

**Norwich Highways Agency committee**

**10:00 to 11:50**

**20 July 2017**

Present:     **County Councillors:**                     **City Councillors:**  
                  Fisher (chair) (V)\*                     Stonard (vice chair) (V)  
                  Vincent (V)                                 Bremner (V)  
                  Bills   Carlo  
                  Jones (C)                                 Lubbock  
                  Thomson                                 Peek

\*(V) voting member

**1. Public questions/petitions**

**Petition in favour of permit parking in College Road (between The Avenues and Earlham Road)**

**Professor Chris Edwards, College Road, presented the following petition:**

“Since permit parking was introduced in the part of College Road between Unthank Road and The Avenues in late March 2017 there has been a marked increase in the number of non-residents parking on the portion of College Road for which permit parking is now requested, as well as a commensurate increase in vehicular traffic. This creates considerable inconvenience for residents as well as a risk to road safety, particularly in respect of children from the three schools in the immediate vicinity. The majority of residents of the area covered by the petition are at a loss to understand why the council chose to institute a partial permit parking scheme and repeated enquiries of Bruce Bentley and his team have drawn a blank.

The majority of residents of the area covered by the petition are at a loss to understand why the council chose to institute a partial permit parking scheme covering only part of College Road given that an informal survey of the residents conducted by ward councillors in June 2016 showed a majority in favour of permit parking. Instead, the council decided to include the non-permitted section of College Road in the Welsh streets area that was added to the permit parking consultation programme for 2018-19. However, the Welsh streets are much further away from the newly permitted College Road and they are not suffering from parking displacement. We would like the council to bring forward a Traffic Regulation Order for extending permit parking along College Road to a much earlier date by including it in the area next programmed for formal consultation.

A petition has been circulated to residents of the properties in the affected area of College Road asking the following question:

'We, the undersigned residents living on College Road call on Norwich Highways Agency to extend permit parking at the earliest possible time. A partial permit parking introduced along two thirds of College Road in spring 2017 has displaced parking onto College Road between Avenue Road and Earlham Road. Together with traffic generated by three local schools, this has created additional parking difficulties for local residents and additional road safety risks due to increased traffic volumes.'

Of the 72 residential properties in the affected area, we were able to talk to 52 households of which 42 households (81%) have supported the petition. The petition has 54 signatures."

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

"Thank you for the petition.

The extent of the consultation on permit parking was consequent on the informal survey undertaken by ward councillors, and despite Professor Edwards assertion, that survey did not show a majority support for permit parking in the northern section of College Road between The Avenues and Earlham Road, and consequently we did not consult in that area.

I understand that residents who have contacted the council have been advised that further extension of the permit parking area might be possible but that currently, the team who undertake this work are fully committed to implementing permit parking schemes elsewhere in the city, and will be unable to progress any additional changes until next financial year at the absolute earliest. We are considering two schemes at the committee today, and have already committed to further extensions around the University of East Anglia, and in Thorpe. These committed locations must come first as residents in these locations have already been promised a consultation."

**The following questions related to agenda items 5 and 6 (items 4 and 5 below):**

**Question 1 – Kelly Bray, Long John Hill, asked the following question:**

"I am Kelly Bray, proprietor of pod (hairdressing salon) Long John Hill. It was my dream to have my own salon and after 17 years' hard work, I had the capital to open the salon. If this proposal goes ahead, it will have a massive financial impact on our businesses within the salon. I have four staff who are all self-employed. We need longer than two hours parking for our clients as colours and colour corrections can take far longer than two hours. If the salon ceases to trade then their businesses will also fail. I am very concerned about the future of the salon. The proposals do not provide adequate parking for our clients and it is unfair that our businesses are being penalised for this. If members agree the proposals, is there an option where I can purchase or reserve spaces for our clients? How will the permits be issued for clients and staff as this is a necessity

for my business and our future, please bear in mind we have minimum of four members of staff which each all will have a client at any one time.”

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

“I note from the report that originally a one-hour period was proposed for the car park, which was supported by four of the businesses in your parade, but that now, a mixture of one and two-hour spaces are recommended, with an additional bay on-street with parking limited to four hours. This is a direct response to the concerns that you have raised.

I believe that you have already been advised of the permits that are available to you, that would enable you to park in the permit bays in the area, but in common with every other business in our non-city centre permit areas, you would be able to apply for two permits for employees vehicles (each can have two registration numbers on them) and one two-hour permit valid on any vehicle for customers. If you wish, you can swap one or both of the employee permits for the customer ones, which, I understand, is what many salons in other permit areas actually do.

We have a report before us today, about the possible extension of permit parking into the Lakenham area, and I am certain that members will consider your concerns whilst considering that report.”

**Question 2 – Sheree Leeds, Milverton Road, asked the following question:**

“The changes proposed hint at reducing cars used by commuters into the city. As there's no provision of any bus or cycle lanes on Bracondale this reduction is not about to happen any time soon. My question is how would adding to the congestion on Bracondale during the morning and evening rush help to reduce pollution?”

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

“The introduction of permit parking areas is for two principle reasons. One is to ensure that the very limited parking available on-street within the city centre and surrounding areas is prioritised for residents to use, and the other is to reduce the amount of free parking available for commuter and shopper parking in those areas, to encourage the use of Park and Ride services and other forms of sustainable transport.

Overall, our transport strategy has increased usage of public transport, and levels of cycling have risen by 40 per cent in the past two years. Levels of traffic in the city centre have been stable over many years, so I am confident that we are making inroads into reducing congestion. There is no reason to believe that any part of the current proposals for changes to the permit parking areas will have any negative impact on Bracondale.”

As a supplementary question Sheree Lees said that cars coming into the city centre would not be able to pass on Corton Road because the road was not wide enough for cars to pass when cars were parked on both sides. The principal planner (transportation), Norwich City Council, said that the chair had replied to this question

and that the presentation of the report would demonstrate that the changes to permit parking would not lead to an increase of traffic on Bracondale.

**Question 3 – Question asked on behalf of Philippa Smith, Bracondale, by Richard Lee-Warder, also of Bracondale:**

“When planning the changes to the parking bays in Corton Road what, if any, consideration has been given to the safety and health of the local population who include pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities e.g. the blind, the elderly and infirm or those who need to use wheelchairs or mobility scooters?”

My reason for asking this question is that at the moment Corton Road is wide enough for two cars to pass each other safely or indeed for a car to overtake a cyclist or someone who is using the road with their wheelchair or mobility scooter. In places the pavement is not wide enough for a mobility scooter or a wheelchair to pass safely and, therefore, on occasions users have to use the carriageway for a short distance. This works well at the moment and does not cause a problem for anyone.

Corton Road has a 90 degree bend in it. Parking bays on each side of the road will mean that as the road will only be wide enough for one car to pass between the parked vehicles and drivers wanting to pass along the road will be tempted to gamble that the route is clear enough for them to get from one end to the other (round the blind corner) before they meet a car coming in the other direction. Inevitably drivers are likely to speed to complete this dangerous manoeuvre as quickly as possible, so that they do not meet a car coming in the other direction, and have to reverse, potentially out into the main road of Bracondale. It is also likely that drivers, many of whom seem to have very little understanding of how to overtake a cyclist safely, will be tempted to “just get past the cyclist” when it is too narrow to do so safely. If the proposed changes are made to Corton Road it will be extremely dangerous for cyclists and those in wheelchairs and mobility scooters to use.

At present there is a route which can safely be used by pedestrians, cyclists and those in wheelchairs or mobility scooters which allows access from Bracondale along Corton Road to Lakenham Primary School, The High School, Sainsburys, Tesco Express, the doctor’s surgery at Wessex Street and numerous other locations. It avoids the necessity to be on the main road and subject not only to the danger of vehicles (in the case of cyclists), but also the noise and the extremely high volume of fumes and pollution. You will be aware that there is not a cycle lane along Bracondale or City Road. The present route via Corton Road makes use of minor roads, the church and several pedestrian crossings and is an asset to the community.

It may be that plans are afoot to make Corton Road one direction, but this in itself will cause further problems, including increased pollution and not make it any safer for pedestrians, cyclists, wheelchair users or mobility scooters. To add a few parking bays, which may I add have not been universally requested by those in either zone Y or zone Z seems a small gain in comparison to the potential dangers to which those not in cars will be exposed.”

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

“Corton Road, like many side streets in the city centre, already has permit parking along both sides for some of its length. I note that the proposal is for another short length with permit parking on both sides, separated by quite long lengths where parking is more restricted. The carriageway on Corton Road is also 7.5 metres wide which is significantly wider than many city streets (many of which are less than 6 metres wide and have parking on both sides for their entire length resulting in parking on footways).

Therefore, there is more than enough room to have parking bays on both sides of Corton Road within the carriageway, without any obstruction to the footways. Clearly the existing permit parking on both sides of Corton Road does not cause congestion issues, so it seems unlikely that this similar arrangement would either.

Residents made it clear to their local councillors that they were concerned to ensure that more permit parking was made available but wished to see the retention of the short stay bays, so the scheme that was put for consultation includes both those elements. The single yellow line is retained at the junction with Bracondale, so there is little likelihood of any need to reverse out of Corton Road.

There are no proposals to make Corton Road one-way.”

Richard Lee-Warder by way of a supplementary question referred to Corton Road and said that the Zone Y part of the road was wide enough but Zone Z was not wide enough. The principal planner (transportation) confirmed that both parts of the road had been measured and there was sufficient room for the proposed scheme.

**Question 4 - Richard Lee-Warder, Bracondale, asked the following question:**

“We feel privileged to live in the centre of our wonderful city and to protect and work with you trying to protect and develop Norwich for everyone

Although we live in Zone Z permit parking and within a few yards of the proposed permit bay changes to Corton Road which will affect every type of user from pedestrian to cyclists, schoolchild to elderly, infirm to able, we did not receive any notification by letter.

You will be aware we first became aware of changes when paper planning notices were displayed late in June thus discharging a statutory duty.

You will be aware that sadly these were destroyed after two days by the heavy storms and many Zone Z residents have not seen the proposed changes. There is extremely strong feeling that this has been slipped in under the radar.

Please could you vote for a stay of execution today so that we don't feel the councillors have been railroaded into these changes and would councillors confirm, please, if they have visited Corton Road since the changes to Finkelgate as we would wish to extend them an invitation please?

Councillor Patrick Manning has visited the site and road very recently.”

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

“It is a statutory requirement that both site and press notices are published when changes to parking and waiting restrictions are proposed. The site notices that are posted are prepared on special weatherproof paper, and three were posted on Corton Road. Other notices that were posted at the same time in other locations were not affected by the weather, so it seems very unlikely that uniquely, all these notices were. In addition, I understand that every resident who responded to the original consultation and provided an email address was sent a link to the report before this committee today a week ago. This report clearly outlines the proposals, and details the closing date for representation. I do not accept therefore, that these proposals have ‘slipped under the radar. In fact, there has been substantially more opportunity to find out about them than would normally be the case.

It is not normal practice to write to residents (and particularly residents of a different street) where minor changes to parking are proposed, particularly where this affects arrangements that could be used by anyone. A site notice ensures that everyone who makes use of a particular facility have the opportunity to comment. It is clear from the level of response received that residents of the area have had the opportunity to make their views known.

I propose that the committee discusses the proposals whilst considering this report.”

The chair confirmed that he had visited Corton Road and surrounding streets several times in recent months.

By way of a supplementary question, Richard Lee-Warder referred to the omission of Bracondale residents between City Road and Corton Road from the consultation on the extension of permit parking to 24/7 and asked whether members were aware of this. The principal planner (transportation) confirmed that a supplementary report containing the consultation responses and officer response had been circulated to members at the meeting and would be incorporated into the presentation.

## Question 5

### **Councillor Bremner presented the following question for Councillor Patrick Manning, Lakenham ward councillor, on behalf of Barrett Road residents:**

“Residents living on Barrett Road in houses 6-60 are deeply concerned at the possible loss of currently unrestricted parking spaces outside their properties resulting from the introduction of double yellow lines.

These residents do not object to the establishment of a permit parking zone in surrounding roads in which they might park instead if double yellow lines are introduced but are afraid that in reality they will be unable to park there under the proposed new scheme. The closest roads – Arnold Miller Road, Arnold Miller Close, Long John Hill, Huxley Road and Huxley Close – already suffer high completion for on-road spaces. In addition, many homes on these roads have driveways which reduce the capacity even further for cars displaced from our area as we could not park opposite those driveways without risk of effectively blocking them in. New double yellows have been painted on the lower part of Netherwood Green which runs onto Arnold Miller Road, reducing capacity further still.

That part of the report to this committee dealing with these residents’ stretch of Barrett Road notes that pedestrians are forced into the road because parked cars obstruct the pathway. Whilst it is true that cars are usually parked partly on the footpath so as to reduce obstruction to traffic travelling east towards County Hall, pedestrians are not in fact made to walk on the road because a second, parallel footpath, on the bank on which nos. 6-60 sit, runs exactly the same length as the path by the roadside. Pedestrians prefer the path in front of the houses as it is screened from the road by iron posts and by trees. The eastern end of this path has a very gentle incline onto the lower end of Arnold Miller Road and the western end of the path, by the Red Orange convenience store, is accessible by just two steps, directly next to which a small earthen slope also exists where wheeled transport such as bikes, pushchairs and wheelchairs have worn away part of the grass bank in preference to negotiating the two steps. If these two steps were removed and converted to a gentle slope to match the other end of the path, then pedestrians would have little or no need to use the roadside path, where residents park, at all.

Traffic moves very freely along this stretch of road at all times of day. Even when cars are parked along the entire stretch of the lower path, traffic heading east is not forced to slow down or to stray into the western-heading side of the road. Cars parked in this area by County Hall staff can occasionally interfere but the introduction of permit parking would resolve that issue.

Many residents in houses 6-60 have children or are of advanced years. The need to park by their homes is great. The reasons given to this committee for altering the existing arrangements could be addressed without removing residents’ right to park in front of their homes.

The question submitted for your consideration is therefore this: can plans to prevent parking on this stretch of Barrett Road via double yellow lines be placed

'on hold' whilst consideration is given to allowing parking to continue on the current basis, applying funds instead to the conversion of the steps at the western end of the higher path to a slope?"

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

"This is a case where it is necessary to balance the desires of residents to park with the need to keep the Ring Road free of obstruction and the footpath clear for pedestrians to use.

The parked cars clearly do obstruct the footway, and whilst there is an alternative route, this is too narrow and constrained for wheelchairs and pushchairs to pass and includes ramps and steps. Removing the steps would be difficult given the varying levels of the footway and the adjoining private gardens.

This particular issue has been raised as part of the consultation on the extension of permit parking into Lakenham and discussed within the report. I understand that the committee could determine not to introduce double yellow lines on this part of Barrett Road and substitute it with permit parking. I am therefore going to suggest that this issue is debated as part of the consideration of the Lakenham permit parking extension report."

**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 16 March 2017.

**4. Potential Changes to the operational hours of Permit Parking Zones W, X, Y and Z**

The principal planner (transportation) presented the report and said that a resident had kindly pointed out that two short sections of permit parking on Bracondale between City Road and Corton Road that should have been included in the 24/7 proposals had been omitted. Residents who had responded to the consultation had been informed that these sections were included in the recommendation to the committee. A supplementary report containing the responses received on the Corton Road proposals was circulated at the meeting. The presentation included slides demonstrating the width of Corton Road in both sections of the road.

During discussion members confirmed that they were familiar with Corton Road and the surrounding streets. Members noted that the two hour parking bays had been provided to meet the needs of visitors to the sheltered housing schemes and the care home in the area. The vice chair said that there had been a mixed response from the Bracondale residents, but on balance, when taking into account the officer response, the greatest weight should be given to the needs of the Corton Road residents. The Bracondale Residents' Association had broadly welcomed the provision of additional permit parking.



**RESOLVED**, unanimously, to:

- (1) note the responses to the permit parking consultation;
- (2) note that no changes are recommended in Zones W and X;
- (3) agree to change the existing permit parking bays to 24 hour, seven day a week operation in the following locations:
  - (a) Zone Y - City Road (from the ring road to just south of the junction with Cricket Ground Road), Doman Road, Kensington Place, Cricket Ground Road (as far as, but not including Geoffrey Road), Carshalton Road, Carlisle Road and Corton Road (part);
  - (b) Zone Z – Corton Road (remaining part) Carrow Hill and Southgate Lane;
  - (c) agree to include the two existing permit parking areas on Bracondale, situated between City Road and Corton Road in the extension of the 24/7 permit parking area;
- (4) agree to the following changes to the parking arrangements in Corton Road:
  - (a) A slight extension to the existing permit bay to accommodate a further two cars (Zone Z);
  - (b) The conversion of the section of single yellow line opposite the existing permit parking to permit parking (approx. 9 spaces – Zone Z);
  - (c) The retention of some of the single yellow line (approx. four spaces).
- (5) ask the head of city development services to complete the statutory processes to implement these proposals shown on Plan No. PL/TR/3584/428.3 and in appendices 3(a) and 3(b) as attached to the report.

## **5. Lakenham Area Permit Parking Consultation**

The principal planner (transportation) introduced the report with the aid of plans and slides. He advised members that a short section of yellow line proposed in the garage court adjacent to number 133 Netherwood Green should be included as a permit parking area.

During discussion members sought assurance that the parking arrangements for the shops would not have an adverse impact on the businesses at Long John Hill. The principal planner (transportation) said that the only change made to the proposals following consultation had been the extension of the waiting period to two hours and the longer four hour waiting bay in response to Ms Bray's comments during the consultation. The original proposal was for a one hour waiting period for the entire car park in front of the shops. Members noted that the bays would be used by other users

but concluded that when taking into account the parking permits available to the hairdressing salon and the revised arrangements, there should be no adverse effect on this business.

Discussion ensued on the proposal to implement the no waiting and limited waiting arrangements associated with the permit parking scheme along the whole length of Barrett Road and the alternative proposal raised on behalf of the residents of 6 to 60 Barrett Road to substitute permit parking instead. The head of citywide development, Norwich City Council, said that consideration would be given to the proposal to replace the two steps at the western end of the path by the convenience store, but it would need to be Disability Discrimination Act compliant and drainage and other issues would need to be taken into account. Councillor Lubbock said that whilst she had sympathy for the residents, Barrett Road was part of the ring road and therefore parking along it was very dangerous. The vice chair said that it was important that the ring road and pedestrian paths were kept clear. However, he considered that further consideration should be given to the impact on the residents of 6 to 60 Barrett Road to provide a more acceptable solution that would address the competing needs. Councillor Bremner seconded this proposal and with the other voting members concurring the principle of not implementing waiting restrictions on this stretch of Barrett Road until other options had been explored was agreed. The major projects manager, Norfolk County Council said that the safety audit had been conducted on the basis of the implementation of waiting restrictions on the whole of Barrett Road and therefore he suggested members deferred a decision on recommendation (3) until a revised safety audit and further consultation had been carried out and the outcome reported to a future meeting.

In reply to a member's question about concern that the introduction of parking restrictions would cause displacement parking into other streets, the NATS/city agency manager, Norfolk County Council, said that the proposal was to prevent county council employees parking in residential streets. The county council's travel plan sought to reduce car use by car sharing and other measures.

The chair then moved to the vote with the recommendation (3) as amended above:

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

- (1) note the responses to the permit parking consultation;
- (2) agree to implement an 8.00am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday permit parking scheme in Arnold Miller Close, Arnold Miller Road, Birkbeck Close, Birkbeck Road, Barrett Road (part), Hall Road (part), Huxley Close, Huxley Road, Keyes Close, Keyes Road, Long John Hill (part), Longmead, Mansfield Lane (part), Martineau Lane, Mendham Close, Netherwood Green, Suncroft and Sunny Hill as shown on the plans (nos. PL/TR/3584/428.1, 2, and 3) attached in Appendix 1
- (3) agree to implement the short section of permit parking adjacent to no.133 Netherwood Green in lieu of the proposed double yellow line
- (4) defer a decision to a future meeting, on the implementation of the proposed no waiting arrangements associated with the permit parking scheme on the length of Barrett Road in front of 6 to 60 Barrett Road pending further a safety audit.

- (4) introduce pedestrian zones (access only) to the front of 31-69, 103-133 and 116-138 Barrett Road.
- (5) agree to implement a 1-hour limited waiting period on the east side of the car park outside the Long John Hill shops and 2-hour limited waiting on the west side with three 4-hour spaces on Arnold Miller Road in place of the previously advertised double yellow line adjacent to the pet grooming parlour.
- (6) ask the head of city development services to complete the statutory processes to implement these proposals.

**6. Miscellaneous Waiting Restrictions for Implementation**

Councillor Bremner, University Ward councillor, said that he welcomed the revised proposal for The Avenues as set out in appendix 2(b).

Councillor Lubbock, Eaton ward councillor, pointed out that there were no schemes in her ward and, as residents frequently asked her for double yellow lines, asked what the criteria were. The transport and network manager, Norwich City Council, explained that due to pressure of work there were still some schemes on the list that were outstanding. The schemes proposed in the report had mostly been requested in 2014, prioritised on safety grounds and approved for consultation in January 2016. Other schemes would be considered as work commitments permitted.

In reply to a question, the principal planner (transportation) said that the fire service had requested a double yellow line to prevent parking near the fire hydrant in Carrow Hill.

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, with all 4 voting members voting in favour, to approve the proposals as set out in the report and ask the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory processes to implement the following waiting restrictions:

- (1) as advertised:

Location / Plan number	
Belvoir Street PL/TR/3329/770	Heartsease Lane/Plumstead Rd PL/TR/3329/756
Bishopgate PL/TR/3355/806	Mile Cross Road PL/TR/3329/768
Chapel Break area (various) L/TR/3355/80	Partridge Way PL/TR/3329/757
Colegate PL/TR/3329/772	St Gregorys Back Alley PL/TR/3329/773
Drayton Road (Bignold Rd/Parr Rd) PL/TR/3329/764	Spowston Road near Gilman Road PL/TR/3329/758
Bowthorpe employment area PL/TR/3329/753	Spowston Road/ Shipfield PL/TR/3329/759

Location / Plan number	
Carrow Hill PL/TR/3329/754	Sprowston Road/ Wall Road area PL/TR/3329/760
Golden Dog Lane PL/TR/3329/755	Sprowston Road/ Wall Road area PL/TR/3329/760
Heathgate (cycle way access) PL/TR/3329/767	White House Court PL/TR/3329/76

(2) as amended:

Location / Plan number	
The Avenues PL/TR/3329/774 (amended plan no PL/TR3578/798/5)	Christchurch Road area PL/TR/3329/771

## 7. Dereham Road: East of Outer Ring Road Pedestrian Assessment

Councillor Carlo, Nelson ward councillor, commented on the report and suggested that members undertook a site visit. She suggested that the findings were based on a “snapshot in time” of the current situation and did not show the complete picture. People should be encouraged to walk into the city and cross the road at natural desire lines. There was a lot of traffic and few crossing points.

The chair and vice chair commented that there were clear reasons in the report for the recommended approach.

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

- (1) note the findings of the assessment as described in the report;
- (2) request that a further pedestrian count and crossing assessment is carried out 6-9 months after the completion of the Dereham Road roundabout works to understand if pedestrian movements approaching the new crossings have changed in number or routing.

## 8. Transport for Norwich – Transport Improvements in Eaton

Councillor Lubbock, Eaton ward councillor, welcomed the proposed scheme and said that the revised scheme was an improvement on the original one. She asked why the 20mph sign was part way down the slip road. The NATS/city agency manager, Norfolk County Council, explained that the location of the sign had been constrained because it was not possible to combine it with the gateway to Eaton sign at a location further up the slip road towards Newmarket Road. A public information notice would be published giving information about the works which would be completed before Christmas.

During discussion a member said that he was sympathetic to the points that had been made by the Norwich Cycling Campaign but the scheme was constrained by funding and it was the best that could be achieved within existing budgets.

In reply to a question, the NATS / city agency manager confirmed that roundels would be used. There was no proposal to use interactive signage.

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, to approve the changes required to implement the scheme within the city boundary, including:

- (1) reducing traffic speeds by the introduction of traffic calming and the implementation of a 20mph restriction; gateway signs to be introduced on the entry to Eaton from both the slip road and Eaton side of the Cringleford bridge;
- (2) enabling cyclists heading towards the city to reach the recently installed signal controlled toucan crossing and off-carriageway cycle track on Newmarket Road (A11) directly along Eaton Street, rather than crossing traffic lanes under the flyover and up the slip lane; this would be achieved by:
  - (a) providing an on-carriageway feeder lane / Advance Stop Line (ASL) for cyclists on Eaton Street (west) approaching the crossroads heading towards the uphill slip road to enable cyclists to get a prominent head start at the traffic lights.
  - (b) new cycle traffic signal for ahead cycles to be introduced on Eaton Street (west) approach, to allow cycles to be given a green traffic signal in advance of general traffic to give them a head start heading straight on towards the uphill slip road.
  - (c) widening the cycle track that leads up the hill from the Cellar House Public House to Newmarket Road from 1.5m to a 3.0m facility to allow for two way cycle flows.
- (3) simplifying pedestrian crossings in the centre of Eaton, with central islands being removed.
- (4) moving the stop line back in Bluebell Road so buses and other large vehicles can turn left from Eaton Street into Bluebell Road more easily.
- (5) realigning / smoothing the radius of the kerblines to improve the turning movement for buses and other large vehicles turning from Eaton Street into Bluebell Road minimising delays to all road users; as a result, the left turn lane will be slightly widened to allow extra room for larger vehicles turning left.
- (6) resurface the carriageway and upgrade the junction with new traffic signal equipment.

## **9. Annual Report of The Highways Agency Agreement 2016-17**

Discussion focused on the increase of cyclist KSI (killed or seriously injured) casualties by 4.5 per cent in the 12 months to the end of March 2017. Members were advised that

this needed to be balanced with the increase in cycling activity. KSI casualties included minor injuries where the casualty was admitted to hospital and discharged quickly. The NATS/city agency manager, Norfolk County Council, said that there was a lot of detailed information behind the report. The head of citywide development advised members that the outcomes of the Push the Pedalway programme would be considered by the committee in due course. The programme had improved cycling safety and increased the number of cyclists. The increase in cyclist KSIs was in proportion to the number of cyclists.

The chair thanked the officers for the work that had gone into the production of the report. The committee would consider a further report on cycling but trends showed that the roads were safer. Councillor Bremner seconded this by referring members to paragraph 4 of the report and the list of improvements brought about by the NATS (Norwich Area Transport Strategy now known as Transport for Norwich). The success of the strategy was demonstrated by the reduction in traffic flows in Rampant Horse Street from 50,000 to 2,000. He also pointed out that bus use had increased.

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, to:

- (1) thank the city and county council officers for their contribution to the report;
- (2) approve the Norwich Highways Agency Annual Report for 2016-2017.

CHAIR