



MINUTES

NORWICH HIGHWAYS AGENCY COMMITTEE

10am to 12.20pm

28 November 2013

Present:	County Councillors:	City Councillors:
	Adams (chair) (V)	Stonard (vice chair) (V)
	Bremner (substitute (V) in the absence of Councillor Harrison)	Harris (V)
	Shaw	Carlo
		Gayton
		Grahame

*(V) voting member

Apologies: County Councillors Harrison and Hebborn

1. PETITIONS

Petition 1 – The Avenues and Avenue Road

Ms Kate Read, College Road, Norwich, presented the following:

“Traffic along The Avenues and Avenue Road has increased enormously in the last 15 years since the UEA has expanded and increased vehicular access to the Bluebell Road entrance. The speed limit is 20mph but cars often drive a lot faster. The provision of a crossing should be targeted at the needs of those who experience the most difficulty and danger. A zebra crossing here is essential in order to allow safe access and flow of pedestrians to Heigham Park as well as Recreation Road, Parkside, The Avenues, St Thomas Moore Schools and Peapod Pre-School. The current raised hump is ambiguous, confusing and unsafe for young children and partially sighted pedestrians. There are no other pedestrian crossings along the Avenues/Avenue Road until Colman Road. The DfT states that local authorities and planners should provide facilities which enable disabled people to cross the road safely. This includes the provision of pedestrian crossings. I include a letter from a partially sighted and deaf resident who crosses the road on a daily basis with her two young children.

I would like to propose a zebra crossing at the junction of The Avenues and Recreation Road beside Heigham Park. I have collected in excess of 205 signatures of residents who support this crossing, photographs, comments, a letter from a partially sighted resident and the KSI (killed or seriously injured) list for the area. The Avenues is an important component of the Pink Pedalways Cycle Scheme and so I hope that the Norwich Highways Agency

committee will seriously consider and vote in favour of this crossing as an important safety measure.”

The transportation and network manager, Norwich City Council, responded on behalf of the committee:

“As Ms Read has said, this area is on the Pink pedalway, which is the major cycling project that we have recently started using the £3.7M Cycle City Ambition grant funding from the Department for Transport and £1.5M of local contributions.

I know a number of members of this committee came to the Pink pedalway consultation event that was held in Blackfriars Hall on Tuesday. The purpose of the event was to highlight the project and get feedback from both the public and stakeholders about what the issues are for cyclists (and pedestrians) along the entire route and to make suggestions on what on what improvements they would like to see. I know there was significant interest in The Avenues section of the route at the event and we received valuable feedback that is currently being analysed.

Alongside the consultation event we have undertaken extensive traffic surveys in The Avenues area to establish the current volume and speed of vehicles, with a focus on trying to establish the proportion of traffic that it is using the road as a through route, rather than an access route.

All the information that has been gathered will be passed to the design team for The Avenues project so that they can draw up improvement proposals. I will of course ensure that they also receive all the information that Ms Read has gathered.

It would be premature for me to prejudge the solution that the design team may propose and there it would not be appropriate to make any promises at this meeting. However I can assure both Ms Read and members that whatever the proposals are, they will come before this committee for approval in principal before there is full public consultation, the results of which will be determined by committee.

I have asked for Ms Read’s details to be added to the pink pedalway stakeholder list so that she is kept fully informed of developments.”

Ms Read addressed the committee and said that 260 people had signed the petition and reiterated her request for a zebra crossing and pointed out that the current raised hump was ambiguous and confusing. She referred to the Pink pedalway and said that the crossing would need to accommodate both cyclists and pedestrians safely, particularly for people who had visual or hearing impairments. She said that she had been really worried that there had been a near miss when a car had stopped suddenly and a cyclist nearly collided with two unaccompanied children, aged nine or ten.

Petition 2 - St Stephens Street

Mr Frederick Agombar, Sightseeing Tour of Olde Norwich, presented the following petition:

“At the meeting of the Norwich Highways Agency committee on 21 March 2013, which approved road improvement schemes to speed up bus routes: the chairman, Mr Adams, wanted to make changes to St Stephens Street a separate issue from the disputed two way bus lane of Chapelfield North. It was not allowed.

I am asking if the change of St Stephens Street to buses, taxis and cycles only could go ahead as an urgent road safety issue. It is not connected with the Chapelfield North scheme in any way whatsoever. A large number of vehicles using St Stephens Street into Norwich take the prohibited no left turn into Rampant Horse Street which means they drive over the pelican crossing between Marks & Spencers and Debenhams which is green at that time for pedestrians to cross over. The scheme only needs two no entry signs (except buses, taxis and cycles) at the roundabout on the inner ring road. Nil infrastructure costs. Going out of Norwich along St Stephens there is very little general traffic and no safety issues and could stay the same as now. The Chapelfield North scheme has become bogged down in a legal dispute at the high court and is delaying all the other changes. The junction of St Stephens Street, Westlegate, Red Lion Street and Rampant Horse Street has been identified as the most dangerous in Norwich for pedestrians and cyclists.”

The transportation and network manager, Norwich City Council, responded on behalf of the committee:

“I am unclear as to who has identified this junction as the most dangerous in Norwich for pedestrians and cyclists; it is not a label that has been applied by either council and the accident records do not support this assertion.

The closure of St Stephens Street to general traffic and making Chapel Field North two way for buses and access cannot be separated. If the Stephens Street scheme went ahead before the Chapel Field North scheme, Westlegate would see an unacceptable increase in traffic.

However this is not the primary issue. Mr Agombar refers to a legal challenge. This challenge is not solely against the Chapel Field North scheme. There has been an application for judicial review against a number of decisions taken by this committee in November 2012 and March 2013. These relate not only to Chapel Field North but also to the removal of general traffic from St Stephens Street, the introduction of the Grapes Hill bus lane and all other works that are directly consequential on those schemes.

An initial ruling by a judge has said that the grounds for the judicial review are inarguable; however the claimant has exercised his right to request an oral hearing to determine whether permission should in fact be granted. If permission is granted then the claims will proceed to a substantive hearing.

The oral hearing is due to take place in February and the councils await the court's decision before acting further on the proposals."

Mr Agombar by way of a supplementary question said that he considered the junction to be very dangerous. He had surveyed local retailers and the majority of those surveyed supported the removal of general traffic from St Stephens Street to reduce the risk of accidents which was also his major concern.

The transportation and network manager said that it was worth noting that the committee had agreed to the removal of general traffic from St Stephens Street and unfortunately had not yet been able to implement it because of the legal challenge.

2. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The chair said that questions had been received from members of the public and a city councillor about issues relating to items on the agenda. Therefore questions would be taken at the start of the appropriate item.

The chair said that he had received a letter from Chloe Smith, Member of Parliament for Norwich North, requesting improvements to Heartsease roundabout and that he and the vice chair had agreed the following response:

"The Norwich Highways Agency committee is aware of the issues at the Heartsease roundabout and the desire to see improvements to pedestrian crossing facilities in the vicinity. It is one of the highest priorities we have for new pedestrian crossing facilities.

However the roundabout is already very congested and was never designed to take the volume and size of vehicles that now use it. There have been a number of studies in the last fifteen years looking at ways that the roundabout could be improved, both for pedestrians and traffic. However the extent of the highway is very constrained and to make any improvements additional land is required. This would be expensive to achieve and would have a detrimental effect on nearby residents and businesses. The most recent estimate suggested that any scheme would be in excess of £3m. The Norwich Highways Agency committee simply does not have that level of funding available to it. For example, for the current year, there is £380k available for all highway improvement schemes in the city.

Consideration has been given to providing relatively low cost crossings on the approaches to the roundabout. However we have the dilemma that if we put them close to the roundabout where the pedestrian desire line is it would add greatly to the congestion at the roundabout and in all likelihood would lead to an increase in rat running on the surrounding residential roads. If we put them in a position where they will not interfere with the roundabout they will be away from the pedestrian desire line and they won't be used. A comprehensive solution addressing both the crossing and congestion issues is the only viable solution.

In conclusion, Norwich Highways Agency committee is not in a position to carry out improvements to the Heartsease roundabout despite it being a high priority as it does not have the funding available to meet the costs of an

effective scheme. This is a direct consequence of the Coalition Government's reduction in its capital and revenue support grant to Norfolk County Council over the last three years and over the next three years. The county council will have to make £329 million in savings. In addition, PFI credits, which would have been worth another £169 million over the next twenty five years, have also been withdrawn. This too will result in additional savings having to be made over and above those already planned. As a result of the reduction in the capital grant the county council has already prioritised maintenance of the existing assets, consequently across the whole county there is only £2m per year available for improvements. Therefore it is difficult to ensure that schemes are brought forward to meet public demand."

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Bremner, Stonard, Harris, Gayton, Grahame and Carlo, all declared an other interest in that they lived in a controlled parking zone and/or used parking permits, including visitor permits.

4. MINUTES

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 19 September 2013, subject to item 2, Public/member questions, question 2, to record that Mrs Harrison had asked a supplementary question as follows: "How will you monitor the correct use of cycle paths" and to note that she remained concerned that some cyclists will still use footpaths to cross the Gardens.

5. REVIEW OF VISITOR PARKING PERMITS

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

The chair referred to a letter received from Mr Philip Morris, Victoria Street, Norwich, which was circulated at the meeting and reproduced below:

"I believe there are a number of important background issues relating to your consideration of this report

- any restriction on the ability to have visitors is an impact on residents' quality of life
- the scheme was originally introduced to protect residents not punish them
- we should be encouraging urban living not making life more unpleasant for residents
- why is there a need for a blanket approach? There is no significant problem parking in Victoria Street/Regina Road. Clearly other areas have problems but perhaps they should be offered the opportunity of a visitors' permit instead of a second residents' permit.
- any problem that there is results entirely from lack of enforcement. Permits are checked on a regular basis and I cannot see why electronic devices cannot capture a visitor pass number and the registration number of the vehicle – this would soon expose any abuse.

Indeed such information must already be collected as I was written to and challenged by the city council when my nephew used my visitor's permit over an extended period when house-sitting while I was away on holiday.

The report compares the current scheme in Norwich to a range of other locations. While interesting, this is not particularly enlightening as every town is different. The schemes are different, the areas covered are different and the nature of the problems to be resolved will be different.

The proposal takes no account of the way restrictions apply differently across the City. I live in Victoria Street where parking restrictions apply 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. This will mean that if I have a visitor for the weekend from Friday evening to Sunday lunchtime I will use 3 visitor scratch cards. Consequently the 10 ticket allowance will provide for me to have 1 visitor's car on for example 3 weekends and one additional evening over an entire year.

Alternatively, consecutive visits in one day, as might happen on a family occasion will use up a scratch card for each separate vehicle. So three consecutive visits of over two hours in a single day will use up 3 tickets. Although the scheme allows for an additional 40 passes this is at significant additional cost. A maximum of 50 passes allows for 50 visits per year which is equivalent to less than 1 visit per week. I estimate that I average somewhere between 3 and 5 visitors of over 2 hours per week or around 150 to 250 per year. If you stop and think about it, this is not exceptional. Currently, there is no restriction on the number of occasions a visitor can park, plus additional day tickets can be purchased for special occasions such as a family party. I am happily in the position of having a large family including 2 grown up sons and a number of good friends but the majority do not live within walking distance and most can only visit by car – how are family and friends supposed to visit with this extreme rationing of passes? The proposed "2 hour" pass make no difference to these examples.

As far as I can see the proposal has not been subject to a sustainability appraisal or adequate equalities impact assessment. With regard to the former there may be an environmental benefit by reducing the number of trips visitors make but this should be weighed against environmental disbenefits with more residents encouraged to pave over their front gardens (I certainly will be forced to pursue this option). There will also be social impacts as described in this email. And of course fewer visitors will mean less spending in local shops, pubs, cafes and restaurants - it is rare for my visitors not to include a trip out to the city centre or to a local pub.

As regards equalities impact, the committee report pays lip service to the issue but no assessment is appended. Clearly such assessment that is included is inadequate as the proposal will unfairly impact on pensioners not in receipt of means-tested benefits, people who don't have off street parking (i.e. those who don't live in large houses), or those who have large families. I leave you to consider how this impacts differentially on different groups in society.

At the very least can I ask that the scheme to be consulted on is modified to:

- increase the number of tickets available as standard (with a consequent reduction in the price per ticket so the overall cost burden per household is not increased),
- continue to make special occasion tickets available, and
- at least partly balance the differential impact between day-time only restriction zones and full-time zones by allowing the “2 hour” pass to be used for evening and overnight visits in zones with all day, every day restrictions?”

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

“The report that is before you today has been developed over a period of time by members of the transportation team, taking account of a variety of issues that have been raised over a number of years. The purpose of it is to consult on the proposals within it. The comments made by Mr Morris will be considered as part of that consultation and responded to fully in the next report to committee on this issue. However it would not be appropriate to revise the consultations proposals at this late stage. Saying that, that is no reason at all while the proposals cannot be revised following the public consultation, which is the whole purpose of carrying out a consultation in the first place.”

Councillor Stonard referred to review of the parking permit scheme and the changes that the committee had already agreed to residential and non-residential permits, and said that the review of visitor permits was the third stage of this process. Since the publication of the report, there had been concerns raised by Mr Morris, letters in the press and from other councillors about the scope of the consultation and the options being proposed to amend the visitor permit parking arrangements. These concerns included the cost to residents; that the proposals did not differentiate between the inner and outer zones; that large families would be significantly disadvantaged and whether the comparisons with other authorities were valid. He said that, with so many questions having been raised, the committee should defer consideration of the report in order to ask officers to review the evidence base and proposals, so that the consultation could be on a broader range of options. Councillor Stonard moved and Councillor Harris seconded that the item be deferred for the reasons minuted above and to ask for a revised report to be considered at a future meeting.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to:

- (1) defer consideration of the review of visitor parking permits to a future meeting:
- (2) ask the head of city development services, Norwich City Council, to review the evidence base and proposals and revise the report to include a broader range of proposals for consultation.

6. CONTROLLED PARKING ZONES: MISCELLANEOUS WAITING RESTRICTIONS AMENDMENTS

Ms Rosemary Turner, Corton Road, Norwich, asked the following question:

“Is it possible to have Corton Road as a separate zone or a continuation of the Y zone? Corton Road is a small road but split into two zones. There wasn't much thought in putting our end as the Z zone as it has tagged us on with Bracondale. Our main problem is cars parking on Corton Road from people living at Bracondale as it is easier for them rather than negotiate their own parking area on the main road. It is so frustrating to look out of our kitchen window to see places we could park if we were Y zone! Some of us are shift workers and if you are not home by 5pm you don't stand an earth in parking anywhere near your house! Once, when there was no other space to park on our road we parked in the two hour space with our permit clearly visible, but were issued with a parking fine. It really is getting beyond the joke now. Removing the parking limits on the other side of the road probably would help but more people from Bracondale would just come and park there!”

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

“All controlled parking zones operate on an area wide basis; we do not operate single street schemes. The reason for this is two fold; single street schemes are complicated to sign and administer, and are far less flexible for residents who have no alternative parking provision should all the spaces in their street be taken.

Moving the whole of Corton Road into zone Y would require a change to the traffic regulation order, and changes to the positioning of the zone entry signs. I am aware that there is also pressure on the zone Y spaces so moving the zone boundary would not necessarily solve the problem.

The proposal we have in the report in front of you is to increase the number of zone Z spaces in Corton Road from the existing six or seven to around 20. I believe this will have significant benefits to all zone Z permit holders, including those in Corton Road and is the most appropriate solution for the wider area.”

Ms Turner explained that she was not asking for Corton Road to be a single street controlled parking zone (CPZ) but for all of the Corton Road to be included in zone Y because at the moment it was split between zones Y and Z. Zone Z was large and parking in Corton Road was attractive to people in Bracondale as it was close to the city and it was difficult for people living in Corton Road who were in zone Z, particularly shift workers, to find spaces in the day time.

Discussion ensued in which the transportation and network manager answered members' questions about the feasibility of including consultation on moving the boundaries of the two zones to accommodate this request. She suggested that the existing zone boundary be moved so that the new 45m bay would be in zone Z and convert the existing zone Z bay for use by zone Y residents. She also suggested that the properties in Corton Road currently in zone Z could be consulted and moved to zone Y. This would mean that all Corton Road properties could park within zone

Y, but there would still be a portion of Corton Road within zone Z. The chair considered that this was a good compromise and that the amendment of the boundary and consultation with the residents of the sixteen affected properties in Corton Road should go ahead. Members considered that should the boundary change be implemented, the committee would review the arrangement after a year.

A member commented that a small change to the CPZ arrangements could make all the difference to residents and said that she regretted that the sum available to the committee was only £20,000. The chair said that an increase to this budget was unrealistic in the current economic climate.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to authorise the head of city development services (Norwich City Council) to arrange for the necessary statutory procedures associated with: the amendments to waiting restrictions at the following locations and to make the corrections to traffic regulation order descriptions as detailed in paragraph 5

Location	Plan number
1. Corton Road	PL/TR/3329/737-1.1, subject to amending the controlled parking zone boundary to zones Z and Y in Corton Road, as minuted above.
2. Duke Street	PL/TR/3329/737-2
3. Gaol Hill	PL/TR/3329/737-9
4. Magdalen Close	PL/TR/3329/737-7
5. Magdalen Street	PL/TR/3329/737-8
6. Riverside (adj riverside path)	PL/TR/3329/737-10
7. Saunders Court	PL/TR/3329/737-3
8. Thorpe Road	PL/TR/3329/737-4
9. Waterloo Road	PL/TR/3329/737-5
10. Wessex Street	PL/TR/3329/737-6

7. REVIEW OF SPEED MANAGEMENT STRATEGY FOR NORFOLK

Councillor Lubbock, Eaton Ward, asked the following question:

“I would like to ask that this committee give consideration to requesting a specific speed management policy for Norwich. I believe that this report is a Norfolk report but does not reflect the aspirations that the people of Norwich and its Councillors have for their City and that is to have a 20 mph speed limit in all of its residential areas. Whilst not precluding the introduction of more 20 mph areas it does not recognise where we are now - the existence of many unconnected 20 mph zones within the city and the Push the Pedalways scheme which will see further 20 mph areas along the pedalway and the whole of the city centre within the Inner Ring Road to be 20 mph within 2 years.

We are almost there with a lower 20 speed limit across the city – we just need to join up this patchwork. I am sure both the police and the officers appreciate that the piecemeal arrangement of lower 20 limits we have at the moment does nothing to educate the motorist to understand why they should comply

with the limits. One of the council's corporate policies is for a safe and clean city – a 20 mph speed limit would deliver a cleaner environment, and a safer one. This has been demonstrated to the extent that many Local Authorities have adopted the policy resulting in 12 m people throughout the country living in a 20 mph area.

Our nearest city, Cambridge, is currently consulting with its residents and has committed £400,000 to a lower 20 mph in all its residential streets. Cambridge City Council is working with the county council and police to bring this about. An example to watch and learn from and I feel sure they would share their experiences with us.

One of the city's service plan priorities is to reduce casualties and encourage modal shift – 15 pedestrians were killed or seriously injured in Norwich in the last year (up to October this year) and 6 cyclists. I believe if we had slower speed limits throughout the city there would be an increase in both walking and cycling and a reduction in congestion outside schools with more children exercising. There is overwhelming evidence that lower speeds results in fewer collisions and less severe injuries.

I believe that a speed management policy should look wider than the aim we have here of just reducing casualties. A speed management policy for Norwich should:

- reflect the aspirations of those it affects
- contribute to a better, cleaner environment;
- encourage modal shift;
- contribute to the reduction in accidents;
- contribute to a healthier population.

I believe we need a more in depth look at Norwich and its accidents – the cost of road casualties is high and yet we see no costs included in this report. We need to know where the accidents are, when they take place and how much they cost. It could be that lower speed limits, coupled with an education programme and the buy in from the residents, are what is needed. I believe we have to get all agencies – city, county, police, emergency services and health authorities around the table to find a way to deliver lower speeds to meet the aspirations of those who live in Norwich.”

The team manager network management (analysis and safety), Norfolk County Council, presented the report and referred to the schedule of amendments set out in appendix A, said that the section on 20mph zones included updated guidance which supported local 20mph zones. The strategy was a policy led approach to speed management which prioritised casualty reduction. Proposals for individual speed management schemes would be considered by this committee and members could comment on the detail of locally appropriate schemes. The strategy embodied a flexible approach to speed management without raising unrealistic expectations. The updated strategy would be considered by the county council's cabinet for approval in January 2014.

Councillor Lubbock said that she considered that it was a speed management strategy for Norfolk rather than Norwich and that it did not reflect the aspirations of the city council to implement 20mph speed limit across the city. She also pointed out that the report lacked financial information and did not refer to the policy position of the police and other local authorities. In response the team manager network management (analysis and safety) said that the focus of the strategy was on the areas where speed management and casualty reduction were an issue, ie, the main radial routes such as Ketts Hill and Plumstead Road. He referred to other sources of funding such as the Cycle Ambition Grant (Push the pedalways) and said that consultation on these schemes could be a platform for supporting local traffic speed reduction schemes.

Councillor Stonard, the vice chair, referred to the city council's cross party support for a blanket 20mph speed limit in residential areas across the city and said that the administration supported this aspiration as a corporate priority for "a safe and clean city". However he pointed out that the current policy for a targeted approach had resulted in a 60% reduction in KSI casualties over the last ten years. Therefore a targeted approach to make the most of the limited resources available to the committee was the most efficient way to reduce KSIs.

During discussion some members considered that the strategy was reactive and needed to be more proactive to ensure that the city councils' aspirations were achieved. It was also pointed out that the strategy should be more closely aligned to match the period of the Joint core strategy. Members noted that speed limits were inconsistent on radial roads in the city. Unthank Road had speed limits of 30mph at each end and a stretch of 20mph near the shops. A blanket approach to 20mph in the city would be consistent for drivers. There was support however for the targeted approach and members welcomed the use of the Cycle Ambition Grant (Push the pedalways). Members also noted that the strategy applied for the county and therefore applied to other urban areas.

A member raised concerns about the recommendation contained in paragraph 2.35 proposing that the council should consider the use of average speed cameras as part of the speed management in urban areas, and said that some drivers would check their speedometer rather than concentrate on the road. Members noted that there would be a range of measures available within the framework of the strategy but not all of these would necessarily be implemented. The committee considered that this reference should be amended by replacing "should" with "could" in the recommendation.

The team manager network manager (analysis and safety) referred to the national guidance on 20mph zones and said that the government had left it to local authority highways authorities to implement. The strategy could be used proactively. The county council would work together with the city council so that it could progress its aspirations. He noted that the variance in speed limits on Unthank Road should be investigated.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to endorse the proposals in section 2, of the report to the ETD overview and scrutiny panel dated 26 September 2013, and appendix A for the review of speed management strategy in Norfolk and subsequent adoption of the strategy to support speed management in Norwich city, subject to recommendation

8) (paragraph 2.35) recommending that the word “should” is replaced with “could” so that it reads:

- 8) The council could consider the use of average speed cameras, supported by the police within the Norfolk Safety Camera Partnership, as a part of use of the full range of speed management measures in urban areas.

8. HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE PROGRAMMES FOR 2014-15

The vice chair introduced the report and said that each scheme had been objectively assessed and given a weighted score. The programme was reviewed on an annual basis. He pointed out that it was regrettable that Grove Road had been near the top of the list but been moved down due to other schemes coming forward with higher priority. This was difficult for members of the public to appreciate.

Discussion ensued. A member referred to the request for a pedestrian crossing at the Waterworks Road/Heigham Street junction and said that there were gaps in the light phasing which allowed pedestrians to cross safely. A member welcomed the provision of coach parking facilities to encourage tourism which was important to the city.

The transportation and network manager assured members that improvements to pedestrian crossings in Grove Road would be considered as part of the Yellow pedalway scheme.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) recommend to Norfolk County Council’s cabinet to allocate local transport plan funding to the following improvements schemes:

Type	Location	Estimate
Walking	St Augustine’s zebra crossing	£30,000
	Aylsham Road by Buxton Rd pedestrian refuge	£30,000
Cycling – All part of Push the Pedalways project	Magdalen Street contra flow	£100,000
	Earlham Road / Colman Road rbt improvements	£90,000
	Tombland & Palace Street	£25,000
	Heathgate to Valley Drive	£25,000
Traffic management	Chapelfield North	£50,000
	NATS design	£30,000
	HGV overrun strips	£20,000
	Minor works	£10,000
Public Transport	Identification of coach parking site	£25,000
	Bus stop infrastructure	£10,000

Type	Location	Estimate
Local safety schemes	To be advised	£tba
Total		£445,000

(2) note the capital maintenance programme as listed in appendix 4 of the report.

9. MAJOR ROAD WORKS – REGULAR MONITORING

In reply to a question, the transportation and network manager confirmed that the road works in Sprowston Road had been completed by the end of October 2013.

RESOLVED to note the report.

CHAIR