

**MINUTES****Norwich Highways Agency committee****10:00 to 11:40****23 July 2015**

Present:                   **County Councillors:**                   **City Councillors:**  
                                  Morphew (chair) (V)                   Bremner (vice chair) (V)  
                                  Adams (V)                               Maxwell (V) (substitute for Councillor  
                                  Agnew                               Stonard, and (V))  
                                  Sands (M)                              Carlo  
                                  Shaw                                 Jackson  
  Woollard (substitute for Councillor Harris)  
  
                                  \*(V) voting member

Apologies:               City Councillors Stonard and Harris (both on other council business)

**1. Public questions/petitions****Salisbury Road NR1 1TU - Parking Permit Petition**

Ms Jay Roll, Salisbury Road, Norwich, presented the following petition on behalf of residents of:

“We the undersigned residents of Salisbury Road are asking for permit parking. Due to constant use by visitors to the station and football ground we are finding it increasingly difficult to park. The planned Generation Park will also create more congestion and less parking. Without permit parking on Salisbury Road, residents will soon have nowhere to park as surrounding roads are already zoned.”

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

“Residents of Salisbury Road have been consulted on the idea of introducing permit parking in their street on a number of occasions in the past 15 years, but to date there has never been the majority support required to implement it. Salisbury Road therefore currently remains outside the Eastern Controlled Parking zone (CPZ) permit parking area

I understand that it is anticipated that the planning application for the Generation Park will be submitted shortly. As part of the planning negotiations, officers will seek to secure funding from the developers to consult on and implement an extension of the CPZ as a result of the potential impact of this

development. However at this stage it cannot be guaranteed that this funding will be forthcoming and even if it is agreed as part of any planning permission the developers would not be obliged to pay it until development commences. Even then the actual inclusion of Salisbury Road within the Eastern CPZ will be dependent on the results of the statutory consultation on the required traffic regulation orders, where we would be looking to find majority support for the idea before imposing permit parking in an area.

There are a number of locations around the city where extensions to CPZs have been requested. Should we be unable to secure funding from the Generation Park development, then funding for Salisbury Road would have to be sought elsewhere, and prioritised against the other requests that we have received.”

Ms Roll asked whether there would be funding from the developer to fund an extension to the controlled parking zone. The vice chair assured her that both the city and county councils would look into all available sources of funding but cautioned that the councils were constrained by the government’s austerity cuts to the county council’s highways budget.

### **Push the Pedalways – the Avenues and Colman Road - question**

Dr Jeremy Bartlett, Stannard Road, Norwich, asked the following question:

“The Pedalways work at Colman Road and The Avenues has been characterised by poor communication, unnecessary disruption and - if the cycle paths on The Avenues aren’t going to be built - unmet expectations.

Work on the junction of The Avenues and Colman Road started on 1 June 2015 and was scheduled for 11 weeks (although a recent letter to residents now says the works will finish "by mid-September"). The end result will be speed humps and additional kerbs at The Avenues end of George Borrow Road, Stannard Road and Corie Road, a slightly altered crossing on Colman Road and some new red tarmac on The Avenues. The work has progressed very slowly and greatly inconvenienced local residents and drivers, pedestrians and cyclists trying to use The Avenues, cross Colman Road and access the adjacent roads.

Why has this work taken so long for so little result, and why were local residents only given four days’ notice that the work was about to start? (And surely it would have been better to put the entire workforce to work on the Colman Road junction, rather than spreading the effort thinly across the project?).

What lessons have Norwich City Council learnt, which can be applied to future pedalways work in the city?”

Councillor Morphew, chair, pointed out that the last question should be “what lessons have the committee learnt?”, and replied on behalf of the committee as follows:

“It is regrettable that it proved impossible to implement the scheme agreed by this committee in November, but it would be wrong of the city council to continue with a scheme when through the detailed design process it became very apparent that the costs were escalating beyond budget and the quality

and longevity of the finished product would be compromised by the tree roots. Officers had believed when making their recommendation to this committee in November that the engineering difficulties presented by the tree roots could be overcome within budget, sadly this proved impossible.

While this revised scheme for The Avenues may not quite provide the improvements originally suggested it still delivers valuable benefits for cyclists, addressing the cycle accident problems at two known accident clusters sites, the junctions with Colman Road and George Borrow Road. It also effectively reduces speeds along The Avenues to the benefit of both pedestrians and cyclists and the advisory cycle lanes will offer increased protection for cyclists over the current arrangements.

I agree that it appears that work has progressed slowly on this project; the reasons for this are twofold; much of the work that has taken place to the Colman Road / The Avenues junction has been below ground with improvements to drainage and the ducting to the signals, which is not obvious to the public at large. Also as we are all well aware there are a number of significant schemes taking place across the city at the current time and the contractors only have a finite work force so it is not always possible to flood a scheme with labour, or to work extended hours, which incur additional costs. Given the need to keep pedestrian routes open through the Colman Road junction and to provide safe working areas for the contractors it was not possible for the entire workforce to concentrate on the Colman Road junction, and therefore to minimise the overall length of the disruption, work along The Avenues took place at the same time.

I apologise for the short notice given for the works, the original start date of late April had to be postponed due to the problems encountered at the detailed design stage, and it took some time to reshape the scheme and the programme for the works. By the time we knew that the works would start on 1 June, all the advance publicity was out for the Radio One Big Weekend and it was thought to have two lots of advance warning notices in an area would be confusing for drivers.

I am told that the contractors are on target to complete the first phase of works during the week commencing 4 August. They will then vacate the site for a few weeks, returning in September to undertake the works on Bluebell Road and start the verge protection works. Due to the closure of University Drive it is not possible to work on Bluebell Road in August.

Finally, I can reassure everyone that a number of valuable lessons have been learnt, not just through The Avenues scheme but many of the other projects that have formed part of the Cycle Ambition Grant funded Pink Pedalway. A balance needs to be struck between the scale of the ambition of the projects and the practicality and affordability of delivery, something that will be at the heart of delivering the Blue and Yellow Pedalways over the next three years within budget and on time."

As a supplementary question, Dr Bartlett explained that he had some concerns about the way the contractors were carrying out the work. He pointed out that as a cyclist himself, he welcomed the scheme, but was concerned about the slow

progress of this scheme. The chair sympathised with the disruption to traffic and invited Dr Bartlett to supply details of his concerns about how the contractors were carrying out the work so that they could be explored outside the meeting.

### **Bowthorpe Three Score – proposed bus lane - question**

The chair agreed to take the following question which although sent to the council by the deadline for questions to committee had not been forwarded to democratic services. He explained that a written response would be provided in due course.

Dr Virginia Greasley asked the following question:

"Given the importance of Green Lane, Bowthorpe, as a cycle route for UEA, N&N, research institutes, Bowthorpe Industrial Estate and Longwater Retail Park, I am greatly disturbed about the planned narrowing of the cycle/pedestrian path from the current 5 metres to 2.5m, and that this path has now been blocked off, forcing cyclists to either take an indirect route through the housing or cycle on a main road such as the Dereham Road. The path was supposed to be closed for just 3 weeks. It has now been closed for 3 months.

Question: Can the committee clarify the date when cyclists and pedestrians will be able to use this route, and ensure that the continued use of this path will be a priority for the duration of these works?"

By way of a supplementary question, Dr Greasley pointed out that the work should have been completed in March 2015, and that the soil and rubble which effectively created a barrier to the path for cyclists and pedestrians.

The chair confirmed that a written response would be sent to Dr Greasley after the meeting. (The written response is appended to these minutes.)

## **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 4 June 2015.

## **4. Hotblack Road**

The senior transportation planner (Norwich City Council) introduced the report.

During discussion the transportation and network manager (Norwich City Council) referred to the reports and answered members' questions. There were no proposals to improve the junction at Bowthorpe Road/Dereham Road/Hotblack Road at present and this junction had not been identified as a bottleneck for buses as part of the Dereham Road bus rapid transit (BRT). The proposal to close Nelson Street off to traffic had been considered in 1999 and could be revisited in the future. The member's suggestion that rising bollards, such as used for bus gates, could be used

to close off Turner Street at peak times for dropping off and collecting children was not a practical solution to the problem.

Discussion ensued in which a member said that he understood the residents' point of view and that the problem was the difficulty was the level of car ownership and the volume of cars on the streets and lack of funding to address the problems at the current time. One member said that he considered the report to be proactive and that a number of actions could be considered as and when funding became available.

The committee also noted that measures within the Transport for Norwich strategy (formerly known as Norwich Area Transportation Strategy (NATS)) aimed to remove traffic in residential areas and keep traffic on the main road network. There was also a commitment to introducing a 20 mph speed limit in all residential areas of the city. These measures could not be done on a piecemeal basis. However, members considered that the issues raised by the residents in this report should be kept on the radar and addressed when it was possible to do so.

**RESOLVED to:**

- (1) receive the report produced by Hotblack Road residents;
- (2) note the actions already taken on some issues in the report and confirm the residential area will be considered for inclusion in a 20 mph speed limit when funds become available.

**5. Push the Pedalway programme update**

The transportation and network manager presented the report using slides to illustrate the progress and implementation of the schemes. She pointed out that one of the recommendations had been left off the report and asked members to authorise the head of city development services (Norwich City Council) to complete the statutory procedures associated with the revisions to project 4, The Avenues, and project 13, Tombland and Palace Street.

Councillor Maxwell, ward councillor for Crome Ward and chair of the Mousehold Heath Conservators, said that she was pleased with the lighting on the heath and that it would be useful for people using the path either to walk or cycle to work on dark mornings or early evenings. She considered that the pink pedalway was beneficial to the residents of Heartsease.

Members welcomed the progress that had been made in delivering the Push the Pedalway programme. One member suggested that as cycling increased in popularity more cycle stands would be required. She also suggested that valuable lessons had been learnt during the implementation of the pink pedalway and that it was important to ensure that the views of local councillors were taken into consideration.

During discussion the transportation and network manager answered members' questions. Discussion ensued on the projects which had either been deferred and/or were partially progressed. Members noted that some schemes had been over budget and been revised or deferred. A member suggested that the city needed to

be permeable for cyclists and expressed concern that elements might not be completed. He suggested that directional signage should be prioritised. Another member commented on whether it was realistic, given the constraints of the budget, to retain schemes such as project 5, Earlham Road (Gypsy Lane to Christchurch Road), and project 6 Adelaide Street, in the Push the Pedalways Scheme which might not ever be realised. Members were advised that projects which had been deferred would be brought forward as and when funding was available, either from further Cycle Ambition funding or from NATS funding.

The transportation and network manager referred to project 16, Laundry Lane to St Williams Way, and explained that although the city council was leading on the Cycle Ambition scheme it was working in partnership with the county council to deliver the NATS cycle network in Greater Norwich.

The major projects manager (Norfolk County Council) responded to a member's question and explained that the county council's contractors delivered each project as part of its contract arrangements. This meant that the county council saved on the tender process and there was a quick turnaround for each project.

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

- (1) note the content of the report;
- (2) ask the head of city development services to complete the statutory to complete the statutory procedures associated with the revisions to project 4, The Avenues, and project 13, Tombland and Palace Street, as set out in the report.

## **6. Push the Pedalways - Project 19 – 20mph areas in the City Centre and Heartsease**

The senior transportation planner (Norwich City Council) introduced the report.

Members of the committee welcomed the report. The vice chair pointed out that there was cross party support for the city council's ambition to extend 20 mph zones from members of both the city and county councils. Members particularly welcomed the implementation of the scheme in Heartsease where there had been a long-standing campaign to implement a 20 mph speed limit in residential areas.

During discussion, the transportation and network manager referred to the report and answered members' questions. Further details of "engine switch off" for parked coaches and buses would be provided to members. The committee considered the replacement of obsolete signalled crossings based on an assessment of the right solution for the location at the time in terms of cost effectiveness and safety. Members were advised that all works on these schemes would be completed by 31 March 2015.

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

- (1) note the response to the consultation;

- (2) ask the head of city development services to complete the necessary statutory processes associated with the installation of:
  - (a) the 20mph Speed Restriction Order for the historic city centre as shown on plan No. PL/TR/4142/225/3.2 and associated amended traffic calming as below:
    - (i) Ber Street – Plan No. CCAG-CON-202A
    - (ii) Duke Street – Plan No. CCAG-CON-502
    - (iii) Rouen Road / King Street – Plan Nos. CCAG-CON-402 and 402a
    - (iv) Westwick Street – Plan No. CCAG-CON-302
  - (b) the 20mph Speed Restriction Order for the area north of Barrack Street as shown on Plan No. PL/TR/4142/225/3.2
  - (c) the 20mph Speed Restriction Order for the Heartsease area without additional traffic calming. The area is shown on Plan No. PL/TR/4142/225/3.1
- (3) ask officers to circulate details of the outcome of measures to improve air quality, including “engine switch off” to members.

## **7. Bowthorpe Three Score**

The chair introduced the report.

Councillor Sands (as local member for Bowthorpe division and ward, said that it was regrettable that residents’ views that the bus gate should be located further south as there were concerns about visibility from the cycle way. The principal planner (transportation), (Norwich City Council), said that there was not an alternative route. English Heritage had objected to the bus link going through the grounds of a listed building (Bowthorpe Hall). He said that the issue of visibility would be addressed and the hedgerow cut back.

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

- (1) note that the new road infrastructure and the associated bus gate to service the new Bowthorpe Three Score development is currently under construction and due to be completed by March 2016;
- (2) ask the head of city development services to advertise the necessary traffic regulation orders to implement the new bus gate, a 20mph Zone and waiting restrictions on the new estate roads within the development site (as shown on the plans in Appendices 1-4), making allowance for the proposed parking bays in front of the new approved development (shown in Appendix 5);
- (3) delegate the consideration of any objections to the head of city development services in consultation with the chair and vice-chair.

## **8. Norwich Car Cub 2015 expansion – results of consultation**

The principal planner (transportation) presented the report.

The vice chair welcomed the expansion of the car club and said that he considered it an effective use of vehicles and saved on car parking spaces.

The principal planner (transportation) said that following this expansion the norwich car club would be the largest not for profit car club in the UK.

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

- (1) note consultation representations regarding proposed car club bays;
- (2) ask the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory procedures associated with implementing the following car club bays;
  - (a) Bank Plain;
  - (b) Brunswick Road;
  - (c) Edinburgh Road;
  - (d) Fishergate;
  - (e) Shipstone Road;
  - (f) St. Clement's Hill;
  - (g) St. Giles Street;
  - (h) Waldeck Road;
  - (i) Bunnett Square;
  - (j) Clarendon Road;
  - (k) King Street South;
  - (l) Newmarket Street.
- (3) authorise the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory procedures to implement the following as and when required up until 5 June 2017:
  - (a) St. Leonard's Road;
  - (b) Riverside Road;
  - (c) Northfields;
  - (d) Wilberforce Road;
  - (e) Rawley Road.

## **9. Hall Road district centre area – results of consultation on traffic management changes**

The principal planner (transportation) introduced the report and said that since the report had been written no comments had been received from members of the public. The Norfolk and Norwich Association for the Blind had submitted a response to the consultation expressing concern about the use of a shared cycle/footway and asking for it to be delineated into separate footpath and cycle way. This was not a practical solution as the pathway was short and narrow at this point.



Discussion ensued in which the principal planner (transportation), together with the transportation and network manager, referred to the report and answered members' questions. Members were advised that the intention was that the proposed cycle path, which was associated to the Asda development on Hall Road, would link into the yellow pedalway.

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

- (1) note the representation received and the officer response:
- (2) ask the head of city development services carry out the necessary statutory procedures associated with implementing the traffic management measures as described in this report.

## **10. Major road works**

The transportation and network manager referred to paragraph 9 of the report and explained that British Gas had needed to conduct essential maintenance in Westlegate and All Saints Green. The vice chair asked that officers ensured that a press release was issued to ensure that the public understood the situation and not that the scheduled works to the gas main in Westlegate, All Saints Green and Red Lion Street had commenced while works were still be carried out in Golden Ball Street.

The transportation and network manager said that disruption from roadworks would be kept to a minimum over the next six to eight weeks. There would be road closures and work would be carried out at night.

**RESOLVED** to:

- (1) note the report;
- (2) ask the head of city development services to ensure that it is made clear that the current works in Westlegate are not part of the Golden Ball Street scheme that is out to consultation but works by National Grid Gas to replace a 100 year old gas main.

CHAIR

## APPENDIX

### Public questions

#### Dr Virginia Greasley asked the following question:

"Given the importance of Green Lane, Bowthorpe, as a cycle route for UEA, N&N, research institutes, Bowthorpe Industrial Estate and Longwater Retail Park, I am greatly disturbed about the planned narrowing of the cycle/pedestrian path from the current 5 metres to 2.5m, and that this path has now been blocked off, forcing cyclists to either take an indirect route through the housing or cycle on a main road such as the Dereham Road. The path was supposed to be closed for just 3 weeks. It has now been closed for 3 months.

Question: Can the committee clarify the date when cyclists and pedestrians will be able to use this route, and ensure that the continued use of this path will be a priority for the duration of these works?"

#### Response on behalf of the committee:

"The extended closure of Earlham Green Lane is deeply frustrating. The construction period for the bus lane / bus gate was indeed indicated as 3 weeks of work in the contractor's programme – unfortunately once construction had commenced it became apparent that a retaining wall was unable to be constructed as designed. This meant that the retaining wall had to be redesigned and submitted for approval. Officers are doing all they can to support the contractor in getting the design completed and approved, and are pressing them to ensure they can get back on site as soon as possible. Regrettably it is not possible to re-open the footpath cycle route until the works are complete."