

**Norwich Highways Agency committee**

**10:00 to 11:55**

**16 March 2017**

Present:     **County Councillors:**                     **City Councillors:**  
                  Adams (chair) (V)                     Bremner (vice chair) (V)  
                  Morphew (V)                             Stonard (V)  
                  Agnew                                     Carlo  
                  Sands (M)                                 Jones (B) (substitute for Councillor Peek)  
                  Spratt (substitute for                 Lubbock  
                  Councillor Shaw)

\*(V) voting member

Apologies: County Councillor Shaw and City Councillor Peek

**1. Transport for Norwich – Newmarket Road – Outer Ring Road Roundabout Upgrade**

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, with all 4 voting members voting in favour, to defer consideration of this item to a future meeting to allow for further consultation on the scheme.

**2. Transport for Norwich – Angel Road – Waterloo Road Cycling Improvements**

**RESOLVED**, unanimously with all 4 voting members voting in favour, to defer consideration of this item to a future meeting to allow for further consultation on the scheme.

**3. Public questions/petitions**

**Agenda items: 5 – Guidance on the Use of 20mph Speed Restrictions and item 6 – Response to the petition by the Mount Pleasant residents**

Question 1 - Ms Annelise Saville, Mount Pleasant, asked the following question:

“The Highways Team has produced a policy for implementing physical restrictions (page 24). The summary policy four points do not reflect the points in previous sections ‘Issues to consider (including DfT (Department for Transport) policy)’ or ‘current situation’. This means the ‘Policy’ does not cover factors such as: safety record, vulnerable areas, schools, current design etc.

In addition the new policy does not including a 'weighting' element which allows transparency of decision-making when viewing the frequently complex interaction of issues. Policy on physical restrictions is clearly not just about speed.

The fact that the new policy is failing is exemplified in the first case: how it is applied to Mount Pleasant. *The question we have is 'why has the policy and its specific application to Mount Pleasant not taken into account key DfT policies and indeed the council's own 'Issues to Consider' (Point 17):'* The paper addresses average speed alone. Missing considerations are as follows

- (a) The council's own assessment of 'significant risk';
- (b) There is no consideration given to the vulnerable people or schoolchildren in the area (high DfT priority).
- (c) There is no reflection of the council's own data that speeds of 40mph are recorded down this road and that the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile of speed is 27mph. DfT notes that this disparity shows severe design issues which requires remedies. Council's own data in this report shows Mount Pleasant is the only road where excessive speeds have increased. It also shows signage only has failed to achieve any change in driving behaviour.
- (d) No consideration to the fact that MP is a designated cycle route and these cyclists are having accidents on Mount Pleasant. (high DfT priority).
- (e) The report insists that there is only 1 relevant accident where in fact there have been 5: 3 on Mount Pleasant, 2 at the entrances and 3 involving bicycles (and this road is a designated cycle route!)
- (f) The local community preference for chicanes has not been considered
- (g) The fact that external funding is available now for remedial action. A unique opportunity that won't be repeated

Will the council review the Mount Pleasant proposal in a full and balanced way that reflects full DfT policy requirements?"

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

"I consider that the policy before us regarding when physical traffic calming measures should be used to help enforce 20mph speed restrictions is fair and equitable. It is based on the DfT advice in their document Setting Local Speed Limits.

Any policy needs to be manageable and reasonable. Adopting a weighting approach as suggested would further complicate the process and would mean that more of the limited available funding would be spent on carrying out formal assessments, resulting in less funding being available to actually implement the restrictions. Given that it is a corporate policy of the city council that all residential areas benefit from a 20mph restriction the widespread use of traffic calming is clearly unaffordable, both from an implementation perspective and a maintenance one.

By making 20mph restrictions more visible through the use of additional signing and roundels on the carriageway it sends a clear message to drivers of what the speed restriction in the street is and as these become more common place both in Norwich and nationally, more drivers will start to assume that 20mph is the default speed in residential streets

I believe that the policy has been fairly applied to Mount Pleasant. The safety analysis team at County Hall has confirmed that there has been a single injury accident along the length of Mount Pleasant in the last five years. This is not in itself a cause for concern and nor does it make the street any more unsafe than the vast majority of streets in the city. As you can see from the table on page 22 of the agenda papers, the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed in Mount Pleasant is very similar to other residential streets including Watling Road which also has a number of pedestrian generators along it such as a playing field and shop as well as being a route to the local schools.

The £600k that is available to fund 20mph restrictions may sound a lot, but looking at the maps on pages 29 and 30 of the agenda papers, you'll see it has to cover a vast area. This will only be achievable if the use of physical traffic calming is limited in the way the policy describes."

By way of a supplementary question, Annelise Saville referred to DfT policy and asked that an assessment was made of the vulnerable people, school children and cycle ways using Mount Pleasant and that it was taken into consideration before any decisions were made. The transportation and network manager, Norwich City Council, said that the policies were applied by professional transport planners. Limited resources were prioritised to areas where speeds were much higher and where more accidents could be prevented as a result.

Question 2 - Councillor Raby, Town Close Ward, asked the following question:

"Mount Pleasant residents have a long-standing concern regarding traffic hazards and ineffectiveness of the 20 mph speed limit on their street. They prepared an extremely well-documented petition demonstrating the need for effective traffic-calming measures and the various aspects of Department of Transport guidelines which do not seem to have been taken into account by the Council or by NHAC. At its January meeting the chair of this committee indicated that the Mount Pleasant petition would be given serious consideration, but this does not seem to have happened and once again the residents are being ignored. I will not go into all the details of the case which Ms Annelise Savill has admirably presented, but as councillor I wish to register my full support for the residents and to urge the committee to reconsider and to take the opportunity (with the availability of funds from the Pedalways scheme) to authorise the implementation of chicanes on Mount Pleasant as requested."

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

"I fully note your support but as I stated in my reply to Ms Savill , I believe the policy has been fairly applied to Mount Pleasant and I see no reason why this street should be treated as an exceptional case."

## **Agenda item 7 - Transport for Norwich – A11 Newmarket Road Cycleway Improvements Projects (Daniels Road to Hanover Road)**

Councillor Adams, chair, made the following statement on behalf of the committee:

“I appreciate that there is significant interest in the proposals for the Newmarket Road / Lime Tree Road / Christchurch Road junction which are being promoted here as part of the cycle route for Newmarket Road. However the removal of the signals has primarily been suggested to ease congestion at the Newmarket Road / Daniels Road roundabout. I therefore propose that we defer consideration of removal of the signalled junction. I have asked officers to revisit this issue and look at alternatives to removing the signals. If that option ultimately transpires to be the most appropriate they must provide robust arguments as to how this will work safely.

Given that the removal of the signals is inextricably linked to the capacity improvement scheme that is currently being developed for the Newmarket Road / Daniels Road Roundabout, I would suggest that we receive a comprehensive report to a future meeting that covers potential improvements at the roundabout and the Lime Tree Road junction. That report should also include the Leopold Road / Eaton Road junction which is due to be considered under the next report on this agenda, but which I am minded to suggest we also defer.

However I would like committee to consider the stepped cycle track further into the city. Officers tell me that the works between from just south of Albemarle Road to the new Toucan crossing at Hanover Road can be implemented independent of the work at the Lime Tree Road junction, and given the time pressures on available funding it would be expeditious if this part of the scheme is considered for approval today”

Councillor Bremner, vice chair, spoke in favour of this approach and said that consultation on these issues would give an opportunity to see what possibilities there were available.

(A number of members of the public had withdrawn their questions in the light of this statement and the deferral of items earlier on in the meeting.)

Petition - Dr Barbara Goodwin, Lime Tree Road, presented the following petition:

“We the undersigned strongly object to the removal of the traffic signals at the Newmarket Road/Lime Tree Road/Christchurch Road junction. The removal of traffic lights is a disproportionate measure in terms of improving the cycle route. At busy/rush hour times it will be impossible and dangerous to exit from the side roads into Newmarket Road without traffic lights. These `side roads' are in constant use as rat runs and the three local schools generate a good deal of traffic.

In view of the fact that the uncontrolled crossroads will create an accident black spot (as it was before the traffic lights were installed circa 1995), with serious risks and danger to pedestrians, including schoolchildren, cyclists and motor vehicles, and will cause even longer rush-hour traffic queues

creating further pollution in Lime Tree Road and Christchurch Road and will lead to the creation of new rat runs such as Fairfield Road, a single-track private road, we request the Norwich Highways Agency Committee to revise the Cycle Improvements Phase 2 Plan (PE4120-2/HT/HP3/DAG) so that the traffic signals at the Newmarket Road/Lime Tree Road/Christchurch Road junction remain in place and operational.”

Dr Goodwin as a supplementary question said that the removal of the traffic signals at the Newmarket Road/Lime Tree Road/Christchurch Road junction was not integral to the cycle path. The chair thanked Dr Goodwin for the petition and said that this point had been made and was the reason for the committee’s agreement to defer consideration of the proposals for Newmarket/Lime Tree Road/Christchurch Road junction to a future meeting to allow for wider consultation.

### **Agenda item 9 - Transport for Norwich – Magdalen Road Cycling Improvements**

Question 3 - Mr Martin Booth, Norfolk Clinic Magdalen Road, asked the following question:

“Given the comment about businesses and parking in paragraph 15 of the report, does the council now have a policy that, in matters of parking, city businesses have to be able to see into the future? When I opened the Norfolk Clinic in 1982, there was ample parking as there were no resident parking areas so patients could park in the side streets if necessary. Since then things have been getting more and more restricted and the loss of these spaces will make things very difficult for the patients of the clinic some of whom have temporary restricted mobility due to acute back pain and other problems.”

Councillor Bremner, vice-chair, replied on behalf of the committee, as follows:

“I fully understand Mr Booth’s concerns and when I first saw this report I did closely quiz the officers about the removal of this parking as I know how much on street parking is valued by small businesses.

We have a situation here where the only way that cycling can be provided for safely on Magdalen Road is by removing the parking. This section of Magdalen Road is an A class road and as such it is a key link in the city’s road network. It has been identified as the route of the blue pedalway. I understand that when the pedalway network was developed officers tried hard to find an alternative route as they appreciated the difficulties involved in providing for cyclists on Magdalen Road. However no route was suitable that did not involve cyclists taking significant detours, and cyclists are always inclined to take the most direct route. We do need to be mindful that encouraging more people to cycle is a key part of the Transport for Norwich strategy, and by encouraging those people who can cycle to do so is one way we can ensure that there is enough capacity in the road network to cater for those who have no choice but to drive.

Investment has already been made in the adjoining sections of the blue pedalway; a couple of years ago the contra flow cycle lane was provided in Magdalen Street and last autumn improvements took place in the northern end of Magdalen Road and St Clements Hill. If the works before us today do not go ahead we are faced with a gap in the blue pedalway that cannot be bridged. As a voting member I have to decide whether this is acceptable for the sake of six parking spaces.”

Mr Booth asked whether members considered that cycling was more important than parking near businesses and referred to the closure of streets and only buses, taxis and lorries were allowed in the city centre. The vice chair said that this was not the case at all and there were positive benefits for businesses. The city centre was still viable and was bucking retail trends.

The committee noted the following letter received from Councillor Julie Brociek-Coulton, local member for Sewell Ward/Division:

“Firstly I would like the members to know that several of the businesses came to me to ask for help with the parking bays being taken out on Magdalen Road. The petition was held outside Tesco’s store and highlighted to people who didn’t even realise that the bays might be taken out. At no time did we say that Tesco’s would close if the bays were taken out just to clear that rumour up.

The bays there not only help people with disabilities to use and be nearer to the shop but are really convenient for people passing to park. The bays also slow down the traffic because they block the flow through which in turn makes sure that the traffic is not fast. Our concern if you move the bays is not only will the spaces be lost but also it will become a rat run to get up Sprowston Road and Magdalen Road. We already experience this when the bays are empty.

There were 224 people who signed the petition. This is a very small part of the road that is vital if we want our businesses to be used. This includes Goodman’s Pet shop, the clinic, bespoke shop and of course Tesco’s store. Already when the bays are full the shops are losing customers and to take away the bays is just another way of taking away small businesses when Norwich is trying to promote more to come in.

We have already had many changes in Sewell for the Pedalways and we really welcome a raised table on Magdalen Road and 20mph but not the parking spaces taken away, we welcome the signalled crossing being changed to have it on a raised bed but would hope that comments from NNAB be taken on board.

Our question would be: Have any surveys been done to see how the speed is limited when the bays are in use, and how effective this is as a deterrent to people speeding down that part of the road as I can see that the bays have been monitored but not the amount of times people haven’t been allowed to speed along Magdalen Street because of the parked cars?”

(The chair pointed out that the details of the surveys were contained in the committee report.)

### **Essex Street - cycleway**

Question 4 - County Councillor Emma Corlett, Town Close division, asked the following question on behalf of residents:

“The cycle ways scheme in Town Close has been in place for some time now. Residents have given it a good go to try and make it work. The current arrangements on Essex Street are not working well, and are compromising both cyclist and pedestrian safety. Essex Street is one way for vehicles, and two-way for cyclists. As the road is narrow there is not sufficient space for a bicycle and car to safely pass each other. There are not enough 'pull in' places for vehicles as the parking spaces are full pretty much all of the time, day and night. As a result cyclists are moving up on to the (narrow) pavement.

The problem is particularly hazardous at the Vauxhall Street end of Essex Street, where the road is two way to vehicles (entering and exiting Suffolk Square), and to cyclists. There are also a large number of delivery lorries, vans and taxis who use the pull-in space adjoining Rupert Street (beside the barbers shop) to turn around. The two way cycle way on Essex Street adds to the dangerous situation. Parents who walk their children to Bignold Primary School along Essex Street have raised their concerns about pedestrian safety with me.

Please will the committee agree to re-visit this aspect of the cycle way, and evaluate the safety issues that I have raised? Please will the committee also give consideration to recommending that the cycle way is slightly re-routed; for Essex Street to return to one way for cycles, in-line with vehicle use and for the cycle way to link to Unthank Road from Vauxhall Street via use of the cycle lane along Rupert Street, exiting right in to Trinity Street, in-line with the one way vehicle use?”

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

“Members will recall that the routing for this cycle way, which forms part of the pink pedalway, was subject to much debate in this committee back in 2014. While it may sound simple to reroute the pedalway along Trinity Street, there are significant problems in getting the cyclists safely from Trinity Street to Park Lane.

In December 2015 a stage 3, post implementation, safety audit was carried out. The audit team noted that the available width was narrow and asked that the compliance with the 20mph restriction was checked. A week long automatic count was carried out and this showed that the average speed was 18.7mph. The safety audit team considered that was acceptable.

Now that the scheme has been embedded for 18 months officers tell me that the stage 4 safety audit is due. They will arrange for this to be carried out and share the outcome with Councillor Corlett.”

Councillor Corlett said that she welcomed the news that a safety audit would be carried out and suggested that there needed to be a clear demarcation of the cycle way and signage at the Vauxhall Street end of Essex Street. The transportation and network manager confirmed that the results of the safety audit would be shared with members of committee as well as local members. She would ensure that the issues that Councillor Corlett had raised were passed on to the safety audit team for consideration.

#### **4. Declarations of interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### **5. Minutes**

**RESOLVED** to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 19 January 2017.

#### **6. Guidance on the use of 20mph Speed Restrictions**

Discussion ensued in which the transportation and network manager and the head of citywide development services answered members' questions. Members of the committee generally welcomed the report which was considered a positive response to achieving the city council's objective of implementing 20mph speed restrictions in residential areas. Members also considered that there would be a change in public behaviour and driving at higher speeds in residential areas would become socially unacceptable.

During discussion there were suggestions that the guidelines could have included other physical measures as set out by Sustrans, consideration of new technology (motion to the city council's full council on 24 January 2017 on low emission vehicles) and working in partnership with the police, 20's Plenty for Us, health providers and other organisations. Members were also advised that this was a guidance note on the mechanism for rolling out 20mph speed restrictions in residential areas, rather than the policy benefits of promoting exercise through walking and cycling. Officers worked closely with the Casualty Reduction Partnership.

A county council member commended the city council for implementing 20mph speed restrictions in its residential streets and was the envy of other parts of the county, and that cyclists and pedestrians had to be safe. However, he cautioned that the city would not become closed to traffic in the future. The vice chair referred to the maps appended to the report and noted that the city council's influence was demonstrated with the proposed 20mph speed limit in Cringleford, South Norfolk. He said that he was pleased with the progress that had been made and praised the city and county council officers for their work.

**RESOLVED**, unanimously with all 4 voting members voting in favour, to approve the following policy for implementing 20mph restrictions in residential areas:

- (1) 20mph should be considered the default speed restriction for all residential C and U class roads and these should be rolled out as and when funding is available;
- (2) in areas, where the existing average speeds are 23mph or less, then a signed only speed restriction with repeater signs at 200m intervals should be implemented. 20mph roundels may be used at the entry points from a 30mph road;
- (3) in areas where the existing average speeds are between 23mph and 26 mph a 20mph speed restriction with repeater signs at 100m intervals should be implemented. 20mph roundels should be used at the entry points from a 30mph road and may be repeated at appropriate intervals across the area;
- (4) in areas where existing average speeds are between over 26mph consideration can be given to also using physical traffic calming and / or interactive signs, if it is considered necessary to augment widespread static signing and the use of roundels.

## 7. Response to the petition by the Mount Pleasant residents

(Councillor Bremner left the meeting during this item.)

During discussion two members considered that Mount Pleasant was suitable for physical road traffic calming to prevent “rat-running” between Newmarket Road and Unthank Road. One member suggested that the Sustrans DIY streets toolkit would be useful here as residents could install low cost traffic calming measures such as chicanes made out of concrete piping and planted. In reply to a question, the head of city development services explained that other priorities had meant that the committee had not received a report on DIY streets as agreed in May 2011. Whilst not wanting to prejudge any future report to the committee, he said that there were concerns about cost and who would be responsible for the maintenance of any traffic calming measures.

Discussion ensued in which the vice chair pointed out that resources had to be shared across the city and on a priority basis. Another member said that it was important that traffic could be kept flowing in the city.

The head of city development services did not consider that physical traffic calming measures were necessary in Mount Pleasant and that the use of signage and 20mph roundels would be sufficient.

**RESOLVED**, with 3 voting members voting in favour (Councillor Bremner abstaining from voting because he was out of the room at the time) that the committee asks the head of city development services to consider improved 20mph signing and the use of 20mph roundels in Mount Pleasant as part of the 20mph project that is funded by the Cycle Ambition Grant and due for implementation by March 2018.

(Councillor Bremner returned to the meeting at this point.)

## 8. Transport for Norwich – A11 Newmarket Road Cycleway Improvements Project (Daniels Road to Hanover Road)

The chair having made a statement about elements of the scheme to allow for further consultation moved the amended recommendations which related to the cycle improvements just south of Albemarle Road to the new Toucan at Hanover Road, and independent of the proposals for the Lime Tree Road junction.

Councillor Corlett, local member for Town Close Division, said that one of the issues raised at a local meeting was the concern for pedestrian and cyclist safety from vehicles pulling out of entrances with poor visibility on to the cycleway, particularly in Albert Terrace, and asked that mirrors were provided to improve visibility of concealed entrances. The transportation and network manager said she would ensure that the design team was aware of this concern but said that mirrors were not used on the highways because of vandalism. Residents could put up mirrors on their own property but mirrors, even unbreakable ones, were not allowed on the highway.

During discussion a member said that Norwich High School for Girls was in the process of introducing a one way system for vehicles entering its site and that this should be taken into account. Discussion ensued on the necessity to share space with the bus lane and the concerns of the Norfolk and Norwich Association for the Blind about the sharing the pavement with cyclists. A member pointed out that Ipswich Road was a gateway to the city and that it was important that the road was not made any narrower than it was with the current bus lane.

In reply to a question, the major projects manager, Norfolk County Council, said that traffic modelling demonstrated that Northern Distributor Road would reduce less traffic in the south of the city, which was already served by the southern by-pass, than it would in the north of the city.

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

- (1) defer consideration of the removal of the existing signalised junction at the Christchurch Road/Lime Tree Road junction and provision of a new Toucan crossing to a future meeting to allow for further consultation;
- (2) approve the changes required to implement the scheme, subject to including:
  - (a) provision of a segregated one-way cycle lane on the northern side of Newmarket Road (city bound) from a point south of Albemarle and the footway link to Hanover Road;
  - (b) provision of a new signalised Toucan crossing on Newmarket Road at the Hanover Road link to provide a route across the carriageway for cyclists;
  - (c) conversion of the footway on the southern (outbound) side of Newmarket Road into a shared use footway/cycleway from the Hanover Road link to Lime Tree Road;

- (d) installation of raised table crossings (road humps) on Town Close Road, Albemarle Road and Mount Pleasant at their junctions with Newmarket Road.
- (3) ask the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory processes to confirm the Traffic Regulation Orders and notices required in relation to provision of the new cycle lane, conversion of the southern footway into a shared-use footway/cycleway, Toucan crossings and road humps required to implement the changes detailed in (1) above.

## 9. Transport for Norwich – Magdalen Road Cycling Improvements

Councillor Morpew said that whilst he was supportive of the proposed cycling improvements scheme, given the concerns of residents and businesses, he needed assurance that all other options had been considered. The transportation and network manager referred to the report and confirmed that all alternatives had been considered. The route from the north of Magdalen Road was the only alternative. Spencer Street had been considered but there were too many parked cars, and Bull Close Road through to Magdalen Street had been considered unacceptable. The scheme included the extension of 20mph for a large residential area of the city. The cycling improvements would benefit cyclists using the Blue Pedalway. There was no intention to link the Yellow Pedalway.

The vice chair said that his comments had been made in his response on behalf of the committee to Mr Booth earlier in the meeting.

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

- (1) approve the installation of the scheme as shown on Plans CCAG 35-04A, 05A and 06A including:
  - (a) a separate cycle track on Magdalen Road;
  - (b) raised footpath crossings on some side streets;
  - (c) amendment to the layout of the signalised junction of Magdalen Road with Sprowston Road;
  - (d) a 20mph zone with associated traffic calming;
- (a) ask the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory legal procedures to:-
  - (b) finalise the traffic regulation order to remove the limited waiting bay on Magdalen Road outside property numbers 38 to 48 and replace with double yellow lines;
  - (c) confirm the Magdalen Road cycle order;
  - (d) finalise the speed restriction order for a 20mph zone in the Magdalen Road area as shown on Plan CCAG-35-06;.

- (2) ask the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory legal procedures to extend the proposed 20mph speed restriction to Silver Road, the Violet Road area and the Crome Road/Mousehold Avenue area as shown on Plan Number CCAG35-15;
- (3) delegate to the head of city development services the determination of any objections to the proposed further extension of the 20mph area in consultation with the chair and vice chair.

## **10. Transport for Norwich – St Crispins Shared Use Crossing**

During discussion the vice chair said that he welcomed the proposed scheme and considered that the wider central reservation would look attractive when planted.

A member said that he was disappointed with the comments from the Norfolk and Norwich Association for the Blind, which included objections to the “dog-leg” and the removal of the subway. There was no option to retain the subway and it would be replaced with a more user friendly crossing. The principal transport planner, Norwich City Council, said that the “dog-leg” arrangement was a temporary stopgap before the Anglia Square development came forward and would therefore be reviewed.

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

- (1) agree to approve the design and implementation of 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) approve the installation of a signal controlled crossing required as part of the scheme.
- (3) note that the subway, which was stopped up (highway rights removed) in 2009 as part of redevelopment proposals will be filled in.

## **11. Transport for Norwich – Mile Cross Lane (Fiddlewood to Catton Grove Road) Cycling Improvements**

Councillor Morphew, local member for Mile Cross Division, and Councillor Stonard, local member for Catton Grove Ward, welcomed the scheme.

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

- (1) approve the following changes required to implement the scheme:
  - (a) widen and convert footways to shared use on the north side of Mile Cross Lane and the north-west of Catton Grove Road heading west into Mile Cross Lane and the footpaths between Mile Cross Lane and Blackthorn Close;

- (b) transfer strips of land from Norwich City Council ownership to adopted highway to facilitate the above;
  - (c) reconfigure the existing traffic island on Mile Cross Lane to allow use by pedestrians and cyclists.
- (2) ask the head of city development services at Norwich City Council to carry out the necessary statutory procedures to confirm the Traffic Regulation Order to convert the abovementioned footways and footpaths to shared use.

## **12. Transport for Norwich – Bluebell Road Cycling Improvements**

During discussion a member welcomed the improved cycling facilities on Bluebell Road and said that drivers should be aware that experienced cyclists will want to use the road rather than the cycleway. All road users should be more respectful of other road users, especially when using shared facilities.

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

- (1) approve the installation of the measures shown on plan Nos CCAG2-28-PH2-007 and 008, including:
  - (a) a zebra with cycle crossing facilities on a raised table on Bluebell Road just north of the slip road to Newmarket Road;
  - (b) widening of the existing cycle path / footpath on the west side of Bluebell Road from its junction with South Park Avenue to the slip road to Newmarket Road;
  - (c) provide mitigation planting to the tree / hedge line on the west side of Bluebell Road;
  - (d) widening and conversion of the north side footpath on the Bluebell Road slip road to Newmarket Road to a shared cycle path / footpath.
- (2) ask the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory legal procedures to confirm the Bluebell Road slip road cycle order.

## **13. Transport for Norwich – City Centre Access Strategy – Contraflow Cycle Lanes**

During discussion members welcomed the scheme and noted the benefits of contraflow cycle lanes for cyclists.

In reply to a member's question, the principal transport planner explained that St Giles Street was not suitable for contraflow cycling because the cost outweighed the benefits.

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

- (1) ask the head of city development services to commence the necessary statutory process for all traffic regulation orders and notices required to:
  - (a) allow contraflow cycling on:
    - (i) St Swithins Road;
    - (ii) Ten Bell Lane;
    - (iii) Cow Hill;
    - (iv) Willow Lane;
    - (v) Westwick Street (Charing Cross to Coslany Street);
    - (vi) Muspole Street;
    - (vii) Lobster Lane;
    - (viii) Little London Street;
    - (ix) Redwell Street;
    - (x) Bedding Lane;
    - (xi) Crooks Place (St Stephens Square to Wessex Street);
    - (xii) St Stephens Square;
    - (xiii) Timberhill;
  - (b) make associated changes to waiting and loading restrictions as outlined in the report.
- (2) approve for consultation the proposals for the City Centre Access project that relate to contraflow cycling on all of the above streets.
- (3) note that all responses will be considered at a future meeting of the committee.

#### **14. Transport for Norwich – Brazengate to All Saints Green Cycling Improvements**

A member asked whether the junction from Grove Road into Grove Walk could be included in the scheme. The transportation and network manager said that this was outside the remit of the scheme and undertook to liaise with the member outside the meeting.

During discussion a member said that he considered that the removal of cars from the city centre was going too far. Councillor Morphew said that he welcomed the scheme and pointed out that the city was already benefiting from the closure of Westlegate, with increased footfall benefiting retailers and businesses, and also reducing traffic queue on the surrounding streets

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

- (1) approve for consultation the proposals for the Brazengate project, including:
  - (a) provision of mandatory and advisory cycle lanes on Brazengate;
  - (b) removal of a pedestrian refuge on Brazengate and installation of a zebra crossing in its' place;

- (c) installation of early release traffic signals with camera detection for cyclists at the Brazengate and All Saints Green junctions with Queens Road;
  - (d) changes to the All Saints Green / Surrey Street junction to remove existing traffic signals and controlled pedestrian crossings and install a new raised table across the junction with informal crossing points;
  - (e) review the existing bus gate at Grove Road to allow use by buses only during the existing operational times of 0730-0930 Monday to Friday and provide camera enforcement;
  - (f) provision of an advisory cycle lane on the east side of All Saints Green;
- (2) ask the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory procedures associated with advertising any Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) and Notices that may be required for the implementation of the scheme as described in this report;
- (3) agree that the outcome of the proposed consultation will be reported to a future meeting of the committee.

## **15. Committee Members and Officers**

The chair took the opportunity to thank members of the committee and officers as it was the last committee of the civic year.

The committee also welcomed Jeremy Wiggin in his new role as NATS manager, Norfolk County Council.

**RESOLVED** to note.

CHAIR