

Norwich Highways Agency committee

10:00 to 11:00

19 December 2019

Present:

<p>County Councillors: Adams (chair) (v)* Ward (acting (v) in the absence of Councillor Mackie) Clipsham</p>	<p>City Councillors: Stonard (vice chair) (v) Stutely (v) Carlo Maxwell Neale</p>
---	--

Apologies: County Councillors Mackie and Gurney

*(v) voting member

1. Public Questions/Petitions

Public questions

The chair announced that two questions had been received. The first had been considered at the city council's full council on 24 September 2019 and referred to the committee for a response.

Question 1

(The following question was considered at the city council's full council meeting on 24 September 2019 and referred to this committee.)

Q1: Earlham Road Parking

Mr Mark Winterburn asked chair the following question:

"In the spirit of trying to preserve as many car parking spaces as possible on Earlham Road around the Mitre pub, I would like to challenge the decision to create two short stay spaces outside the Mitre pub. Therefore my question is: would the council consider revoking the plan to offer short stay spaces outside the Mitre Pub?"

Even though it is apparently "standard" practice to offer two short stay spaces for businesses, in this situation, the Mitre does have its own car park which should

have had some influence on this decision. The church is getting some short stay spaces further up and so reversing the double yellows to accommodate. This means that Mitre will have its own car park and some short stays outside the church which should be more than adequate for the persons who use the Mitre. Officers have commented already that the short stays are not outside residential property but this does not take into account that actually they are opposite residential properties who currently are often able to use the space for parking due to having double yellows directly outside their own residential properties.

The council is also planning to put double yellows outside the gates of the Mitre Public House which will consume yet another space which will be a waste as the pub does not use the gate for vehicular access. Any deliveries or bin emptying or emergency services would park as far off the road as possible in front of the Mitre's car park. They would not park in front of the gates as it would be too narrow for them. The only outcome is the loss of a further space."

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

"Within a permit parking area there are always conflicting demands on the space available and in this particular area, there are a number of local businesses that would benefit from the provision of short stay parking in addition to the Mitre Public House. The short stay parking can also be used by residents' visitors without the need to display a permit.

This committee discussed this short section of short stay parking when it met in September as a local councillor raised the issue on behalf of local residents who wanted the spaces changed to permit parking. This committee agreed that the short stay parking should remain. The issue you now raise about the length of the yellow lines in this location was not raised at any point during the consultation.

The legal order to support the new permit scheme has now been made and signage is currently being installed across the new permit area. This includes the yellow lines on Earlham Road and the short stay spaces adjacent to the Mitre public house. It is not possible to make changes now without a further consultation and another legal order. I do not consider that this is a worthwhile exercise for a few metres of double yellow line. The permit scheme, including the short stay bay and the yellow lines (assuming we have been able to paint them as they are weather dependant) will go live in January."

As a supplementary question, Mr Winterburn said that he appreciated that it was not the council's responsibility to provide a car parking space for everyone, but asked that the council reassessed the parking provision at this bay to two short stay parking spaces and reserve the remaining four for residents permit parking spaces. In reply, the transportation and network manager (Norwich City Council) said that the legal process for changes to traffic regulation orders was lengthy and expensive. The short stay parking bay had been provided following a full consultation and legal orders made, meaning it was impossible to change the proposals now. She also stated that there might be an opportunity to review the restrictions in a year's time.

Q2: Bus services – Earlham Road

Mr Richard Gray, West Parade, asked the following question:

“Will the committee use its influence to ensure a balanced provision of services across Norwich and Norfolk? Specifically will it persuade konectbus to return Nos. 3 and 4 back to Earlham Road.?”

In September, konectbus unilaterally rerouted nos. 3 and 4 via Newmarket Road. Whilst understandable during the disruptive roadworks, this now means:

- (a) No direct bus from Earlham Road to either the hospital or the bus station:
- (b) First Bus No 26 is the only remaining service to and from the hospital and is overcrowded with students in the morning, making it impractical for those with disabilities;
- (c) No service to the hospital at all on Sundays;
- (d) No bus service at all on Earlham Road between the ring road and Fiveways;
- (e) Newmarket Rd now has 9 services running along it whilst Earlham Road with a larger population living just off it has one”.

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

“Thank you for your question regarding bus services 3 and 4 operated by konectbus. These services are run commercially with no financial input by the county or city councils, which means there is no local authority input to the routing and operation of these services. Other bus services operate in that area and we note the feedback that they are busy and can therefore be difficult to use, particularly for someone in a wheelchair. The county council is currently in discussion with konectbus to see if a solution can be found.”

By way of a supplementary question, Mr Gray explained that his son was a wheel chair user, who worked at the hospital and could not get on the buses because of overcrowding with students by the time the buses reached Earlham Road. He called on members to use their influence under the Bus Services Act 2017 through this committee and the Transforming Cities committee to correct “the nonsense” of nine services going down a parallel road to Earlham Road where there was now one very crowded service. In reply the chair explained that konectbus was a privately operated bus company and that the county council did not control the operation of its no 3 and 4 services. The local authorities could try and negotiate services with the company but could not force it. The vice chair explained that the Norwich Highways Agency committee would be holding its last meeting in March 2020 before being abolished. The Transforming Cities committee was a separate committee set up by the county council comprising representatives of the county council, city council, Broadland District Council, South Norfolk Council and the Local Enterprise Partnership and that this would oversee the delivery of the Transforming Cities Fund.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Minutes

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 5 September 2019.

4. St Matthews Road Traffic Regulation Order

Councillor Price, Thorpe Hamlet ward councillor, addressed the committee with his objections to the proposal to allow permit parking to the residents of the new development in St Matthews Road because it would have a negative impact on existing residents. The development site should be permit free as it was within easy of the city, was “cycle friendly” and near to a car club bay. If it was a current application parking permits would not be permitted. Residents objected to the proposal for one permit per new dwelling and were concerned that visitor passes would exacerbate the pressure on parking within the permit parking zone. The proposal to apply parking permits to a new development was contrary to policy and could set a precedent. Car use should be discouraged to improve air quality.

In reply, the transportation and network manager referred to the report and said that the proposal would not set a precedent. The planning application had gone through at the time when the policy relating to parking permits for new builds in controlled parking zones had not been finalised. This was an exceptional circumstance. The development had stalled because of the removal of parking permits and difficulty to sell or rent properties without on street parking. The proposal was for six residential parking permits and the visitor passport scheme. There were 33 per cent of households in St Matthews Road who did not have cars (Census, 2011), which if this was applied to the new development would result in only four additional car parking passes. The proposal was therefore considered to be a reasonable compromise.

During discussion members took into account the number of parking spaces available within this controlled parking zone on Riverside Road, that the original planning permission had been made in good faith based on an assessment of parking spaces being available on street and that the retrospective application of the policy relating to new builds within controlled parking zones could be open to legal challenge. Other members commented that the developer should have been aware of the emerging policy at the time of the planning application. Another member suggested that there should be a compromise to remove the “visitor passes”. Members were advised that the proposal was already a compromise because only six residential passes were allowed rather than two residential passes per household.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations as set out in the report.

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

- (1) approve the permit entitlement for 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e & 1f St Matthews Road as set out in the report;
- (2) ask the head of city development to implement the following restrictions as advertised the restricted parking permit entitlement for 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 1f St Matthews Road;
- (3) ask the head of city development services to advertise for consultation a proposal to convert a former limited waiting bay on St Matthews Road adjacent to the site at 66 Rosary Road for permit parking at any time; Appendix 2 plan number PLTR3329802-001
- (3) agree that any objections arising from this amendment TRO are determined by the Head of city development services, in discussion with the chair and vice chair of this committee

5. Proposed zebra crossing on Drayton Road – consultation results

The vice chair said that he had been asked by City Councillor Huntley, Mile Cross ward councillor, on behalf of local residents if the zebra crossing could be moved to St Martin's Road junction with Drayton Road, close to the entrance to Wensum Park. In reply, the transportation and network manager said that this proposal had been raised as part of the consultation and that the same number of people crossed Drayton Road at both locations. There was no justification to move the proposed zebra crossing but there was potential to consider an additional crossing at St Martin's Road in the future to be part funded from a county councillor small highways improvements budget or the parish partnership scheme..

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations as set out in the report.

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

- (1) approve the proposed zebra crossing on Drayton Road and;
- (2) ask the head of city development services to:
 - (a) arrange the installation of the proposed zebra crossing on a raised table on Drayton Road by Stone Road as advertised: and,
 - (b) carry out the statutory legal procedures to finalise the traffic regulation order to extend the double yellow lines by 4m on the north side of Drayton Road, west of its junction with Stone Road as shown on plan No. PLA433 HD2 01.

6. Transport for Norwich City Centre Access and Experimental Cycle Contraflow

During discussion, the transportation planner (Norwich City Council) referred to the report and answered questions. In relation to people with visual impairments, he

confirmed that both the Norfolk and Norwich Association for the Blind (NNAB) and the Royal National Institute of Blind People (RNIB) had been consulted and guidance had been sought from the Department for Transport. In reply to a further question, the transportation planner said that there was no proposal to conduct a follow-up consultation to evaluate whether people with visual impairments were not using the city centre because of the cycling provision. Implementation had gone relatively smoothly and signage would be continued to be monitored. Cambridge had utilised a comparable policy and other cities with Cycling City Ambition Grant (CCAG) funding have shown interest in adopting a similar approach. Members noted that it was not possible to record near misses.

Councillor Stonard, vice chair, raised the question of why Willow Lane had not been included in contraflow cycle facilities as it would be impacted from the changes in Ten Bell Lane and Cow Hill, had a blind corner, problem of fast drivers, was obstructed by refuge vehicles and bins, and had narrow pavements. The transportation planner said that Willow Lane would benefit from the increased permeability of cycling in this area and was parallel to Cow Hill. A separate road safety scheme was being considered for Willow Lane and illegal driving was a police matter. He acknowledged that Cow Hill could be congested at peak times.

A city councillor said that he was in favour of these schemes and suggested that in Europe coloured surfaces were used to demarcate cycle lanes. The transportation planner and transportation and network manager explained the signage that was proposed. Coloured tarmac had been used at Brazengate but was expensive to maintain in future years and was not suitable for cobbled surfaces.

Members also commented that cyclists needed to be mindful of other road users and ensure that they used lights when necessary. The chair pointed out that this was a police matter.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations as set out in the report.

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

- (1) *note that the changes to cycle access within the pedestrianised areas and the new contraflow facilities that were installed permanently in October 2018 have operated safely and successfully;*
- (2) agree the improvements to the St Stephens Square contraflow arrangements detailed on the plan no. CCAG2-45-19-01 in Appendix 1.
- (3) ask the head of city development services to complete the statutory processes to make the contraflow cycle facilities in Cow Hill, Redwell Street, St Stephens Square (including Crooks Place) and Ten Bell Lane permanent

7. Car Club Expansion

At the vice chair's request the transport planner (Norwich City Council) explained that national statistics showed that shared car club vehicles removed around 7 to 15 vehicles from the road.

A member said that she welcomed the proposal to expand the car club and reduce private car ownership, but wondered about progress to provide electric vehicles. The transport planner explained that county wide provision of electric charging points was being looked at through the Transforming Cities committee. Hybrid vehicles were available on York Street and Goldsmith Street and transitional arrangements would be made for electric vehicles.

In reply to a members' question the transport planner explained that the car club purchased or leased vehicles as the scheme was developed. He explained that as the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) process was cumbersome the proposal was to approve a batch of car club locations as outlined in the report and then implement these as funding for car club vehicles became available. The transportation and network manager confirmed that members were being asked to approve car club locations as set out in the recommendations, which would be provided at a rate of two to five spaces each at a time over the two years that the TRO was valid. She added that an application to the Department for Transport Future Mobility Zone funding had been made to expand the use of electric vehicles in the fleet.

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

- (1) approve the car club locations listed below and ask the head of city development to implement the following restrictions as advertised:

- **Avenue Road**
(additional 1 car club space to existing single bay)
- **Ber Street**
(1 space car club bay)
- **Britannia Road**
(1 space car club bay)
- **Borrowdale Drive**
(1 space car club bay)
- **Cavell Road**
(1 space car club bay)
- **Cecil Road**
(2 space car club bay)
- **Clarendon Road**
(additional car club space to existing bay)
- **Farmers Avenue**
(1 space car club bay)
- **Fishergate**
(additional 1 car club space to existing single bay)
- **Greyfriars Road**
(Extend existing car club bay whilst retaining 2 car club spaces insitu)
- **Ipswich Road**
(in Eaton Rise parallel to main road) (1 space car club bay)
- **King Street (south)**
(additional 1 space)
- **Mill Hill Road**
(2 space car club bay)
- **Mountergate**
(2 space car club bay)
- **Park Lane**
(additional car club space to existing bay)
- **Rye Avenue**
(2 space car club bay)
- **Scott Road**
(2 space car club bay)

- **Southwell Road**
(1 space car club bay)
- **St Giles Street (West)**
(additional 1 space for existing car club bay)
- **Westwick Street**
(2 space car club bay)
- **Woodgrove Parade**
(1 space car club bay)

(2) agree not to implement the following car club parking bay locations:

- **Bishopgate**
(2 space car club bay).
- **St Faiths Lane;**
(2 space car club bay)
- **Waverley Road**
(1 space car club bay)

CHAIR