

MINUTES

Norwich Highways Agency committee

10:00 to 10.40

23 October 2014

Present:

County Councillors:

Adams (V) (chair)

Bremner (V)

Sands (M)

Spratt (substitute for Councillor Shaw)

*(V) voting member

City Councillors:

Stonard (vice chair) (V)

Harris (V)

Gayton

Carlo

Grahame

Apologies:

County Councillors Hebborn and Shaw

1. Push the Pedalways – Tombland and Palace Street

The head of city development services, Norwich City Council, referred to the report on Push the Pedalways, Tombland and Palace Street and said that a number of issues had been raised by the Norwich School and parents of students at the school as late representations. He suggested that officers met with representatives of the school to discuss these issues and come back to the committee with a response to the points that had been made.

The chair and vice chair moved that the item be deferred from consideration to the next meeting of the committee.

RESOLVED, unanimously, with all 4 voting members voting in favour, to defer consideration of the Push the Pedalways – Tombland and Palace Street scheme to provide an opportunity for officers to discuss the scheme with the Norwich School and consider the issues raised in late representations by parents of students at the school and other interested parties to the next meeting of the committee (Thursday, 27 November 2014 at 10:00)

2. Public questions/petitions

The chair said that a public question had been received from Mary Cherry, Bursar to the Norwich School. In view of the decision to defer consideration of the Push the Pedalways – Tombland and Palace Street scheme, Mary Cherry reserved her right to ask a question until the next meeting of the committee.

The chair said that a public question had been received in respect of item 5, Review of visitor parking permits, which would be taken at the start of the item.

3. Declarations of interest

Councillors Stonard, Bremner, Gayton and Grahame declared an other interest in item 5, below, Review of visitor parking permits in that they held parking permits.

4. Minutes

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 22 July 2014, subject to item 7, Push the Pedalways – The Avenues, paragraph 2 deleting the last sentence.

5. Review of visitor parking permits

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

Julia Edgeley, Chester Street, Norwich, asked the following question:

“What does one do once your allocation of 60 scratch-cards has gone? To alleviate this problem I suggest that instead of a hour clock system we keep the 24 hour visitors’ pass but make it much more expensive which will then give people the choice of scratch-cards for those who don’t have many visitors and the 24 hour visitors pass for those that do. There are boroughs that use this system, Merton being one, and have found it to be successful and less stressful for the public, particularly the elderly population who sometimes scratch out the wrong date or year and find themselves with a fine. It seems to me the simpler the method the easier it will be to regulate, both for the citizens of Norwich and the council.”

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

“As is explained in the report a number of options for updating our current visitor permit scheme were explored and we looked at how several other local authorities tackle the problem. The option that we are asking to be adopted, a 4 hour permit and up to 60 day permits, is what we believe to be the best compromise to suit the majority of people who live in a permit parking area. Having an expensive 24 hour permit and day permits scratch cards would over cater for the long stay visitors and penalise those residents who have lots of short stay visitors.

With the duration of the short stay permit extended from the 2 hours originally proposed to 4 hours the need to use the daily scratch cards is reduced, especially in the controlled parking zones that do not operate 24 hours, which are the majority outside the city centre. Those on the edge of the city centre, including the one covering Chester Street, operate Monday to Saturday 8am to 6:30 pm and around the university Monday to Friday 10am to 4pm. Within

the city centre car parks are available for visitors to use if the full quota of scratch cards have been used.”

By way of a supplementary question, Julia Edgeley suggested that the system would be unfair on the elderly who could become confused. The transportation and network manager said that the review of the visitor parking permits was part of a general review of the controlled parking permit scheme introduced 25 years ago. There had been various problems with the scheme and the proposals sought to address these by taking into account best practice in other areas.

Councillor Stonard proposed that the recommendations in the report should be amended so that the cost of a day permit scratch card in the outer area was 50p, sold in multiples of 20 for £10, and that this was what had been consulted on. Councillor Bremner seconded the amendment. In response to a question, the committee was advised that the city centre area zones started with a "St" such as St Saviours, St Giles, etc. During discussion members considered the cost of purchasing the scratch cards in the outer areas. In response to a suggestion that residents could purchase fewer scratch cards, the transportation and network manager explained that the minimum purchase to cover the cost of administration was £10. Councillor Stonard pointed out that the scheme was self-financing and did not generate a profit. On being put to the vote, with all four voting members, voting in favour it was agreed to amend the recommendations to include the proposal for day permit scratch cards in the outer area to be 50p sold in multiples of twenty.

During discussion, a member pointed out that the proposed visitor parking permit scheme would make it more difficult for people to abuse the system and easier for the civil enforcement officers to enforce. Members considered the situation where households might have a number of regular visitors, including partners living away or a family member who worked away, and whether there was any provision for them to apply for a resident permit. In response, members were advised that the vehicle owner needed to be a resident and that the vehicle documentation needed to be registered at that address. The use of the 4 hour visitor permits would allow parking until the next morning in areas where there was no restriction after 18.30. People could also use limited waiting bays or park in neighbouring streets where there were no restrictions. It was also suggested that two hours was sufficient time for carers to visit their clients using the community care parking permit. Members were advised that residents in receipt of some means tested benefits were eligible for a free visitor permit.

A member asked if the decision on who could be granted a long stay care permit should be a joint one between the cabinet member and the head of city development services, rather than simply resting with officers. The head of city development services confirmed that he would consult with the cabinet member on all applications.

In summing up members considered that the scheme was a fair response to concerns about visitor parking permits being abused and ensuring that limited parking spaces on the highways were shared by residents.

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

- (1) note the consultation responses;
- (2) agree to replace the current visitor parking scheme with:
 - (a) a new short stay visitor permit offering 4 hours of parking costing £19 per annum (free to low income households);
 - (b) city centre day permit scratch cards priced at £1 each and sold in multiples of 10, and outer areas day permit scratch cards priced at 50 and sold in multiples of 20, up to a maximum of 60 per household per year.
- (3) agree the terms and conditions for the new visitor permit scheme as set out in appendix 4.
- (4) ask the head of city development services to implement the new visitor permit arrangements when the new permit issuing software goes live early in 2015.

6. Push the Pedalways – Heathgate to Valley Drive

During discussion, members were advised that painted signs on the highway were expensive to maintain but could be considered.

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

- (1) note the consultation responses;
- (2) ask the head of development services to arrange for the necessary statutory processes to implement the advertised proposal for a 20mph zone in Gurney Road, Britannia Road and Vincent Road.

7. Push the Pedalways – Programme update

Councillor Harris welcomed the report and said that she considered it very useful.

RESOLVED to note the report.

8. Major roadworks – regular monitoring

RESOLVED to note the report.

CHAIR