



**Norwich Highways Agency committee  
5 September 2019**

**Public questions/petitions**

**Three questions have been received which relate to Item 5, on the agenda, Welsh Streets' Area Permit Parking Re-consultation. The petition also relates to Item 5, on the agenda.**

**Question 1**

**Ms Rosalind Marriott, owner of a property in Caernarvon Road, to ask the following question:**

“As a responsible landlady of 47 Caernarvon Road, I am concerned at the proposal to introduce parking permits in Caernarvon Road. I need to visit the property on and off during July and August in order to maintain the property to an acceptable standard, in September I need to visit in order to carry out an inventory with the students and in January to interview prospective students for the following academic year. On each occasion I spend more than 4 hours at the property during the working day.

Please would you ask the committee to explain where I should park or what sort of permit I should apply for? I should add that I live 145 miles from Norwich.”

**Councillor Tony Adams, chair, to reply on behalf of the committee.**

“Thank you for your question and I am sure you realise that a very significant proportion of the houses and flats in the permit parking areas in Norwich that are within permit parking areas are let out rather than owner occupied. Consequently, the need for landlords to access and maintain properties is well understood and a range of options are available to landlords and their contractors depending on the nature of the visit.

Details of these are available on Norwich City Council's website, and as we have had very few issues with landlords over the many years that we have operated permit parking schemes I think it is unlikely that you will have any problems should the permit scheme go ahead.

Your tenants will also have access to the visitor permit scheme which provides not only the four hour permit, but all day visitor permits as well.”

## Question 2

**Ms Sandi George, Caernarvon Road resident, to ask the following question:**

'As a long standing resident of Caernarvon Road for 41 years plus, I like others have seen the coming and going of traffic and parking in the area and heard the question that continually rears its head - 'Do we or don't we want parking permits? And here we are again.

Please remember that Caernarvon Road is the longest road within the group of roads in this second, this year, consultation.

We are also the road that is the most inconvenienced by non-resident traffic. How? Well, we accommodate anyone who has any association with both Avenue Junior School (where incidentally I used to teach full-time) and Peabody Nursery – e.g. parents, visitors and staff who choose to park on our road. Since the last consultation we have also had Cadent blocking off parts of the road with their equipment and digging up the road and adjoining roads for gasworks. Then there have been road closures because of work at the junction with Earlham Road and over all of these weeks, parking has not been an issue.

You would think that with all this extra traffic requiring parking, Caernarvon residents would without question and unanimously, vote for parking permits but you would be wrong.

Every time we have voted 'No' loud and clear, and we have done it this time around too. We trust those who park on our street and they appreciate the flexibility no parking permit gives. Take this away and all is lost. No-one likes their freedom taken away especially if there is nothing to be gained by it.

By imposing parking permits you will make those residents who share abodes and have more vehicles than the allotted number of permits per household, seek elsewhere to park hence perpetuation rather than solving, parking issues. And I put it to you that this is why we are here now - half of College Road etc., was permitted about two years back and cars moved to the other part of College Road and residents there objected. Before they lived in harmony knowing that if you chose to live with on road parking, you have to park where you can.

Absolutely nothing will be gained for Caernarvon Road by forcing parking permits upon us, except to hit our pockets.

Leave Caernarvon Road alone and let us see if we are impacted by what you are proposing to do around us. Let us be an experiment. If it doesn't work, you can say 'We told you so' but give us that chance.'

Where is the money coming from to implement what you propose? £46,000 for the first phase. £46,000 for this? Couldn't the pot holes be fixed instead?

Is this the intention of a sweeping permit City?"

**Councillor Tony Adams, chair, to reply on behalf of the committee.**

“We are due to consider the proposals for permit parking in your area today, and I am confident that members of this committee will take account of the points that you have raised, which I note are confirmed by the information contained within the report.

I believe it is the case that local councillors have canvassed in the area about permit parking (as this is something that has been routinely raised by some residents of many of the streets in your area) but this recent consultation is the first time that residents in the area have been formally asked with the prospect of permit parking actually being funded and installed for very many years.

Permit parking schemes are self-financing and the income that we get from permits pays for their implementation, maintenance and enforcement. We do not aim to make any additional income from them to pay for other services such as filling potholes. If a surplus is made then this would be spent on transport improvement in the Norwich area; however, the permit parking scheme has not made any significant surplus in recent years.”

**Question 3**

**Mrs Mary Clark, Earlham Road, to ask the following question:**

“I am a resident of the section of Earlham Road in the postcode NR2 3RW. I would appreciate if the following information could be supplied to all the members of the highway committee ahead of the above meeting.

Although the report to the committee states that the overall threshold for implementing parking permits was reached on Earlham Road, this ignores the distinction between sections of Earlham Road. The council officers have decided that the boundary of the zone should be Christchurch Rd, which, whilst a junction, does not reflect the lived experience of residents, which is that the ‘natural break’ is at Earlham House/Batley Court and the entrance to the Earlham Cemetery on Earlham Road.

If one takes the row of 15 terraced houses between Earlham House and Christchurch Road as a community and as a postcode (NR2 3RW), this does not sit as a natural part of the ‘Welsh Roads’ community. Based on discussions with my neighbours over the last two days, I have ascertained that all but five of the fifteen households are opposed to the imposition of permits. Although I accept that there is a need to impose boundaries somewhere on a somewhat arbitrary basis, this particular boundary does not reflect the natural boundaries and disenfranchises a particular group of residents as they happen to be on Earlham Road.

I would therefore ask the council officers to break down the responses on Earlham Road further using the methodology in paragraphs 11 and 12 of the committee report, based on postcode, and provide this to committee members before they make a decision. I know that this will show that the vast majority of residents beyond

Earlham House/Batley Court on the south side of Earlham Road are opposed to parking permits.

Given that the majority of parking on this stretch of Earlham is by residents (it is not widely used by commuters as it is too far out of the city centre and parking during the proposed hours of the permit is rarely an issue), the solution of imposing parking permits is in effect a solution to a problem that does not exist, and disadvantages the residents unnecessarily. If the breakdown shows that the residents of NR2 3RW are indeed mostly opposed to the permits, I would therefore propose that the boundary of the zone on the south side of Earlham Road would be Earlham House/Batley Court, not Christchurch Road.

If this were to be the case, the committee would also then need to consider the context of the north side of Earlham Road (NR2 3RQ), where the residents may have differing views. It would clearly be disadvantageous to end up with permit parking on one side of the road and not the other, so, if the target is reached for permits by taking both of these post code areas as a whole, so be it."

**Councillor Tony Adams, chair, to reply on behalf of the committee.**

"Thank you for your question

I understand that officers did not break down the Earlham Road result into two sections, because there was an overall majority in favour on both sides of the divide at Bately Court.

On the city side of that point there were 26 households in favour of permits with 11 against (70% in favour), whilst the stretch between Bately Court and Christchurch Road there were 12 households in favour and 9 against (57% in favour).

It was made clear in the consultation letter that was sent to residents that we would consider the outer part of Earlham Road separately if that area did not favour permits whilst the inner area did. The result was not split in the report as that was not the case."

## **Petition**

### **Mr Shan Barclay, Caernarvon Road resident, to present the following petition:**

“Respected Chair and members on the committee, I have lived in Norwich for 40 years and on Caernarvon Rd for 30, the parking situation on our street is no worse now than thirty years ago.

There have been three previous attempts to impose permits on our road and in every case the great majority felt we didn't need them and this is still the case, maybe even more so now.

I am sorry that I have had to draw up a petition again because the recent consultation had to be re-run, even though previously our street, being so strongly against, was not initially included. This is because our previous petition had to be put aside to make way for the new hearing. With due respect to Bruce Bentley and all the hard work he and others have had to put into it, I believe that all of this was actually unnecessary. Also I regret that I was unaware that this hearing had been brought forward so the deadline for submission this hand petition was cut short so I was unable to get more signatures of which there could have been many, not only I stress from Caernarvon Road.

I stress also that none of these signatures was obtained under duress, quite the contrary. My first question to all was: “have you received the letter from Bruce Bentley about parking permits and if you have, have you responded online? If not, I recommend you do so straight away, however you wish and many as a result who would not otherwise have done so actually did this.

If they were against, I only then invited them to sign. There were also many who were out and some houses were empty when I called and even despite this, as you will have seen, the petition still has over 100 signatures.

The question on the petition read: “We the undersigned do not wish to have permit parking on our streets”. Namely Caernarvon, Denbigh, Milford, Swansea and Wellington. (Some signed from neighbouring streets who were nevertheless affected and were against too).

The main reason I encountered for not signing was from those who feared that if they voted against and the decision went the other way, their street might be used by others from neighbouring streets and elsewhere which had permits as an alternative parking place. Had it not been for this many more would probably have signed.

To refute this fear, I site among other things the fact that when recently Denbigh was largely unavailable for over two weeks owing to gas main works, there was still no great problem (Upwards of 15 car spaces at a time were lost).

Among reasons for not having permits were:

- No need
- Won't help us because only between 8-6.30pm when not needed anyway
- Costly,

- Inconvenient,
- An imposition,
- Will create ill-will because we will have to 'police' our streets,
- Don't want to have patrols,

Also, that supposed 'cost-neutral' claim doesn't include fines which could come to a lot; and others as well, including that permits do not guarantee as some mistakenly thought a space near or in front of their house: and that 'all or none vote' is an imposition as well.

To sum up, I respect democracy and the need to have it, but maintain that ruling out the firm opinion of many, as seen in this petition and no doubt online too, is also undemocratic and feel that this opinion should be heard and accommodated also

Personally, and I believe that I am not alone in this on Caernarvon Road at least, I would be willing to take the risk of remaining as we are without permits for the sake of the integrity of our street which is a very neighbourly one and which for example has had very successful street closure events among other things to prove it. I therefore invite the Chair and committee to consider this option in view of the very large opinion here that permits are unwanted and an imposition.

To this end I humbly submit this petition to you now.

**Councillor Tony Adams, chair, to reply on behalf of the committee.**

"Thank you for taking the trouble to organise this petition and for submitting it to this Committee.

As this petition directly relates to the item on today's agenda, I hope you will agree that it is right that the members of the committee should consider your representations while they debate the proposals."