

**Norwich Highways Agency committee**

**10:00 to 11:05**

**21 September 2017**

Present: **County Councillors:**  
Fisher (chair) (v)\*  
Bills (v) (voting member substitute for  
Councillor Vincent)

**City Councillors:**  
Stonard (vice chair) (v)  
Bremner (v)  
Carlo  
Lubbock  
Peek

\*(v) voting member

Apologies: County Councillor Vincent (v) (other council business), Jones (C) and Thomson (other council business)

**1. Public questions/petitions**

**Public question Question 1 Agenda item 7 (item 6 below) – Transport for Norwich – Queens Road to Brazen Gate**

**Mrs Mary Chacksfield, Grove Walk, asked the following question:**

"We have noted that there is concern over the safety of cyclists negotiating the junction of Brazen Gate and Grove Road where there are conflicting right-turn movements, adverse gradients, and a road alignment that is conducive to high traffic speeds; there are fears that they could be vulnerable when turning into Grove Road. Has the Norfolk Constabulary been fully consulted on the safety aspects of the changes at this particular junction and what was their response?"

**The chair replied on behalf of the committee as follows:**

"The proposal will tighten the radii of the junction. This, together with the planned changes to road markings and use of coloured surfacing, will help to control vehicle speeds at this location. It is not proposed to change the road gradients but these are not excessive. Norfolk Constabulary has been consulted and supports the scheme. The design has been safety audited to ensure there are no inherent issues with the proposals."

As a supplementary question, Mrs Chacksfield asked "audited by whom?" and at the chair's invitation the transportation and network manager, Norwich City Council, explained that Norfolk County Council had a dedicated team, who were RoSPA (Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents) trained and fully qualified to assess the impact

of a scheme and road safety issues. She also said that a member of Norfolk Constabulary was often part of any safety audit panel.

**Member question/comment – Agenda item 8 (item 7 below), Lakenham Permit Parking Extensions – Barrett Road issues**

**Councillor Bremner asked the following question on behalf of Councillor Manning, Lakenham ward councillor:**

“The work conducted by officers and members since July’s Norwich Highways Agency committee (NHAC) on the ‘Barrett Road’ question is appreciated. Nonetheless, reversion to the plans presented to July’s NHAC committee means residents on this stretch are likely to suffer serious inconvenience to their daily routines as a result of a lack of capacity for car parking displaced from this stretch of road into the areas closest by their homes. Can the committee instead consider the installation on this stretch of road of a single yellow line with time-limited application? This may well be a viable compromise if the times within which parking is not permitted are fixed so as to (a) ensure free flow of traffic and an unobstructed roadside footpath in busy commuting hours but (b) allow residents an opportunity to park by their homes in evenings and at weekends.”

**The chair replied on behalf of the committee as follows:**

“I understand that officers have discussed the single yellow line option with the Network Management (Analysis and Safety) team at the county council, who are responsible for monitoring the efficiency and safety of the highway network. Their view is that a single yellow line (no waiting restriction) operating 8am to 6:30pm Monday to Saturday could potentially be a sensible compromise solution for this area. Furthermore if outside those times the parking could be limited to permit holders only, this would avoid the area being heavily parked during football matches. As part of such a compromise scheme, and to encourage people to park more on the road than the footway, it will be necessary to protect the pedestrian islands with a no waiting at any time restriction.

When we consider this report shortly, officers will be presenting a sketch of the single yellow line option for us to consider further.”

**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 20 July 2017.

#### 4. Transport for Norwich – City Centre Access Strategy

The transportation and network manager introduced the report. Members noted that the reference in recommendation 2(a) to appendix 1(c) was inaccurate and should be deleted.

The transportation planner, Norwich City Council, said that a late representation had been received from the Norwich Business Improvement District (BID) relating to the impact of cycling on the narrow streets and the effect that further restrictions to waiting and loading times would have on supply lines. These issues were addressed in the report. He pointed out that cycling on narrow streets such as Lower Goat Lane, Swan Lane and Back of the Inns already took place and it was self-regulating, with cyclists dismounting when it was busy. It was not proposed to put up large signs to restrict cycling or pedestrian times to certain times

The vice chair said that more residents had been in favour of option 2 but he understood the concerns regarding the shared use pedestrian spaces with cyclists. There was no evidence of an increased accident risk but cyclists needed to be aware of pedestrians and to encourage this, “share with care” signage. He suggested that the scheme was reviewed six months from the commencement of operation. The city council was in discussion with operators of cycle rental schemes and this would fit in with the timing of a review.

Discussion ensued in which the transportation planner referred to the report and answered members’ questions. He explained that the consultation had been conducted over a three week period and that over 700 businesses and residents had been contacted by letter and there had been press coverage twice during the consultation. The NATS/city agency manager, Norfolk County Council, said that the county council had been awarded £1.5 million “Pushing Ahead” funding from the Department of Transport to fund revenue schemes to promote walking and cycling over the next three years and could be used to promote safe use of new facilities. Members spoke in support of reviewing the scheme in six months’ time, with one member suggesting that the review should be after a year because it would take longer to change cyclists’ behaviours. A member suggested that the review should include surveying people using the street to obtain their views and that she supported “gentle cycling” in the city.

Councillor Carlo suggested that Bedford Street was used as a cycle route and had loading access arrangements which could be reviewed. The transportation planner said that Bedford Street was not part of the proposals but could be considered in future.

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

- (1) approve the installation of the scheme as set out below:
  - (a) cycle contraflow facilities on Bedding Lane, Lobster Lane, Little London Street, Muspole Street, St Swithins Road (plan CCAG2-HD-45-02-108), Timberhill and Willow Lane;
  - (b) associated changes to kerb alignment and installation of raised separators;

- (2) ask the head of city development services to complete the necessary statutory legal procedures to:
  - (a) allow cycling at all times and loading only between 5pm and 10am (on existing time restricted streets) as shown in appendix 1(d); and described as option 2 in the consultation;
  - (b) finalise the traffic regulation order to remove the no waiting Monday to Saturday 8am to 6:30pm on the northern edge of Westwick Street opposite property numbers 3 to 15 and replace with no waiting or loading at any time;.
  - (c) finalise the traffic regulation order to remove the no waiting Monday to Saturday 8am to 6:30pm on St Swithins Road and replace with no waiting or loading at any time;
  - (d) advertise the revised road hump notice for Westwick Street (plan CCAG2-HD-45-02-107);
  - (e) proceed with an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order to allow contraflow cycling on Cow Hill, Crooks Place (St Stephens Square to Wessex Street), Redwell Street, St Stephens Square and Ten Bell Lane;
  
- (2) ask the head of city development services to conduct a review six months from implementation of the scheme.

## **5. Proposed Conversion of Three End of Life Signalled Pedestrian Crossings**

(Councillor Coleshill, local member for Sewell Ward, attended the meeting for this item.)

During discussion, the transportation and network manager referred to the report and answered members' questions. Members considered the context of replacing signalised crossings in the current economic climate and that crossings installed in the '90s needed to be reviewed in terms of locations and type of crossing. Members were advised it was coincidental that the proposal was to replace three signalled pedestrian crossings with zebra crossings, and noted that in previous years this had not been the case. It was noted that the introduction of 20mph speed limits and traffic calming created a different environment on class C roads.

The vice chair said that he supported the proposals and that there was no evidence to be concerned about pedestrian access and safety from the use of zebra crossings at these locations.

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

- (1) ask the head of development services to carry out the necessary legal process of advertising the proposal of replacing Constitution Hill signalised crossing with a zebra crossing on a raised table in the position of the existing signalised crossing, including removal of all pedestrian guardrail as shown on Plan No.16/HD/24/06. Consideration of comments received from the consultation to be delegated to the head of city development services in consultation with the chair and vice chair of this committee;
- (2) approve the replacement of Grove Road signalised crossing with a zebra crossing and associated road works as shown on Plan No.15/HD/31/02;
- (3) approve the replacement of Unthank Road signalised crossing with a zebra crossing and associated road works as shown on Plan no 16/HD/30/01.

## **6. Transport for Norwich – Queens Road/Brazen Gate**

During discussion members welcomed the scheme. In reply to a members' question, the committee was advised that in the text on plan 3 (page 111 of the agenda papers) the use of "mandatory" meant that motorists must not enter the cycle lane, not that cyclists have to use it.

Councillor Carlo suggested that Queens Road should be made more environmentally friendly as it was an ugly piece of road. She also referred to the points made in the public question earlier at the meeting and given the residential development expressed concern about turning right at Brazen Gate into Grove Road. The transportation and network manager referred to the report and said that there would be a new zebra crossing just south of this junction and the cycle lane would be wider. This was the best solution as it was expected that the majority cycle journeys in this area were expected to be from north and south (as part of the Yellow Pedalway linking Brazen Gate and Lakenham Way) rather than turning right at this junction. The vice chair said that Queens Road was part of the inner ring road and therefore it was necessary for good visibility. The reduction of car use in the city meant that there could be more green schemes but it was difficult to identify funding for this.

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

- (1) approves the changes required to implement the scheme, including:
  - (a) provision of mandatory and advisory cycle lanes on Brazen Gate (see Appendix 4, drawing nos. PE4113-MP-002C, 003C & 004C);
  - (b) removal of a pedestrian refuge on Brazen Gate, just south of the Grove Road junction, and installation of a zebra crossing in its place (see Appendix 4, drawing no. PE4113-MP-003C);

- (c) installation of early release traffic signals with camera detection for cyclists at the Brazen Gate and All Saints Green junctions with Queens Road, together with changes to the traffic islands and controlled crossings (see Appendix 4, drawing no. PE4113-MP-002C);
  - (d) changes to the All Saints Green / Surrey Street junction to remove existing traffic signals and controlled pedestrian crossings and install informal crossing points (see Appendix 4, drawing no. PE4113-MP-001C);
  - (e) provide camera enforcement at the existing bus gate at Grove Road to allow use by buses only from Grove Road to Brazen Gate during the operational times of 07:30-09:30 Monday to Friday (see Appendix 4, drawing no. PE4113-MP-003C);
  - (f) provision of a southbound advisory cycle lane on All Saints Green, between the junctions with Surrey Street and Queens Road (see Appendix 4, drawing nos. PE4113-MP-001C & 002C);
- (2) asks the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory processes to confirm the following traffic regulation orders (TRO) and notices:
- (a) the Traffic Management Order - rescind the current TRO that covers the Grove Road bus gate, and introduce a new TRO that allows for civil enforcement of the bus lane over the same length and operational times as the existing one (see Appendix 4, drawing no. PE4113-MP-003C);
  - (b) installation of a new zebra crossing on Brazen Gate, just south of the junction with Grove Road (see Appendix 4, drawing no. PE4113-MP-003C).

## **7. Lakenham Permit Parking Extensions – Barrett Road issues**

The transportation and network manager presented a revised plan (which was circulated at the meeting) which sought to address the strength of feeling from Barrett Road residents as brought to the attention of the committee by Councillor Manning, Lakenham ward councillor. She explained that while ideally parking should be banned on Barrett Road, a compromise solution which allowed permit holders to park between 6:30pm and 8am Monday to Saturday and all day on Sundays, in areas between the pedestrian refuges was considered viable. The new proposal did not condone parking on the pavement as during these times parking could take place on the road without compromising capacity. A revised recommendation was circulated at the meeting.

Members welcomed the new proposal.

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, with all 4 voting members voting in favour, to ask the head of city development services to complete the statutory processes to implement the following waiting restrictions on Barrett Road between Long John Hill and Martineau Lane that are part of the Lakenham CPZ extension:

- (1) no waiting Monday to Saturday 8am to 6:30pm, permit holders only at all other times outside numbers 26-36 and 44-56 Barrett Road;
- (2) no waiting at any time in all other areas of this section of Barrett Road.

## **8. Proposed Variations to Off-street Car Park Fees and Charges**

**RESOLVED**, having considered the report, unanimously, with all 4 voting members voting in favour to support the proposed revised fees and charges as set out in appendices C and D of the report, to take effect from 13 November 2017.

## **9. On-street parking charges review**

The chair introduced the report.

During discussion, Councillor Carlo expressed concern that the proposed charges for car parking in the evening and at weekends could displace parking from the city centre into residential areas. The head of city development services, Norwich City Council, said that as part of the NATS (Norwich Area Transport Strategy) review there was recognition of the need to address the issue of Sunday and evening parking and that this would be considered with all other measures and it was important not to pre-judge the review at this stage. The chair said that Sundays had become a general trading day and that it was good to flag up that there would be further consideration of parking issues as part of the NATS review.

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

- (1) ask the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory processes to change the on street charges as follows:
  - A flat 50p parking charge and then:
  - 50p for each 15 minutes parked in higher band spaces.
  - 30p for each 15 minutes parked in lower band spaces.
- (2) note that charging during evenings and on Sundays will be considered as part of the up and coming Norwich Area Transportation Strategy (NATS) review.

CHAIR