolk County Council in April 2010 and updated in November 2013: https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/-/media/norfolk/downloads/roads-and-transport/tfn/nats-ip-update.pdf?la=en. The plan sets out the range of transport measures, together with their general intended phasing, for delivery over the short to medium term.
- 5. The plan has now been updated to take account of what has been delivered since 2010 and to reflect the latest position on future scheme delivery, given progress with implementation, and now that the growth plans for the area are more clear (see joint core strategy document: http://www.greaternorwichgrowth.org.uk/dmsdocument/1953).
- 6. Cycling is on the increase for both recreation and commuting nationally and the area has a thriving cycling community. The implementation of a city wide cycling network (see link to cycle map https://www.norwich.gov.uk/downloads/file/3107/map illustrating our proposed cycling ambition programme) is a key part of the Transport for Norwich Strategy as by delivering a comprehensive city network this reduces a number of short distance car journeys removing pressure on the network, as well as offering improved quality of life with well documented health benefits.

The Greater Norwich area is one of 8 urban areas across the country that has been successful in bidding for Cycle Ambition funding from the Department for Transport to comprehensively improve the quality of cycling infrastructure across the Norwich cycle network. A copy of the application documents can be found here:

https://www.norwich.gov.uk/downloads/download/2096/cycle_city_ambition_phase_two

Scheme Objectives and Benefits

- 7. This scheme is located on Norwich's outer ring road at the junction of Mile Cross Lane/Chartwell Road/Catton Grove Road and St Faiths Road. Please see Appendix 1 for a Site Location Plan.
- 8. The scheme is a key part of the Yellow Pedalway which links the airport at the north, with Lakenham, heading into the city centre, to the south. The map included in Appendix 2 shows the route of the yellow Pedalway through the area.
- 9. The Norwich outer ring road (Mile Cross Lane Chartwell Road) is subject to a 40mph speed limit and carries a high volume of traffic including HGVs. Currently cyclists are required to ride alongside traffic through the junction because there are no off-carriageway facilities or protected space. This scheme looks at the link between Catton Grove Road and the Fiddlewood estate (to the immediate north west of the junction) and seeks to improve an important link on the yellow Pedalway where it crosses the ring road at the Catton Grove Road/St Faiths Road junction. The main objective of the scheme is to provide protected space for cyclists away from vehicular traffic.

Design Proposals

Options Considered

- 10. A feasibility study setting out the design guidance and options considered has been included in Appendix 3 of this report. A summary of this is provided below:
- 11. At the feasibility stage of this scheme 3 options were considered:

Option 1 –

- Cycle track on south side of Mile Cross Lane
- Constraints include the frequency of vehicular accesses, level differences, healthy London Plan trees, maintaining adequate network capacity for vehicular traffic, including providing an acceptable taper for east-west merging traffic
- Due to constraints the facility would need to be provided within existing carriageway space.
- Existing puffin crossing on Mile Cross Lane to be upgraded to toucan crossing to enable use by cyclists

Option 2 –

- Provision of an off-carriageway shared pedestrian/cycle facility on the north side of Mile Cross Lane
- Widen existing footway to 3.0m into the verge behind and complete legal process to convert to shared use

- Widen footpath where constraints allow between Mile Cross Lane and • Blackthorn Close and convert to shared use
- Upgrade signalised junction to allow cyclists to use crossing points

Option 3 –

As option 2, with the addition of the removal of the left slip lane for vehicular traffic from Mile Cross Lane to St Faiths Road. The aim of this would be to create a 2-stage rather than 3-stage crossing to potentially minimise wait times for cyclists and pedestrians (see item 16 for more information).

Preferred Option & Design Guidance

- 12. It is recommended that option 2 to provide an off-carriageway shared use route is taken forward for consultation. Drawing PEA003-TfN-013 showing the proposals can be found in Appendix 5.
- 13. A cyclist and pedestrian survey was carried out on 23 June 2015 and the results are summarised on drawing PEA003-TfN-006 which can be found in Appendix 4. The survey shows a peak hour flow of 56 for pedestrians and 25 for cyclists. Assuming an increase of 50% in peak hour cyclists the flow would be categorised 'very low' by London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS) [0-60 per hour], requiring a shared use width of 2.2m.
- 14. Design guidance, as detailed in the feasibility document in Appendix 3, indicates that 3.0m would be a suitable width for a shared use facility.
- The proposals include widening existing footways and converting them to 15. shared use. The existing footway to the north of Mile Cross Lane is approx.1.8m wide. The footway will be widened to the back to a total 3.0m width to avoid the need to move kerb lines and impact on traffic capacity. The land behind the existing footways is owned by Norwich City Council and will be acquired as part of the delivery of this scheme.
- The footpath that links Mile Cross Lane through to Blackthorn Close is 1.9m 16. wide at its' narrowest point. The scheme will seek to widen this link but 3.0m is unlikely to be achievable due to the proximity of a steep bank and existing trees with shallow roots. A minimum proposed width of 2.2m is shown on drawing PEA003-TfN-013 and this area will be considered during the detailed design process.
- 17. An existing pedestrian crossing on Mile Cross Lane at the junction with Catton Grove Road/St Faiths Road will be upgraded so that it may also be used by cyclists. This will require widening the island to 3.0 and lengthening it.
- 18. The provision of off-carriageway space will separate cyclists from general traffic, providing particular benefit to more vulnerable cyclists.
- Traffic signals: The existing junction operates on the SCOOT (Split Cycle Offset 19. Optimisation Technique) system and it is biased to vehicular traffic as no pedestrian crossings are automatically demanded but need to be called using a push button. Based on the assumption of a 120 second cycle time at the

junction, the pedestrian wait times are currently 139 seconds minimum/207 seconds maximum heading north to south, and 127 seconds minimum/245 seconds maximum heading south to north.

It is proposed that as part of the scheme improvements be made that will reduce wait times to 44 seconds minimum/135 seconds maximum heading north to south and 26 seconds minimum/108 seconds maximum heading south to north. In addition it is proposed that the operation of the signals be changed to the MOVA (Microprocessor Optimised Vehicle Actuation) system. This will allow larger variations in stage length to be more responsive to live conditions thereby reducing queuing and delay.

20. Were scheme option 3 implemented (removal of left turn slip from Mile Cross Lane to St Faiths Road) the wait times would be 22 seconds minimum/118 seconds maximum heading north to south and 80 seconds minimum/183 seconds maximum heading south to north. The wait times for this option heading south to north are considerably longer than those in the proposed option 2.

Traffic Regulation Orders and notices

21. Legal processes will be required to convert pedestrian only routes to shared use.

Traffic impacts

22. Traffic management will be required during the work and delays to traffic are likely. It is intended to issue a press release for information closer to the start of construction. Work will be programmed to minimise impact on the road network where possible.

Environment

23. A City Council Landscape Architect has offered advice in relation to the proposed design. Further advice will be sought in relation to areas constrained by trees as noted on drawing PEA003-TfN-013 (Appendix 3). The Landscape Architect is also designing an improvement to the triangular shaped area to the immediate south-west of the main junction. This area is not highway and is owned by Norwich City Council.

Accident reduction

24. There have been 7 accidents in the vicinity of the proposed scheme in the last 5 years all categorised as 'slight', 1 of which involved a cyclist. By providing an off-carriageway route for cyclists this scheme will reduce the potential for conflict with vehicles and resulting accidents.

Public Consultation

25. A four week public consultation of scheme proposals is planned to go ahead during January 2017. Consultation will also be carried out for any TROs or Notices required. The consultation feedback and any objections will be reported

to a future meeting of this committee for consideration on how to proceed with the scheme.

Timescales

26. Subject to legal processes the scheme is planned to be constructed during 2017-18 quarter 2 (July-September 2017).

Stakeholder views

27. Stakeholders, including businesses in the area, local residents and local interest groups, will be included in the consultation.

Conclusion

28. The project is rooted in strategy documents that have been adopted by Norwich City and Norfolk County Councils and the proposals will meet the requirements of the brief by providing benefits to cyclists and pedestrians. The proposals as presented would provide the next phase of improvement on the yellow Pedalway and will improve connectivity to the city centre from the north of the outer ring road.

Resource Implications

- 29. Finance: The TfN programme forms an integral part of strategic infrastructure as set out in the Joint Core Strategy. The delivery of this work is funded by government grants by way of the City Cycle Ambition programme and Section 106 funding.
- 30. Staff: The project will be delivered through joint team working involving both County Council and City Council officers.
- 31. Property: The proposals cannot be provided within the existing highway boundary. Adjacent land is owned by Norwich City Council and strips of this will be acquired as highway in order to provide the shared use facilities.
- 32. IT: None.

Other implications

- 33. Legal Implications: None
- 34. Human Rights: None.
- 35. Communications: The Communications Project Manager for Transport for Norwich schemes will manage publicity and enquiries.

Section 17 - Crime and Disorder Act

36. The scheme will be designed to ensure it has a positive effect on crime and disorder where possible. Particular consideration will be given to the link between Mile Cross Lane and Blackthorn Close, to ensure that lighting levels are adequate and foliage trimmed back where appropriate. Care will be taken during construction to minimise opportunities for crime and disorder, for instance the secure storage of construction equipment and materials.

Risk Implications/Assessment

- 37. A risk assessment has been undertaken for development of the NATS Implementation Plan (TfN). The key risks for delivering this are around funding, timescales and planning. These risks are being managed through active project management and ongoing engagement with stakeholders.
- 38. A risk register is being maintained as part of the technical design and construction delivery processes.



Source: Norwich City Council (2015)



Pedalways	Hub creation or upgrade
Cross City	
Cringleford ↔ Sprowston Superceeded section of pedalway Lakenham ↔ Airport Superceeded section of pedalway	Planned development sites (served by yellow and blue pedalways)
Drayton ↔ Whitlingham (National Cycle Route 1) Bowthorpe ↔ Broadland Business Park N&N Hospital ↔ Heartsease	Proposed monitoring location (on routes to be upgraded)
Outer circuit Inner circuit	 Doctors surgeries (extra cycle parking) Schools (extra cycle parking)
Neighbourhood routes	Potential project area

Transport for Norwich Programme meeting 4th October 2016 PEA003 – Mile Cross Lane to Fiddlewood (Yellow Pedalway Project 8)

SCHEME AREA



BRIEF

Catton Grove Road – Mile Cross Lane – footpath link through to Blackthorn Close and Fiddlewood forms part of the yellow Pedalway. The brief details a junction CLoS score of 4/24, a score of 41/70 on Mile Cross Lane, the potential for left hook accidents in all 4 directions and lack of protection for cyclists. The objective is to provide a link achieving a CLoS score of at least 70/100.

- A1042 Mile Cross Lane forms part of the outer ring road subject to a 40mph speed limit
- Currently 10m wide
- 2B Principal Primary Route & abnormal loads route
- Traffic sensitive band 7 (0730-1900 Mon-Sat and 1000-1700 Sun all year)
- 7 'slight' accidents in last 5 years (1 involving a cyclist)

A pedestrian and cycle survey carried out in June 2015 0700-1900 records a maximum peak hour cycle flow of 25 (this includes those using part of the route, e.g. joining the route heading in a south-easterly direction from Mile Cross). Peak hour pedestrian flow was recorded as 56 (at the Blackthorn Close to Mile Cross Lane footpath). Both flows fall into the 'very low' London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS) flow category.

ENVIRONMENT

To the north of Mile Cross Lane there is a 1.8m wide footway with a wide verge behind which is land owned by Norwich CC. There are some trees located in a bank behind this. Vodafone and BT apparatus are located in this area.

To the south of Mile Cross Lane are residential properties, most with driveways. There is an existing parking bay and 3 London Plane trees which are to be retained. There is a considerable level difference between the carriageway edge and the footway (lower), between which there is a verge. BT, water/foul, LP gas, LV and HV electricity and Virgin Media are located in this area.

OPTIONS

- 1 light segregated lane south side of Mile Cross Lane, 2-way (but could be 1 way). Upgrade puffin, link into Catton Grove Rd.
- 2 Provide shared use facility on north side of Mile Cross Lane by widening the existing footway to the back. Upgrade junction to allow cyclists to use crossing from Catton Grove Road.
- **3** As option 2 but with removal of left slip to St Faiths Lane to create a 2-stage (instead of 3-stage) crossing.

DESIGN GUIDANCE FOR OFF-CARRIAGEWAY ROUTES

LCDS Flow categories for partially separated and shared routes (off-road)

Peak flow	Pedestrians	Cyclists	Recommended effective width	
categories	per hour	per hour		
			Shared	Partially separated
Very low	0-120	0-60	2.2m	3.0m (cycle track 1.2m-1.5m)
Low	120-200	60-150		
Medium	200-450	150-300	3.0m	4.5m (cycle track 2.5m-2.8m)
High	450-900	300-450		
Very high	900+	450+	4.5m	5.9m (cycle track 2.5m to 3.5m)

SUSTRANS recommended minimum widths, unsegregated shared use

Urban traffic free	3.0m on main & secondary cycle routes. 4.0m preferred &
	consider segregation where high usage is expected
	(>150/hr)/demand to ride 2 abreast
Urban	3.0m on all main cycle routes, major access paths & school links
fringe/semi-rural traffic free	2.5m possible on lesser secondary cycle routes & access links
Rural traffic free	2.5m on all main routes, major access paths & school links
	2.0m possible on lesser routes and links

Min acceptable verge 0.5m; 1.0m preferred

DESIGN GUIDANCE FOR ON-CARRIAGEWAY ROUTES

LCDS peak hour flow categories:

	1-way lane/track	2-way track
Very low	<100	<100
Low	100-200	100-300
Medium	200-800	300-1000
High	800-1200	1000-1500
Very high	1200+	1500+

LCDS Summary of guidance on widths on carriageway for cycle tracks (including segregated lanes):

Flow	1-way	2-way
Very low / low	1.5m	2.0m
Medium flow	2.2m	3.0m
High / very high	2.5m+	4.0m+

SUSTRANS

- Motor vehicle speeds much above 40mph become unsuitable for cycling on the carriageway
- Light segregation (intermittent islands/armadillos or similar) are suitable on roads with a speed limit of 30mph or less 'at higher speeds segregation should be more substantial'
- 1-way tracks should be a minimum width of 2.0m (or 1.5m & 0.5m margin) where speed limit is 40mph (also as in LTN 2/08)
- 2-way tracks should be a minimum of 3.0m in most situations
- Hybrid (stepped) tracks should be minimum 3.0m width for 2-way use
- Suggest a minimum 1.0m segregating kerbed strip where speed limit is >40mph

LTN 2/08 states that 2-way cycle lanes are generally not recommended – they can be confusing to motorists, including those exiting side roads (or driveways). The note says cyclists should be separated from traffic lanes by means such as a kerb.

OPTIONS ASSESSMENT – MAIN PROS AND CONS

Option	Pros	Cons		
1	Cyclists use upgraded single-stage toucan crossing	13 accesses / 150m length – any segregation will be intermittent – design		
(south	instead of multi-stage crossing at junction - reduced	guidance suggests it should be substantial at 40mph		
side)	wait times	Sustrans guidance – 3m wide 2-way / 1m segregation strip unachievable		
,		Question suitability of facility on 40mph busy route, particularly in relation to 2-		
	Civils work to main signalised junction not required	way proposal, particularly for vulnerable users		
		Carriageway level higher than footway / many adjacent accesses / retention of		
		London Plane trees / parking bay means that the facility will claim carriageway		
		space – is the impact on the network acceptable to NCC and to stakeholders?		
		May not achieve public/stakeholder support in light of perceived suitable		
		alternative option on north side		
		Potential conflict due to vehicular accesses		
		Likely increased overall cost & design time		
		TRO required for mandatory cycle lane		
		Length of lane is short – benefit is not maximised		
		Complex design due to level differences, including drainage		
2 (north	Plenty of space – design guidance achievable	Requires acquisition of City Land (paper trail required)		
side)	Fewer utilities			
	Less complex to design and build	Cyclist wait times greater due to 2 (or 3) stage crossing as opposed to single		
	Reduced construction time / disruption to the network	stage using upgraded crossing on Mile Cross Lane		
	More likely to achieve stakeholder approval?			
	Less likely to receive resident objections?	Work to signalised junction required		
	More suitable for all user groups inc. vulnerable			
	Less expensive			
	Less chance of vehicle/cyclist conflict due to no			
	vehicular accesses			
	Suggest 'greener' route may be more pleasant			
	Improved crossing facilities for cyclists at the junction			
	will benefit cyclists heading north/south			
	I rattic capacity is not reduced			
Option 3 is as option 2 but with the removal of the left slip from Mile Cross Lane to Catton Grove Road. A turning count and modelling will				
determin	e what the reduction in wait time would be and a judgeme	ent on cost/benefit to be made		



	1	(INITIALS	DATE	DRAWING No. PEA003-TIN-006 PROJECT TITLE A1042/18 Norwich: Mile Cross Lane Cycling Improvements)		
_		SURVEYED BY	OS	2016			-		
		DESIGNED BY	AJC	09/16			A1042/18 Norwich:		
_		DRAWN BY	AJC	09/16			_		
)		CHECKED BY	LO	10/16	1:1000	PEA003	J		
-			-						



Local Enterprise Partnership for Norfolk and Suffolk Norwich NR1 2SG

for Transport

FIDDLE WOOD ROAD

-Widen path adjacent to trees and steep bank where possible

Remove railings. Consider installation of single central bollard

Widen existing footpaths to 2.75m to create shared use areas

MILE CROSS LANE

Existing footway widened into verge and converted to a 3.0m wide shared use facility

 \square

ST FAITH'S I

ROAD

Area to be landscaped. Design to investigate whether existing 2.25m facility can be widened under tree canopy

DRAWING TITLE

A1042/18 Norwich: Mile Cross Lane Cycling Improvements Prelimiminary Engineering Layout

REV.	DESCRIPTION	CHECKED

BRIGHTMELL ROAD



Report to	Norwich highways agency committee
	24 November 2016
Report of	Head of city development services
Subject	Review of Permit parking and pricing

Purpose

To note the effectiveness of the new permit parking scheme, and to review the current pricing structure to ensure that the scheme is self-financing.

Recommendation

Members are recommended to:

- (1) note the report;
- (2) agree changes to the prices of permits and dispensation vouchers to have the following effects
 - (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.

Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to meet the corporate priority to provide a safe, clean and low carbon city and the service plan priority of implementation of the Transport for Norwich strategy.

Financial implications

The review will help to fund existing shortfall, and maintenance, improvement and extensions of existing Controlled parking Zones

Ward/s: Multiple Wards

Cabinet member: Councillor Bremner – Environment and sustainable development

ltem

Contact officers:

Bruce Bentley, Principal transportation planner bruce.bentley@norwich.gov.uk

01603 212445

Background documents

None

Background

- Currently, the city council operates and enforces controlled parking zones (CPZs) throughout the city centre, the inner suburbs of the city and around the University These permit schemes operate either 24 hours a day seven days a week in and around the city centre, whilst the more suburban ones operate between 8am and 6:30pm. Some parts of the 'University' scheme only operate between 10.00am and 4pm
- 2. All issuing of permits and enforcement is undertaken 'in house'
- 3. From June 2015, the new permit scheme became fully implemented. These involved significant changes to the business permit scheme requiring that all long-stay permits were only vehicle specific. Two-hour permits are available for customers, or for those businesses and organisations who made multiple visits throughout the permit areas. Dispensations are issued to contractors who need to park in the controlled zones. This system has not been changed. All business permits in use now operate under the new arrangements
- 4. Arrangements for resident's permits were unchanged; except that households in the outer areas of the city now have a permit entitlement of two permits (previously there was no limit). City centre residents have only ever had an entitlement to one permit. As this limit was introduced in March 2015, all households are now subject to this limit.
- 5. The visitor permit system was substantially overhauled, with the old style 'any vehicle - any length of time permit' being replaced with a four hour permit, and up to sixty 'day' permits. Residents can choose either or both permit types. As the permits were issued from June 2015, and the maximum length of any permit is 18 months, very few of these old style permits remain in circulation, and all will have expired by the end of the year.
- 6. The price of parking permits has not been reviewed since November 2012 at which time the eligibility for free permits was changed to ensure that only those in financial need could obtain a free parking permit, and then only for visitors. Parking dispensation charges have not been reviewed for many years.
- 7. It has always been the stated intention that the permit parking scheme covers its full operational costs.

Implementation of the New Scheme

8. Officers have been pleased with the relatively smooth transfer from the old to the new permit arrangements. Whilst there have inevitably been complaints (almost all about the new visitor scheme), there have also been letters from residents saying how pleased they are that the new system has reduced permit abuse, and helped to keep parking spaces available for genuine users. This is primarily down to the changes to the visitor permit scheme, although changes to the business scheme have also had an impact. Fourteen thousand (14,000) 'four-hour' visitor permits have been issued to residents over the past year. The number of complaints cannot be ascertained, as this would require us to re-read every letter about parking to determine which were relevant. However, the number is certainly a very small proportion of the households that are now on the new arrangements.

9. This effect has also been confirmed by the civil enforcement officers (CEOs) who have noted an increase in available permit parking places across the city, and a significant reduction in abuse. In the first six months of 2014, almost 100 full investigations into abuse were commenced by the CEOs. In the first six month of this year, that reduced to 37, and almost all of these were for the 'old style' permits. It is therefore expected that this very time consuming and costly exercise will reduce still further as these permits finally expire.

Financial Background

- 10. Prior to the commencement review of the permit parking scheme in 2012, the permit parking scheme was heavily subsidised from other revenue sources. As a result of implementing changes to the system since then, the shortfall has gradually reduced and in 2014/15 the scheme covered its immediate operating costs (the cost of issuing permits, and the cost of enforcement) for the first time. As all the changes that were agreed as part of the permit review have now been implemented, and have been in place for almost all the last financial year, projected income for this year is unlikely to change
- 11. However, there are several other costs associated with operating and managing the permit parking areas that have not been covered, and these include updates and replacement of the computer systems that we use, the maintenance of the signs and lines associated with the permit scheme, and alterations and extensions to the permit parking areas which a regularly requested by residents, and for which we rarely have any resources to progress.
- 12. There is an expectation that the computer systems will be upgraded to allow direct on-line permit issuing, but currently this project is not progressing. However, there are is a significant level of outstanding signage and lining replacement that needs to be done, that we have been unable to undertake due to financial constraints. The estimated cost of this work is £50000. We are also committed to amendments and extensions to a number of the permit parking areas. Proposals for the Salisbury Road area and the College Road area are currently being progressed, and there is a commitment to extend permit parking around the University and into Lakenham where a review the operational hours of adjacent zones is also anticipated. Although the costs of these have yet to be established, as we do not know the extent of the changes until after we have consulted. The current schemes are estimated at £40,000, but the schemes in Lakenham and West Earlham are likely to be significantly more expensive, as the areas are much larger. In addition, officers are aware that there are a number of other areas around the city where local members are seeing a demand for permit parking. Consequently, there is likely to be several years of work on maintenance improvement and extension of the permit parking scheme.

Recommended changes to permit parking charges

13. In 2014-15 income from permit parking scheme exceeded its day to day operating costs by £73,000. Whilst this is a positive step, this is still insufficient to cover the necessary renewal of signs and lines throughout the permit parking areas, the necessary upgrading of our systems to allow full on-line service for permit applications, or the requests for amendments and extensions to the existing permit schemes (We are already committed to work in Lakenham and West Earlham and are

currently progressing requests in the College Road and Salisbury Road areas). The cost of implementing the current schemes has never been recovered.

- 14. Except for the 'One-Day' scratchcards, all the permits on offer have their price based on a standard permit charge (currently £10) and a monthly parking charge. The permit charge is levied on every transaction that involves issuing a new permit, and is also the minimum charge for the scratchcards. As one of the standard fixed costs per permit is the software and necessary upgrades, the appropriate way to fund cost here is through a revision of the permit charge. It is therefore recommended that the permit charge is increased to £12 which also becomes the minimum transaction fee.
- 15. Increases to the monthly parking charges are also recommended. This element of the permit charge covers on-street enforcement, maintenance and review of the schemes. Proposed charges are as follows:-

Permit type	Current monthly parking charge	Proposed monthly parking charge
Resident Short vehicle, Blue Badge Holder and 4-hour Visitor permit	75p	80p
Resident Medium Vehicle	£1.75	£1.85
Resident Long vehicle	£3.00	£3.20
Resident 1 day scratchcards (City Centre)	£1 (single day charge)	£1.20 (minimum purchase £12 - 10 cards)
Resident 1 day scratchcards (Outer Area)	£1 (single day charge)	60p (Minimum purchase £12 – 20 cards
Business (vehicle specific) and Single Zone 2-hour	£10	£10.50
Business 2-hour All Zones	£15	£15.50
Business 2-hour All Zones (Registered Charities)	£1.75	£1.85

16. The effect of these proposed changes for an annual permit is detailed below, however, all permits can be issued in periods form one month upwards in whole months, some for a maximum period of 12 months, and some for a maximum of 18 months. If approved it is anticipated that the new charges will commence in April 2017. This will be the first substantive price rise for permits in four years.

Permit type	Current charge for a 12 month permit	Proposed charge
Resident Short vehicle, Blue Badge Holder and 4-	£19.00	£21.60

hour Visitor permit		
Resident Medium Vehicle	£31.00	£34.20
Resident Long vehicle	£46.00	£50.40
Business (vehicle specific) and Single Zone 2-hour	£130	£138
Business 2-hour All Zones	£190	£196
Business 2-hour All Zones (Registered Charities	£31	£34.20

Recommended changes to Dispensation charges

- 17. The dispensation scheme (the scheme that allows contractors to keep their vehicles on-street, and even in the city centre pedestrian areas has not even covered its operating costs. In 2014-15 the scheme cost twice as much to administer and enforce than we received in income, requiring a subsidy from other revenue sources of almost £90,000
- 18. Dispensations are currently sold in sheets of five for £20, making a full days parking just £4. Dispensation charges should be set to minimise the amount of on-street parking that takes place, particularly in the city centre and should consequently be at least on par with typical car park charges to ensure that only vehicles that are really needed close to the site are parked there, and parking in a car park is otherwise preferential. A table of car park charges is contained in Appendix 1
- 19. Apart from the more peripheral surface car parks, the cheapest central car parks cost £5.90 per day with charges of between £8 and £12 being common. Income from dispensations needs to double in order to cover current costs. It is therefore recommended that the price of a 'book' of dispensation vouchers should increase in price to £42.50, representing a daily charge of £8.50
- 20. However, as we only issue dispensations in books of 5 that does mean that the minimum spend will increase from £20 to £42.50. This is justifiable for those contractors who regularly use dispensations, and are therefore likely to use a book well within the valid period (every dispensation is valid for one year from the date of purchase), but less so for a small contractor who only rarely has jobs in the CPZs and only needs to be there for a few days. Consequently, it is recommended that a dispensation permit is introduced, valid for between one and four days to ensure that no-one is required to purchase additional permits which are unlikely to be of use to them. There would be the minimum permit charge for the first day (£12) with 2 days costing the equivalent of two dispensations (and pro-rata up to four days). Unlike the dispensations (which are validated by the user as needed) these dispensation permits would be issued for the required dates.

Issues in the Outer areas of the City

- 21. Although difficult to quantify (as dispensations can be used in any CPZ), the anecdotal evidence is that most dispensations are actually used within the city centre.
- 22. Any residential property under renovation can be issued with a long term permit for contractors vehicles for a period of up to six months, and in reality, many residents offer the use of their visitor permit to contractors who are only there for short periods and consequently it is often not necessary for contractors to residential properties to need to use dispensations at all. The impact of the recommended changes in the outer areas of the city is therefore likely to be relatively low, and residents do have options available to them that are not available in the heart of the city, where reducing the number of contractors vehicles to the practical minimum is essential

Conclusion

23. Substantive changes to the charges for parking permits were last agreed in 2012, and implemented in spring the following year, and these proposed charges would come into effect some four years later. Charges for permits are expected to cover the full costs of operating, maintaining and altering the permit parking schemes, and although the situation has improved significantly since the last review (when the scheme had to be heavily supported from other income streams) there is still some way to go to fully recover costs, particularly in respect to the dispensations. The recommended increases should ensure that both the permit parking schemes and the dispensation scheme fully cover their operational costs. In the event that any surplus is made, this will be used to support other transport projects.

Appendix 1:	Costs for	off-street c	ar parking
-------------	-----------	--------------	------------

Norwich Comp	parators	Spaces		М	on to Sa	turday 0	500 to 18	30	
Car Park	Operator		1 hr	2 hrs	3 hrs	4 hrs	5 hrs	6 hrs	Eve.
Botolph Street	Regional Car Parks	160	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	n/a
Anglia Square MSCP	Anglia Square/R CP	Closed							
Anglia Square surface	RCP	138	1.20	2.40	3.60	4.80	5.50	5.50	n/a
Riverside MSCP (rail users £6 up to 24hrs)	X-Leisure (National Express)	738	2.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	20.00	n/a
St Stephens MSCP * If arrive before 9.30am.	NCP	260	2.60	4.10	6.30 *	6.30 *	6.30 *	6.30*	n/a
Castle Mall MSCP	Mall Corporati on	800	1.20	2.30	3.50	4.70	8.00	12.00	1.50
John Lewis mscp (non-shoppers in brackets)	John Lewis	650	1.00 (1.50)	2.00 (3.00)	3.00 (4.50)	4.00 (6.00)	6.50 (8.00)	10.00 (12.50)	n/a
Forum	Mill Co	204	1.80	3.60	5.40	7.20	9.00	10.80	1.80
Chapelfield	Intu	1000	1.30	2.60	3.90	5.20	8.00	8.00	2.50 from 3pm
NCC Short stay	Norwich CC	647	1.80	3.60	5.40	7.20	8.50	15.00	1.80
NCC Medium stay	Norwich CC	1016	1.30 to 1.40	2.60 to 2.80	3.90 to 4.80	4.40 to 5.90	4.40 to 5.90	4.40 to 5.90	1.80
NCC Long stay	Norwich CC	74	1.20	2.40	3.60	4.40	4.40	4.40	1.80
NCC St Andrews MSCP	Norwich CC	1084	1.70	3.40	5.10	5.90	5.90	5.90	1.80

Report to	Norwich highways agency committee
	24 November 2016
Report of	Head of city development services
Subject	Major road works – regular monitoring

ltem

15

Purpose

This report advises and updates members of current and planned future roadworks in Norwich.

Recommendation

To note the report.

Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to achieve the corporate priorities of a strong and prosperous city and the service plan priority to coordinate programmes to achieve best value.

Financial implications

There are no direct financial consequences from this report

Ward/s: All wards

Cabinet member: Councillor Bremner – environment and sustainable development

Contact officers

Joanne Deverick, Transportation & network manager joannedeverick@norwich.gov.uk	01603 212461
Ted Leggett, City network co-ordinator ted.leggett@norwich.gov.uk	01603 212073

Background documents

None

Report

Background

- 1. Roadworks are a source of frustration and inconvenience to road users but they are an essential operation and need to be managed carefully to minimise their impact on the travelling public.
- 2. There are two main originators of roadworks: The Highway Authority and public utility companies. Norfolk County Council has a responsibility to improve and maintain the highway, while the public utility companies have a responsibility to provide and maintain their infrastructure, the vast majority of which is located under the highway. From time to time developers are also required to work in the highway, carrying out improvements to facilitate access to their developments.
- 3. The table attached as appendix 1 sets out the current works that have been completed since your last meeting, are currently in progress or are planned for the future on the A, B and C class roads within the city. More detailed roadworks information is provided online via the electronic local government information network at <u>https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/roads/roadworks</u>
- 4. The more significant works are highlighted below.

Golden Ball Street Scheme

5. Works have now ceased until the end of the Christmas embargo in January. The outstanding section of works to All Saints Green and All Saints Street will commence in early January and is currently programmed to run until June. The redevelopment of the Mecca Bingo site on All Saints Green has been programmed to also commence early January to lessen the impact to the network

Transport for Norwich programme

6. Works continue on the programme after the Christmas embargo, details of the upcoming major schemes are listed overleaf. There are a range of small scale cycle parking projects at hub sites around the city commencing in January

Anglia Water

7. Anglia Water is due to commence on a large scale drainage project in the north-east of the city. The works will involve the closure of Plumstead Road East and Aerodrome Road from 16 January to 10 March 2017 and some associated closures of a number of residential streets to the north of Plumstead Road East

Works in progress

Location	Lead Authority	Type of scheme	Traffic management	Due for completion	Remarks
					Due to the Christmas embargo there are currently no major works taking place within the city

Works completed since last report

Location	Lead Authority	Type of scheme	Traffic management	Due for completion	Remarks
Cattlemarket Street	County	Remedial works to traffic island	Closure of Cattlemarket Street northbound	completed	
Ber Street/ Finkelgate/ Queens Road	County	Junction remodelling at either end of Finkelgate	Closures in various places	completed	
St. Clements Hill/Magdalen Road/ Constitution Hill	City	Junction remodelling, installation of speed cushions and	Closures	completed	

Planned future works

Location	Lead Authority	Type of scheme	Traffic management	Anticipated dates	Remarks
Newmarket Road	County	County Transport for Norwich	Lane Closures with associated side road	January to June 2017	Phase one: Unthank Road to Daniels Road
			closures		Phase two: Daniels Road to Brunswick Road
Chartwell Road/St.	County	Transport for Norwich	2-way lights on Chartwell Road.	January to March 2017	To be programmed along with Constitution Hill scheme below
Clements Hill			Closure of St. Clements Hill & Spixworth Road	(exact dates tbc)	
Constitution Hill	City	City Footway reconstruction scheme	econstruction 5 weeks of traffic lights, one week of closures	January to March 2017	To be programmed along with Chartwell Road scheme above
				(exact dates tbc)	
All Saints Green	City	Transport for Norwich	Permanent Closure	January 2017 to April 2017	In conjunction with Mecca Bingo construction site
Earlham Green Lane/ Bowthorpe Road	City	Local safety Scheme	5 weeks of traffic lights, one week of closures	9 January 2017 to 19 February 2017	

Location	Lead Authority	Type of scheme	Traffic management	Anticipated dates	Remarks
Plumstead Road East/ Aerodrome Road and associated side streets	Anglia Water	Local drainage scheme	Road closures and rolling road closures	16 January 2017 to 5 May 2017	Major closures of Plumstead Road East and Aerodrome Road to take place between 16 January 2017 and 10 March 2017