



## NORWICH HIGHWAYS AGENCY COMMITTEE

10.00 a.m. – 11.15 a.m.

25 November 2010

Present:

**County Councillors:**

Adams (Chair) (V)  
Plant (V)  
Bearman  
Scutter  
Shaw

**City Councillors:**

Read (V)  
Bremner (V)  
Altman  
MacDonald  
Morphew

\*(V) – Voting Member

Apologies: N/a

### 1. WELCOME

The Chair welcomed Councillor Graham Plant who had replaced Councillor Adrian Gunson as county council cabinet member for travel and transport. He also welcomed back Jackie Rogers, Senior Committee Officer, Norwich City Council.

**RESOLVED** to ask the head of transportation, Norwich City Council, to send a thank you letter to Councillor Gunson on behalf of the committee, for all of his hard work.

### 2. PUBLIC QUESTION

#### Question 1 - Mount Pleasant / Albemarle Road

Ms Annelise Savill asked the following question:-

'We represent the Mount Pleasant and Albemarle residents and come here regarding the child and pensioner safety issues:

1. On 28 October 2010 we sent in a business case for inclusion of our roads on the 2011/12 Transport improvement projects programme.
2. We have asked the council officer for an acknowledgement of receipt. Additionally on 15 November and also the 17<sup>th</sup>, the 17<sup>th</sup> again and the 19<sup>th</sup> -- no reply.
3. We have asked the council officers on 6 October 2010 for the open, clear and transparent evaluation model for the budgets assessment. None has been forthcoming.

4. We have asked the council officers for a copy of the process on 6 October 2010 by which we can have access to this process of allocating funds. No reply.
5. We have been told on 6 October 2010 that safety in School areas are not a priority any more and must wait to be evaluated on accident statistics; when we have asked when the Council presented this change of approach to national guidelines and had it approved by this Committee -- we received no reply.

We believe that as tax-paying Citizens of this fine City we are entitled to access a full, open and transparent process. It is clear that the residents have not had proper access to the process we are by right entitled to. Indeed it has been clearly demonstrated that the process is not transparent, not open and has not got the independent and impartial decision-making process that is required of it by mandate.

My question is: how will this forum urgently address this undemocratic and unlawful situation and ensure that the Citizens of Norwich have access to a fair, open and transparent process that reflects the fundamental duty of the Council to its residents?'

Ms Savill said that the public were entitled to an open and transparent evaluation process so that they could see the evaluation process; how citizens can put forward a business case and how they are then evaluated against other submitted business cases.

(A written response was provided to Ms Savill at the meeting).

The head of transportation declared a personal interest because he knew Ms Savill in a personal capacity.

He informed members that the letter provided to Ms Savill outlined the proposed improvement projects within the programme. He also said that the most recent review of the evaluation process had gone before the committee in 2004 which agreed three main criteria to enable the prioritisation of traffic calming and similar projects. The criteria were 1) consideration towards the rate of accidents in the area; 2) whether schools were within the area; and 3) whether speeds were excessive in the area. The underlying priority of the committee was to prioritise areas where accidents happen.

He referred to the Norfolk local transport plan and local Norwich transportation strategy which provide an overall context for investment decisions. He also advised members that the budget deficit and comprehensive spending review would impact the improvement programme in the next year, providing additional challenges of where the money would be best spent.

In response to a request from Ms Savill for the council to provide a copy of the evaluation model and how their business case was to be evaluated against other cases, the head of transportation said that he could provide the relevant documents regarding the position of the committee, the local transport plan and the local Norwich transportation strategy.

Members said that they had no concerns regarding the evaluation process used but that it must remain open and transparent. They also acknowledged that many schemes are requested and that a balance of resources would be required throughout city areas.

## **Question 2 - Mount Pleasant / Albemarle Road 2**

Miss Stella Maynard asked the following question on behalf of the residents of Broadland Housing Association's sheltered housing scheme, The Cedars:-

'Why is it that there is no twice daily patrolling by a traffic warden covering Mount Pleasant and Albemarle Road at peak traffic times, i.e. between 08.00 and 09.00 and in the afternoon between 14.30 and 14.00?

No doubt the Committee is well aware of the acute traffic problems in the Newmarket Road/Mount Pleasant/Albemarle Road area during these peak times.'

Miss Maynard asked the committee to note an amended time of "14.30 and 16.00" to the above question.

The head of transportation informed the committee that there had been 18 patrol visits during September 2010 and 11 patrol visits in October 2010. The council was responsible for the civil enforcement throughout the entire city, which therefore required areas/needs to be prioritised, for example the patrol of Surrey Street to ensure that buses could get in and out; city centre parking to ensure an adequate flow of traffic; and for every school area to be patrolled at least once a month. It was suggested that the list of priorities should be brought back to the committee for consideration.

Due to the stretching of resources, members suggested schools could provide additional enforcement for example spot checks, to help ease the problem of the illegal parking of parents around schools.

## **Cameron Court meets Jamieson Place**

**Question 3 – Mrs Haze asked the following question:-**

'Would the Committee consider painting double yellow lines in the part of the road where Cameron Court meets Jamieson Place? A number of residents have had near accidents with pedestrians (mainly children) whilst reversing their cars out of their garages here, due to the blind spots that the cars create and we fear for the potential for future fatalities.'

Councillor Altman, City Councillor informed members that Sergeant John Bills had said that there was a high chance of an accident happening and that preventative action should be taken.

The transportation manager said that due to the need to balance resources, the policy of the committee was to focus on the main road network and areas with a history of accidents, however she would investigate into whether a legal order

existed for further double yellow lines on the road and feed this back to Councillor Altman.

**RESOLVED** to ask the head of transportation to:-

- (1) provide Ms Savill with the relevant documents regarding the position of the committee with regard to including projects within the improvement programme; the local transport plan; and the local Norwich transportation strategy;
- (2) produce a report for consideration at a future committee on the needs and areas prioritised for civil enforcement throughout the city;
- (3) draft a letter from the Chair to heads of schools encouraging them to provide additional parking enforcement within school areas.
- (4) ask the transportation manager to investigate into whether a legal order existed for further double yellow lines on Jamieson Place and feed this back to Councillor Altman.

### **3. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 23 September 2010.

### **4. CONSULTATION RESULTS ON EXTENDING THE EASTERN, NORTHERN AND SOUTH WESTERN CONTROLLED PARKING ZONES**

The transportation manager presented the report and added that 2 members of the wards affected by the report had commented; Cllr Fairbairn of Lakenham fully supported the recommendations for the SE cpz, while Cllr Grahame of Thorpe Hamlet was concerned about the impact that football parking had in her area, particularly in light of the recent sale of the football club car parks. She explained that the council would not have any control over the sale of the football club car parking which was agreed approximately 10 years ago.

Ms Susan Smith and Mr Nigel Hodge, public speakers said that there were major concerns regarding parking in the Thorpe Park area and were in agreement with the proposals.

The Chair moved and Councillor Plant, County Councillor seconded that it was:

**RESOLVED** to:-

- (1) note the consultation response and agree not to install extensions to the Northern and South Eastern Controlled Parking Zones;
- (2) ask the head of transportation to carry out the necessary statutory process associated with implementing the following waiting restrictions:-
  - Extension of the Eastern CPZ zone C to include double yellow lines on Wilson Road, with single yellow lines, limited waiting

and permit parking on Scott Road and Glendenning Road as detailed on Plan No. PL/TR/3355/796

- Double yellow lines to Denmark Road as detailed on Plan No. PL/TR/3355/794
- Double yellow lines on Crome Road as detailed on Plan No. PL/TR/3355/795

## **5. NORWICH AREA TRANSPORTATION STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION – DEREHAM ROAD BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT) PHASE 1**

Mark Kemp, design manager (major projects), presented the report and responded to members' questions. The report recognised that the banned right turns into Old Palace Road and Heigham Street could result in an increase of through traffic trying to use the side streets for example Goldsmith Street. This would be dealt with as any issues arose. He explained that the consultation process would pick up any further issues regarding the traffic movements near the junction of Dereham Road and Old Palace Road.

Members said that cycle routes should be given equal weighting as bus lanes. Councillor Read, City Councillor suggested that the text 'except for cycles' should be included in recommendation (1) f) of the report.

Mr Alan Urvin, public speaker representing Mr David Utting of Uttings Garage on Goldsmith Street stated that the proposed improvements to traffic flow during rush hour would be positive, however the proposals would result in blocking off the main access to the garage. This would compromise the planned expansion of Uttings Garage. He also asked whether the project could be reconsidered in light of potential funding cuts. In response, the design manager (major projects) stated that the proposals were part of a much larger plan to cover future years; that all documents were available to the public for consultation; and that the points raised above would be taken into consideration as part of the consultation.

Members broadly supported the proposals including the proposed diagonal crossing on the Old Palace Road junction; the reinstatement of the cycle routes; and that the bus management at the far end of Grapes Hill would improve general traffic flow. However it was stated that the raised junction tables, as shown on the plan for use at Douro Place, could cause stability problems for cyclists. Mark Kemp said that he would review the need for this element of the scheme prior to public consultation.

The funding for the project was coming from the development and community growth point funding via the Greater Norwich Development Partnership, which the city council and county council had worked hard to secure.

The Chair moved and Councillor Bearman, County Councillor, seconded that it was:

### **RESOLVED to:-**

- (1) approve for consultation the proposals to:
  - a) an right turns from Dereham Road into Old Palace Road and Heigham Road except for Pedal Cycles;

- b) introduce mandatory cycle lanes with “no loading at any time” at the Dereham Road/Old Palace Road junction;
  - c) introduce a 24-hour, 7 days a week bus lane with “no loading at any time” on the Dereham Road approach to the junction with Grapes Hill/Barn Road;
  - d) introduce bus pre-signals to allow the buses to proceed from the bus lane into the right turn lane on the Dereham Road approach to the junction with Grapes Hill/Barn Road;
  - e) change the operational time of the existing bus lane on Dereham Road, from near Gurney Road to near the Outer Ring Road, to 24 hours a day, 7 days a week;
  - f) make St Benedict’s Street eastbound only at the junction with Barn Road/Grapes Hill, except for pedal cycles;
  - g) introduce a ‘no entry’ restriction at the southern end of Goldsmith Street with its junction with Midland Street;
  - h) introduction of high quality BRT bus stops
  - i) extend the 30mph restriction on Dereham Road by 70m in a westerly direction from the Norwich Road junction.
- (2) agree to local community and stakeholder’s consultation on the detailed proposals.
- (3) ask the head of transportation and head of legal and democratic services to progress the necessary statutory procedures associated with advertising the following which are shown on plan numbers PA1004-GP-080, PA1004-GP-081, PA1004-GP-082 and PA1004-GP-084:
- a) the banned right turns at the Old Palace Road junction;
  - b) the mandatory cycle lanes at the Old Palace Road junction;
  - c) the changes to the parking and loading restrictions on Dereham Road between Old Palace Road and Barn Road;
  - d) the creation of the bus lane on the Dereham Road approach to Grapes Hill/Barn Road junction for use by Buses, Taxis and Pedal Cycles, operating 24 hours a day, 7 days a week;
  - e) the proposed change of operational time of the existing bus lane on Dereham Road from near Gurney Road to near the Outer Ring Road for use by Buses, Taxis and Pedal Cycles, operating 24 hours a day, 7 days a week;
  - f) the eastbound only operation of St Benedict’s Street at it’s junction with Grapes Hill/Barn Road, except for Pedal Cycles;
  - g) the ‘no entry’ restriction at the southern end of Goldsmith Street;
  - h) the creation of Bus Stop Clearways at the BRT stops that are within the CPZ;
  - i) the extension of the 30mph speed limit on Dereham Road by 70m in a westerly direction from near the Norwich Road junction.

## **6. REVIEW OF DAYTIME CHARGES IN ON STREET PARKING PAY AND DISPLAY BAYS**

Members supported the proposals and said that a moderate increase in charges should not greatly affect customers and would bring in additional revenue. Members hoped that a continued process of moderate increases to charging would avoid any large increases which could potentially deter people from visiting the city. The transportation manager said that initial stage of introducing a moderate price increase in secondary areas would enable the council to assess the impact on use and whether customers start to use alternative parking options instead. The changes would be advertised on pay and display machines.

A member also stated that the misuse of parking bays resulted in a loss of revenue for the council and that the regulations should be enforced.

The Chair moved and Councillor Altman, City Councillor, seconded that it was:

### **RESOLVED to:-**

- (1) ask the head of transportation to carry out the necessary statutory procedures to increase the tariff for on street parking in the secondary areas of the City Centre from 20p per 15 minutes to 25p per 15 minutes, to take affect as soon as possible.
- (2) ask the Head of Transportation to report to the November 2011 meeting of this committee with a view to implementing a further increase in the tariff in the secondary areas of the City Centre to 30p per 15 minutes.
- (3) to agree that there should be no increase in the current tariffs for the core area at the current time, and ask the head of transportation to review the situation in November 2011.
- (4) ask the head of transportation to carry out the necessary statutory procedures to enable the following changes to on street restrictions to be completed;
  - a) change the pay and display bay in Stepping Lane to a permit parking bay for St Julian permit holders, as shown on plan number PL/TR/3329/724/1
  - b) change the pay and display bay in Music House Lane to a permit parking bay for St Julian permit holders, as shown on plan number PL/TR/3329/724/3
  - c) change the pay and display bay in St Martins Lane to a permit parking bay for St Mary permit holders, as shown on plan number PL/TR/3329/724/2
  - d) change the tariff for the pay and display bays in Mountergate from the core rate to the secondary rate
  - e) change the loading bay on the south side of St Giles Street to a core area pay and display bay operating 7:30am to 6:30pm Monday to Saturday, maximum stay 60 minutes, tariff 40p per 15 minutes, as shown on plan number PL/TR/3329/724/4

## **7. ON STREET PARKING ENFORCEMENT MONITORING REPORT**

Members considered the report.

**RESOLVED** to note that income and issuing of penalty charge notices are above budget.

## **8. TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS PROGRAMME**

(Councillor Read, City Councillor, was absent from the meeting for this item only).

The transport manager presented the report and explained that due to the uncertain budget situation, it was very likely that it would not be possible to complete all of the projects within the programme. In response to members' questions she stated that there was some flexibility in the priority order of projects but otherwise they would follow the priority class as identified in the report. She confirmed that if the full funding was not forthcoming, it would be possible to complete a few lower cost projects in place of one of the more expensive projects, but that this would need to be decided by members.

The Chair moved and Councillor Bremner seconded that it was:

**RESOLVED** to:-

- (1) endorse the list of projects for submission for funding in 2011/12, and their relative priorities within that list.
- (2) ask Norfolk County Council's cabinet to consider funding the schemes in priority order in the context of the final settlement from central government
- (3) ask the head of transportation to confirm to members the final content of the 2011/12 capital improvement programme, when Norfolk County Council's Cabinet has allocated funding

## **9. NORWICH CITY AGENCY REVIEW**

**RESOLVED** to note the contents of the report.

## **10. HIGHWAY PERFORMANCE MONITORING OF THE HIGHWAYS AGENCY AGREEMENT**

**RESOLVED** to note the available performance results.

## **11. MAJOR ROADWORKS – REGULAR MONITORING**

**RESOLVED** to note the contents of the report.

CHAIR