NORWICH City Council

MINUTES

Norwich Highways Agency committee

10:00 to 10:40 **18 January 2018**

Present:	**County Councillors:**	**City Councillors:**
	Fisher (chair) (v)*	Stonard (vice chair) (v)
	Vincent (v)	Peek (v) (as substitute for Councillor Bremner)
	Bills	Carlo
	Jones (C)	Wright (substitute for Councillor Lubbock)
	Thomson	

*(v) voting member

Apologies: City Councillor Bremner, Lubbock and Sands (M)

1. Public Questions/Petitions

Public question 1

Ms Margaret Todd, Norwich Cycling Campaign, to ask the following question:

"Several schemes to improve provision for cycling installed in the past few years rely on painted lines for the safety of the route. The most obvious example is the Magdalen Street contraflow where the mandatory cycle lane is defined by a white line. In practice, many vehicles have to cross this line because of car parking on the other side of the road; both legal, illegal and sometimes just inconsiderate.

This line is the only protection for cycling, a visual signal to drivers that they must be aware of cycles in the contraflow line and not cross it unless it is safe to do so. This line is not advisory or for information, but a legally enforceable space on the highway and essential for safe cycling along this route. It has disappeared along much of its length.

Can the committee say when this line will be re-instated? What resources and plans are there in place to maintain this lane and others in a safe condition for the future?"

Councillor John Fisher, chair, to reply on behalf of the committee:

"Thank you for bringing this to my attention. The city council's highways team will make sure that the lining highlighted on Magdalen Street is included in the

> 2018 programme. Unfortunately it cannot be done sooner as this year's re-lining budget has already been spent. The city council's routine maintenance lining programme is usually undertaken during the spring and summer months, as the weather and road conditions at that time improves the durability of the refreshed lining and helps to ensure its lasts longer."'

As a supplementary question, Ms Todd asked that as the lines at this junction performed an essential safety function could re-lining be implemented before any injuries were sustained as it would be too late then. The chair confirmed that the committee would take on board her concerns. The highways design and maintenance manager, Norwich City Council, referred to the pressure on the highways maintenance budgets in the city and across the county, and said that difficult decisions had to be taken in prioritising requests for highways maintenance. He also noted that there were safety implications for stoplines for cyclists and asked that the Norwich Cycling Campaign advised the city council's highways maintenance team if there were any more that they considered should be investigated.

Public question 2 – This question relates to agenda item 6 – University Area Parking Consultation

Mr Hunt, Osborne Road, to ask the following question on behalf of Mr Paul Brett, Osborne Road:

> "Firstly I would like to say in short as possible way what has been happening up here for a number of years. We have had lots of problems with students parking here, leaving their cars here for up to three weeks at a time, so we have nowhere to park. There are six houses in Osborne Road that do not have driveways so we do not have the option of parking in our garden or will never have due to the angle of the embankment!
>
> The proposal is to place double yellow lines from Bluebell Road to 10 to 12 Osborne Road which won't work. Can you tell me where we are going to park? We have a mobility car for my son but don't have a badge. We agree that double lines need to be at the Blue Bell Road junction. We have spoken to people further down Osborne Road and explained that if this goes ahead we will have to park down there end and they aren't happy with that. Sorry for the explanation!
>
> My question is can we please have permit parking from the boundary of no 2 for approximately 40 metres towards Bluebell Road. This would resolve the parking issues for us and stop student parking.
>
> Please can you consider this as it would resolve the safety issues. Thank you."

Councillor John Fisher, chair, to reply on behalf of the committee:

> "Thank-you for your question, and I am sure that everyone can appreciate the frustration of not being able to park.
>
> I understand that, although Osborne Road as a whole did not support the idea of permit parking, there was more support at the Bluebell Road end of the street

than elsewhere. However the response rate was still low with only six of the first twenty homes responding (a 30 percent response rate) and only four of those six households supported the idea.

Although a majority of those who did respond supported permit parking, I do not believe that we can justify providing permit parking in these circumstances. We have not implemented individual permit parking bays outside extended permit parking zones anywhere else in the city and it would create a precedent that we do not have the resources to accommodate in other areas.

I understand from the report that it is possible to consider lesser restrictions on Osborne Road than the double yellow lines that were advertised. I am sure that the committee will want to consider that, and when officers introduce the report they will be suggesting an alternative proposal which they believe will help address the student parking problem."

In response to a question from Mr Hunt, the principal planner (transport), Norwich City Council, explained that a revised proposal for Osborne Road would be presented to the committee which would be double yellow lines on the south side of the road and a limited waiting bay operating between 10 am and 4 pm on the north side.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Minutes

RESOLVED to agree the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 21 September 2017.

4. Norwich Area Transportation Strategy Implementation Plan – Rose Lane and Prince of Wales Road

(A supplementary agenda containing revised graphs to paragraphs 33 and 35 of the main report, due to a formatting issue, had been circulated prior to the meeting.)

During discussion, Councillor Jones, Thorpe Hamlet Division, said that there had originally been a lot of objections in his division to the proposed scheme, but that following the changes he considered that the amended scheme would be broadly welcomed.

Councillor Stonard, vice chair, referred to the report and Norwich Area Transportation Strategy which following public consultation had established the principles for this scheme. The detailed scheme proposed in the report was based on traffic modelling and assessed against the impact of other transport strategy measures that had been implemented. This consultation was therefore another opportunity for members of the public to comment on the proposals for a scheme which would improve the environment in Prince of Wales Road.

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

During discussion the principal planner (transport) referred to the report and answered members' questions. Councillor Carlo expressed concern that Prince of Wales Road would not be restricted to bus and taxi use only and that air quality issues were not being addressed at Foundry Bridge. She said that she shared First Bus's disappointment with the proposed scheme as it did not allow two-way traffic for bus and taxi use only. The principal planner (transport) said that Foundry Bridge would be considered as part of the review of all the inner ring road junctions. He explained that modelling had shown that removal of general traffic from Prince of Wales Road would cause congestion in the surrounding road network. The improvements to Agricultural Hall Plain would simplify the system and achieve better bus times. The scheme provided better links with Mountergate and the mixed development sites at St Anne's Wharf and Rose Lane car park. He acknowledged that comments had been received from the bus operating companies which had yet to be reviewed.

The chair said that Norwich BID supported the proposals.

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

(1) note that the original strategic proposal to remove general traffic from Prince of Wales Road and make Rose Lane two-way has proven not to deliver the anticipated benefits, and the scheme has been refined to achieve the most positive outcomes for transport in the city centre;

(2) approve for consultation the proposals included in the Rose Lane / Prince of Wales Road project, including:

(a) re-aligning the road between the end of Mountergate and Prince of Wales Road, creating a new public space on Prince of Wales Road and a two-way link between Prince of Wales Road and Mountergate;

(b) closing Eastbourne Place to motorised traffic;

(c) narrowing Rose Lane to two traffic lanes along the majority of its length, providing wider pavements, an off-carriageway cycle route, landscaping and a bus and loading bays. The current bus lane is to be removed;

(d) converting King Street between Prince of Wales Road and Rose Lane to a pedestrian / cycle zone and close it to through motorised traffic at its junction with Prince of Wales Road, significantly upgrading this section of National Cycle Route No. 1. The direction of traffic flow along King Street to be reversed from Rose Lane through to the Greyfriars Road junction;

(e) moving the disabled space from King Street to Greyfriars Road;

(f) providing a cycle track through Cattlemarket Street from Rose Lane, linking with the existing facility;

(g) providing an enhanced pedestrian / cycle facility on Market Avenue;

(h) creating a contra-flow cycle lane on Bank Street, moving the disabled parking to the south side of the road;

(i) adjusting the layout of Agricultural Hall Plain to take account of the closure of King Street providing a new cycle link to Castle Meadow from Prince of Wales Road and wider pavements;

(j) maintaining Prince of Wales Road as a one-way route for motorised traffic, installing an off-carriageway contra-flow cycle route to the south side by narrowing the carriageway (but maintaining two lanes of traffic);

(k) closing St Faiths Lane to motorised traffic at its junction with Prince of Wales Road, maintaining two-way cycling and enhancing pedestrian provision;

(l) considering proposals to visually upgrade the area around the Foundry Bridge.

(3) ask the head of city development services to progress the statutory procedures associated with advertising the Traffic Regulation Orders that are necessary for the implementation of the first phases of the scheme as described in this report.

5. University Area Permit Parking Consultation

(A supplementary appendix to the report, comprising further consultation responses and the revised proposal for Osborne Road, was circulated at the meeting.)

The principal planner (transport) introduced the report. Members were advised of two corrections to the table set out in Appendix 5 of the report: Robson Road and Corie Road were shown in the tables to be included in controlled parking zones but were not included in the recommended schemes. This had no effect on the recommendations. He then explained the revised proposal for Osborne Road. Although, double yellow lines had been advertised in the traffic regulation order it was appropriate to review an alternative now. The proposal for a two hour limited waiting bay between 10 am and 4 pm would provide flexibility for residents.

During discussion the chair welcomed the revised proposal for Osborne Road and congratulated the officer on this solution. Councillor Wright, Eaton Ward councillor, said that he considered that, based on local residents comments, the revised proposal would be a good compromise and would address concerns about student and staff parking on Osborne Road.

The chair moved, seconded by the vice chair, the recommendations set out in the report and as amended in relation to Osborne Road, and it was:

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

(1) note the responses to the permit parking consultation;

(2) agree to implement a 10am to 4.00pm Monday to Friday permit parking scheme in Ambleside Close, Buttermere Road, Crummock Road, Earlham West Centre, Edgeworth Road, Enfield Road (part), Grasmere Close,

Hemlin Close, Keable Close, Pitchford Road (part), Rockingham Road, Scarnell Road, Wakefield Road, Wordsworth Road (part), as shown on the plans (nos. PL/TR/3329/776) attached in Appendix 1;

(3) agree to implement a 24-hour 7 day a week permit parking scheme in De Hague Road (part), Fairfax Road and Northfields as shown on the plan (no. PL/TR/3329/778) attached in Appendix 2;

(4) agree to convert the existing permit bays on North Park Avenue that currently operate 10am to 4pm Monday to Friday to 24 hour 7 day a week operation as shown on the plans (nos. PL/TR/3329/777) attached in Appendix 3;

(5) agree to implement the 'no waiting' arrangements associated with the permit parking scheme that was proposed in the South Park Avenue area and to implement additional waiting restrictions in the Norvic Drive area (but not to progress any permit parking in this area at the current time) as shown on the plans (nos. PL/TR/3329/779) attached in Appendix 4, and as amended in relation to Osborne Road as shown on the plan (no TR/PL/3329/783) (circulated at the meeting.);

(6) ask the head of city development services to complete the statutory processes to implement these proposals.

6. Transport For Norwich – Angel Road / Waterloo Road Cycling Improvements

The senior transportation planner, Norwich City Council, presented the report. She also referred to the letter from Councillor Brociek-Coulton and the Sewell Ward councillors which was circulated at the meeting.

In response to a question from the vice chair, the senior transportation planner confirmed that the width of Angel Road allowed 7.5 metres for vehicular traffic with the advisory cycle lane at 1.5 metres. There was not room for two vehicles to pass each other if a vehicle was parked on the side of the road in the limited waiting bay unless traffic moved into the cycle lane. Traffic modelling, undertaken following the implementation of the gyratory, showed that it had reduced traffic queues. Therefore a vehicle waiting on Angel Road for another to pass would not cause unacceptable congestion.

The senior transportation planner pointed out an amendment to the recommendation 2(b) with additional wording to authorise the statutory legal procedures were carried out in relation to a no waiting at any time restriction on Angel Road opposite Rosebery Road. This short section would improve traffic movements around the school.

RESOLVED to:

(1) agree the retention of the existing signalised crossing on Waterloo Road north of the junction with Angel Road;

(2) ask the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory legal procedures to:

(a) advertise and consult on the revised proposals for traffic calming on Waterloo Road and Angel Road as shown on plans PE4122-CO-012 to 016, including the cycle lane on Waterloo Road;

(b) confirm the traffic regulation order to install a 30 minute waiting area outside nos.126/128 Waterloo Road and a no waiting at any time restriction on Angel Road opposite Rosebery Road;

(3) delegate consideration of any comments received from the consultation to the head of city development services, in discussion with the chair and vice chair of this committee.

7. Transport for Norwich – Cycling improvements, Edward Street / Magpie Road Junction

RESOLVED, having considered the report, with all 4 voting members voting in favour to:

(1) approve for consultation the scheme to introduce a segregated cycle crossing of Magpie Road at its' junction with Edward Street. In addition to the crossing the scheme will have the effect moving the position of the Heath Road closure, changing the vehicle waiting restrictions in Heath Road and Esdelle Street, introducing a new cycle path on land to the east side of Edward Street and converting part of the footpath on the western side of Edward Street to shared use;

(2) ask the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory legal procedures to advertise the road notices and traffic regulation orders for the cycle scheme in Edward Street and Magpie Road as shown on plan No. PEA009-MP-004C.

CHAIR