

I suggest that at this time there is no need for a 20 mph limit and urge you to refuse it.”)

Question 1 - Mr Les Rowlands, resident Eaton Rise, asked the following question:

“The Eaton Rise Residents Association has recently held a consultation with residents about a proposal for a 20mph speed limit to be introduced on the estate. This is because the association is keenly aware that there is tremendous overall support in the city to reduce traffic speed and at the same time reduce noise and air pollution. The majority of residents are in favour of the idea. Whilst it is accepted that not all drivers will adhere to a 20mph speed limit it will nonetheless slow vehicles down and make it a much safer environment for pedestrians, schoolchildren and for cyclists. Would it be possible for Eaton Rise to be included in the latest plan to make all roads within the inner ring road 20mph?”

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

“The introduction of the 20mph speed limit within the inner ring road is a project nearing completion and it is not possible to extend the area to be included at this late stage.

However as part of the second round of City Cycle Ambition funding we are planning to introduce 20mph restrictions on residential roads within a 400m radius of both the blue and yellow pedalways where there is support from local residents. Eaton Rise is sandwiched between the blue pedalway that runs along Newmarket Road and the yellow pedalway on Hall Road and as such will be included within the scope of that project.

Members will be aware that in addition to this question being asked a letter has been circulated to the committee by another resident of the area who refutes the claim that there is majority support for the 20mph restriction and urges the committee to dismiss the idea. The consultation work that we plan to undertake towards the end of the 2016 will inform the extent of the support for a 20mph restriction in this area. It is planned that the implementation of a 20mph restriction in the areas where there is support from the residents will take place in 2017-18.”

In reply to Mr Rowlands’ supplementary question relating to the form that the consultation would take, the transportation and network manager (Norwich City Council) confirmed that all the residents in the area would be sent a letter setting out the proposals and asking for comments.

Question 2 – Councillor Lubbock, Eaton Ward councillor, asked the following question:

“This committee knows the benefits of introducing 20 mph limits and has been doing so in a piecemeal way for some years.

Are we not at a stage, with regard to devolution and lack of funding where local authorities engage with their communities and recognise that they are able to better reflect their views and in some cases pay for measures to make

their communities better places to live? This is exactly what happens between county and parish councils.

Could not this happen between this joint committee and a residents' association?"

The chair replied on behalf of the committee as follows:

"I believe that Councillor Lubbock is referring to the parish partnership scheme that the county council administers. Each year the county council sets aside a pot of money from the Local Transport Plan budget, typically in the region of £300k, to offer as matched the funding to parish councils to cover up to 50% of the cost of localised highway schemes that benefit the community. It is used to fund small scale projects such as bus shelters, speed awareness signs and footway improvements. The parish partnership scheme is only open to parish councils and does not include larger urban areas such as the city, Great Yarmouth and Kings Lynn, as it is acknowledged that these areas have greater potential to attract external funding in their own right. This is borne out by the city's successful bid for Cycle Ambition funding.

Residents' associations are voluntary groups with no statutory or democratic foundation. This makes it much harder for councils to be able to work with them in the same way as parish councils. Parish councils have the powers to raise local taxes known as parish precepts to fund their contribution. A local residents' association has no such powers and there would be no statutory mechanism for resolving differences in the community should these arise; it can be seen from the first question that such differences are likely.

Saying that, the way councils work is rapidly evolving and there may be opportunities in the future to explore the option of community funded schemes."

Councillor Lubbock said that she was encouraged by the response and that the implementation of a 20mph scheme in Eaton Rise, subject to consultation, was planned for 2017-2018. As a supplementary question, she asked what the ball park figure would be for the implementation of the scheme. The transportation and network manager said that the cost would depend on whether it was signage only or there was a need for traffic calming. She pointed out that there would need to be discussions with the county council's road safety audit team as there were long straight roads with relatively little on street parking meaning that existing speeds probably exceeded the 24mph threshold that usually determined whether traffic calming was needed. The ball park figures were approximately £10k for a signed only scheme or up to £100k for a traffic calmed scheme. This could be funded by the Cycle Ambition grant. .

Norwich City Football Club – results of consultation on proposed toucan crossing and bus gate

Question 3 - Councillor Grahame, Thorpe Hamlet ward councillor, asked the following question:

“There is considerable local opposition to the bus gate, because of the pressure on Kerrison Road junction. Residents will welcome the mitigation proposed but fear that this will not be enough, with hundreds of dwellings on Geoffrey Watling Way, the Harbour Triangle and the Factory, all sharing only one point of access.

If the proposal goes ahead, what other options will the council consider to mitigate congestion and air pollution from traffic queueing at Kerrison Road junction? One might include keeping the old Carrow Road open with an exit next to the bus gate at Geoffrey Watling Way/Koblenz Avenue. This could be done quite easily by shortening the verge that separates Carrow Road and Koblenz Avenue.

Will the council monitor the potentially worsening situation, e.g. queueing times and consider opening another exit point onto Koblenz Ave from Geoffrey Watling Way or Carrow Road?”

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

“It is precisely because there are to be a significant number of new dwellings on Geoffrey Watling Way, and development anticipated on both the Deal Ground and the Utilities site that provision for the more sustainable modes of transport is absolutely essential. The report before us today makes clear that the new developments have been constructed with limited parking provision, and in fact, the traffic generation of the new flats is much lower than was originally anticipated at the time when it was expected that the entire development would be served by a single access. Maintaining this low level of car use as the area grows will only be achieved if appropriate measures to support sustainable transport options are provided, which were negotiated as part of the developments that have been built. The Kerrison Road junction has been constructed to handle the anticipated traffic flows, and as the report makes clear, its operation will be optimised, and any adjustments required will be made.

The success of the NATS strategy relies on ensuring that we make provision for sustainable forms of transport across the city, and this scheme improves accessibility for cyclists and pedestrians, and for the first time will allow public transport to access this expanding part of the city. . However, it is also important that we maintain facilities for private motor vehicles on the strategic road network, Consequently there is a limit to the complexity of the junctions that we can introduce on this section of the ring road, which is particularly busy, without introducing further delays, and that is why the proposed bus gate has just sufficient functionality to deal with the necessary bus cycle and pedestrian movements, and those vehicles exiting from Wherry Road (which is their only point of access).

Creating another exit adjacent to the bus gate would (unless it formed part of the light controlled system) be a dangerous option as providing two access points in close proximity to each other onto a major route is a known safety hazard. Increasing the scale of the light controlled junction to cater for this movement would bring with it delays to the ring road to the detriment of the operation of the ring road, which it is particularly important to avoid in this

location. It is, of course, the case that at peak times there are delays on the network and queuing does occur at junctions, but this would only be made worse by adding additional access points and complicated junction arrangements which are unnecessary.”

Councillor Grahame said that she welcomed the expansion of the bus service to this area and, by way of a supplementary question, asked whether it was necessary to close off Carrow Road, when it was only needed by the football club for about twelve days a year when home matches were played; and, that if the proposals were agreed there would only be one exit for the thousand homes. Councillor Bremner, the vice chair, said that the proposals demonstrated the success of policies to reduce car use and promote sustainable alternatives and referred Councillor Grahame to the response to her main question.

Question 4 - Councillor Price, Thorpe Hamlet ward councillor, asked the following question:

“The junction of King Street and Koblenz Avenue has caused difficulty for drivers, pedestrians and cyclists over many years. It is very dangerous for pedestrians to cross the road and the air quality falls well below the required standards. Local residents have approached me on numerous occasions and highlighted this issue, so too have the King Street Resident’s Association who have directly asked me to address this with the council by requesting the introduction of a roundabout, pedestrian crossings or other traffic control measures. I have stood and witnessed these problems for myself and agree wholeheartedly with their analysis. While the bus gate is being considered for the area and with one of the main aims of that project to speed up the traffic flow on the ring road due to additional pressure from permanent city centre road closures, is it not time to implement improvements to this junction too?”

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

“Officers are aware of the longstanding concerns of residents in this area about a number of highway issues in this area including the lack of a pedestrian crossing and the difficulty of exiting the northern end of King Street at the bend where King Street meets Carrow Road. As Councillor Price mentioned on today’s agenda there is a report detailing not only a bus gate at the end of Geoffrey Watling way but also a toucan crossing at the end that will be of significant benefit to residents in the area.

The Geoffrey Watling Way proposals are of a direct result of the development at the football ground and are not as a result of the city centre road closures. The ethos for the Geoffrey Watling Way is to encourage sustainable transport to the development without having a detrimental on the capacity of the ring road.

Following on from the recent consultation on the city centre measures in the Golden Ball Street area and particularly the proposed closure of All Saints Street outside John Lewis, a planned review of the junctions on the inner ring road has been brought forward in the work programme. This will include the King Street/Carrow Road junction. However in order to complete the review we need accurate traffic surveys to establish the base line data and with all

the work that is taking place in the city centre during 2016 it will not be possible to collect traffic data this year as it would not reflect the true situation. The surveys are therefore planned for spring 2017 and assessment work will begin immediately after this.”

Councillor Price said that residents would welcome the review and asked that this junction was given priority and that the data be made available to the local members. The chair said that data from the survey of the junctions around the inner ring road would identify the priorities and this information would be shared in due course.

Proposed toucan crossing on Newmarket Road

Question 5 - Councillor Lubbock, Eaton ward councillor, asked the following question:

“I am concerned that the siting of the toucan crossing on Newmarket Road without the 30 mph speed limit being moved further out of the city will be unsafe.

Traffic is moving far too fast coming into the city at the point where the crossing is being proposed. There is a speed reactor light there and it lights up with every other car which indicates that 50% of cars are travelling faster than 30 mph.

Going out of the city again cars are travelling too fast and additional signage will be needed to let drivers know that there is a signalled crossing ahead.

Will the committee agree to consider these changes to further improve the safety of pedestrians crossing at this point across a 3 lane road?”

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

“Whilst Councillor Lubbock’s concern is appreciated, this particular issue was raised with the county council’s network analysis and safety team before the proposal was advertised and they concluded that an extension of the 30mph limit was not required on safety grounds, and this has been noted in the report before you today.

The proposal does include the narrowing of the outbound carriageway of Newmarket Road, and the provision of the crossing will result in a very different driver experience in this location. The change from a very open road to one with a signalled crossing on it is likely to encourage better compliance with the existing 30mph restriction, but in any event this type of crossing is routinely used on roads with much higher speed limits than this.”

Councillor Lubbock said that she was concerned that, whilst she welcomed the toucan crossing, there were still some improvements that could be made. She considered that the reduction in speed from 50mph to 30mph in a 50 metre distance was unsafe. She considered that there would be better compliance if the speed limits for the A11 from the Round House Park were rationalised and that 30mph in the urban area would be safer for everyone. The chair said that the committee

would consider her comments when considering the officer report later on the agenda for this meeting.

2. Declarations of interest

Councillor Jackson declared an other interest in item 9 (below), Leonards Street car park to the rear of St Augustines Street, as he lived in the vicinity that was affected by the proposals.

3. Minutes

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 17 September 2015, subject to a correction to item 5, Transport for Norwich – Golden Ball and Westlegate, resolution, deleting the reference to Councillor “Harris” by replacing it with Councillor “Stonard”, to accurately record the names of the city council’s voting members.

(There was a power point presentation at the start of each of the items 4 to 13 below.)

4. Transport for Norwich – Project 19: Hall Road (Bessemer Road to Old Hall Road)

In reply to a member’s question, the NATS manager (Norfolk County Council) explained the options that had been considered, as set out in the report. He pointed out that general traffic on Hall Road would increase in the long-term and it would be difficult to reduce network capacity. The preferred option was for a shared use footway/cycleway which would improve cycle safety for less confident cyclists. The scheme would offer a good balance of different options for cyclists in the area.

The vice chair pointed out that there would be an opportunity to comment on the proposals as part of the consultation. He considered that the service road was “very comfortable” to cycle on and said that it was important to balance expectations with a scheme that could be achieved within the funding resources available.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to:

- (1) approve for consultation the proposals included in the Hall Road project, including:
 - (a) conversion of footway on the east side of Hall Road to shared use footway/cycletrack from the newly implemented shared use footway/cycletrack associated with the ASDA works to Old Hall Road;
 - (b) revoke the existing 40mph speed limit on Hall Road and promote a 30mph speed limit;
 - (c) removal of one pedestrian refuge 125 metres south of Robin Hood Road and replace with a larger pedestrian refuge in the same location;

- (d) removal of one pedestrian refuge 50 metres north of Fountains Road and provide a new pedestrian refuge closer to Fountains Road;
- (2) ask the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory procedures associated with advertising the Traffic Regulation Order and notice that would be required for the implementation of the scheme as described in this report.
- (3) agree that the outcome of the proposed consultation will be reported to a future meeting of the committee.

5. Transport for Norwich – Catton Grove Road/Woodcock Road roundabout and 20mph speed limit

During discussion, the transportation and network manager, referred to the report and answered members' questions.

Councillor Stonard, Catton Grove ward councillor, said that residents welcomed the proposals to improve road safety in this area. The resident of no 56 Catton Grove Road had expressed concern that the rear and front access to his property was close to the roundabout and associated zigzag lines. The transportation and network manager said that she would arrange for the project manager to visit the resident to allay his concerns.

Councillor Harris, Catton Grove ward councillor, referred to the residents' meeting during the consultation, and asked for information on the siting of the bus stops. The transportation and network manager said that the location of the bus stops was not material to the approval of the proposals. However she would ask the project manager to review the location of the bus stops and make adjustments if it was considered necessary. She also agreed to send Councillor Harris details of the extent of the consultation area.

Discussion ensued. The committee was advised that the crossing was on the pedestrian desire line and that the refuge was sufficient size for both pedestrians and cyclists. The consultation had been based on speed tables but officers would consider whether a sinusoidal table would be appropriate but cautioned that there could be a cost implication. The committee was advised that it would not be possible to enforce the bus gate at this location until the signage issue had been resolved. In future consideration could be given to camera enforcement following the rollout in the city centre.

RESOLVED, unanimously to:

- (1) acknowledge the responses to the consultation;
- (2) approve the implementation of the proposals for improvements to Catton Grove Road/Woodcock Road roundabout and extension of the 20mph restrictions along Catton Grove Road, consisting of:

- (a) reduction of carriageway space on the roundabout by realigning outer kerblines and widening of the perimeter footways, converting these footways to unsegregated shared-use cyclist and pedestrian cycleways on each quadrant.
 - (b) the provision of shared-use pedestrian cyclist zebra 'tiger' crossings on each of the four approach arms to the roundabout, of Woodcock Road and Catton Grove Road; Each of these zebra crossings are to be constructed on speed reducing raised tables; These shared-use zebra crossings on raised tables together with the adjacent converted footways will create a continuous gyratory for cyclists and pedestrians, based on an adaptation of "Dutch-style" roundabouts;
 - (c) an extension of the existing 20mph zone restrictions along the southern extent of Catton Grove Road, to replace the existing 30mph speed limit between the crossroads junction of Angel Road, Elm Grove Lane/Philadelphia Lane heading northwards to Lilburne Avenue adjacent to the Woodgrove Parade shopping precinct just south of the roundabout;
 - (d) the provision of four pairs of traffic calming speed cushions within this new 20mph speed zone extension.
- (3) ask the head of city development services to complete the necessary statutory processes associated with the installation of the 20mph Speed Restriction Order.

6. Proposed toucan crossing on Newmarket Road

During discussion the principal transportation planner (Norwich City Council), together with the NATS manager and the transportation and network manager, referred to the report and answered members' questions.

A member endorsed Councillor Lubbock's suggestion that the various speed limits employed on the A11 from Round House Park to the city centre should be rationalised. The committee was advised that the speed limit 100 metres from the proposed crossing was 40mph and would be reducing to 30mph. There had been a lot of development in the area and a review of speed limits from Thickthorn roundabout to the toucan crossing on Newmarket Road could be carried out but it would be more likely to achieve a 40mph speed limit rather than 30mph.

Officers agreed to look at reviewing the speed limits on the A11 between Thickthorn Roundabout and the Bluebell Road slip road as part of the A11 north slip to Cringleford cycle ambition scheme. The committee noted that implementation of the scheme would be within the next 18 months and work would commence in the next three to six months.

Officers confirmed that the proposed toucan crossing was not close to other crossings and would not impact on other signalled crossings. It was important to

ensure that Newmarket Road and the A11 maintained a good flow of traffic and therefore it was necessary to balance this with pedestrian footfall. The lights would change relatively quickly when requested by a pedestrian.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to:

- (1) note the objections, and the level of support for the new crossing;
- (2) agree to the installation of the proposed toucan crossing as shown on Plan No. PH0079-TS-Sketch 15-10-2015 2 in appendix 1 attached to the report.

7. Norwich City Football Club – results of consultation on proposed toucan crossing and bus gate

During discussion, a member said that he supported the closure of Carrow Road in front of the football club as it was used as a rat-run. The committee noted that Geoffrey Watling Road was closed to vehicles except for access only and demonstrated the success of residential developments which discouraged car use.

Councillor Jackson said that he welcomed the provision of the toucan crossing which was on the desire line.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to:

- (1) agree the provision of a toucan crossing and a bus gate at the junction of Koblenz Avenue and Geoffrey Watling Way and the removal of all on-street parking on Carrow Road around the football stadium as show on the plans in Appendix 2.
- (2) ask the head of city development services to complete the necessary statutory procedures associated with implementing the traffic management measures as described in this report.

8. Car club expansion

The principal transportation planner introduced the report and explained that whilst the plans were correct the list of locations for car club bays was incomplete (the list of sites is attached to these minutes as an appendix.)

During discussion the principal transportation planner referred to the report and answered members' questions. The committee noted that there were currently 38 cars available to car club members (this was confirmed by the operator, who was present at the meeting). A member suggested that there were opportunities for off-street parking but was advised that under the terms of reference the committee only considered on-street parking. Members noted that the car club operator needed to demonstrate that expansion was viable to secure funding. Discussions between the car club and businesses and the city council, and consideration could be given to potential use of the car club rather than retaining a pool of cars. The committee

noted that the car club fleet would include a BMW electric car which was currently on order.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to:

- (1) approve the new car club bay locations for consultation;
- (2) ask the head of city development services to advertise the necessary traffic regulation orders and notices to provide for 132 new car club bays and associated waiting restriction changes (as detailed in the plans attached to the report and the list set out in the appendix to these minutes)
- (3) note the fact that there is significant scope for further expansion of the car club if and when new funding becomes available;
- (4) note that any objections received will be considered by a future meeting of the committee.

9. Leonards Street car park to rear of St Augustines Street

(Councillor Jackson had declared an interest in this item.)

RESOLVED, unanimously, having considered the report of the head of city development services, to:

- (1) note the results of the consultation on the proposals on the proposed changes to Leonards Street car park;
- (2) agree to extend the surrounding on-street STA permit zone into the car park with provision for short stay parking for a maximum of 2 hours to allow for parking for visitors to the local shops Monday-Saturday between 8.00am and 6.30pm. With parking unrestricted at other times;
- (3) ask the head of city development services to complete the statutory process to enable the changes to be brought into effect.

10. Night-time economy – Prince of Wales Road (side roads)

Councillor Stonard endorsed the proposal for a permanent traffic regulation order to close Cathedral Street, St Faiths Lane and Recorder Road to traffic late at night except for access. The scheme was part of the measures proposed by the city council, in conjunction with the police. The experimental scheme had proven successful and been commended by residents who reported that the side roads were much quieter as a result of the trial road closures.

Councillor Jackson said that the local members for Thorpe Hamlet welcomed the proposal to close the side roads, had met with residents and considered that the permanent traffic order should be implemented without further delay.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to:

- (1) authorise the head of city development services to carry out the Necessary statutory procedures to implement a permanent traffic regulation order that will have the following provisions:
 - (a) to prohibit motor vehicle access: 11.00pm – 12.00 midnight and 12.00am – 06.00am on any day except Christmas Day, from the junction of Prince of Wales Road with the following streets:
 - (i) Cathedral Street;
 - (ii) St Faiths Lane;
 - (iii) Recorder Road;with the exemptions detailed in paragraph 14 of the report;
 - (b) to amend waiting restrictions relating to on street charging for pay and display times on bays on Cathedral Street, Recorder Road and St Faiths Lane as shown on the plan in Appendix 2, and detailed in the report;
- (2) continue the discretionary measure that private hire vehicles or taxis may wait at Castle Meadow and Bank Plain during the time of the Prince of Wales Road side road access restrictions only. This measure will be subject to review by the head of city development in consultation with the chair and vice chair of the Norwich Highways Agency committee, if necessary.

11. Transport for Norwich – Colegate/St Georges Street junction improvement

The NATS manager introduced the report and referred to the issues raised during the consultation and the measures proposed to address these (as set out in paragraphs 22 to 24 of the report). Representatives from the Norfolk and Norwich Association for the Blind had been on site yesterday and officers would be meeting with the association to discuss its concerns and to ensure that a solution could be agreed.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to:

- (1) approve the changes required to implement the scheme, including:
 - (a) extending the shared space environment from the southern part of St Georges Street through its junction with Colegate;
 - (b) install a raised table on Colegate through its junction with St Georges Street;
- (2) ask the head of city development services to carry out the necessary statutory processes to confirm the road hump notice necessary for the scheme.

12. Miscellaneous waiting restrictions

Councillor Shaw said that he welcomed the proposed waiting restrictions for Heartsease Lane and Plumstead Road but considered that it would be a good idea to extend the no waiting lines on the southern side of Plumstead Road to the boundary of no 164 and no 2, as it was a narrow road. The principal transportation planner agreed that this proposal could be added to the consultation.

The principal transportation planner explained that the consultation would be low key, comprising statutory consultees and residents and businesses affected by the proposals. He also responded to a member's question in relation to Partridge Way and explained that the council could enforce waiting restrictions if double yellow lines were installed.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to:

- (1) ask the head of city development services to advertise the necessary statutory procedures to introduce traffic regulation orders in the following locations:

| Location | Plan number |
|---|--------------------|
| Bowthorpe employment area | PL/TR/3329/753 |
| Carrow Hill | PL/TR/3329/754 |
| Golden Dog Lane | PL/TR/3329/755 |
| Heartsease Lane | PL/TR/3329/756 |
| (subject to amending the plans to extend the double yellow lines from the junction with Plumstead Road to the boundary of no 164 and no 2 on the southern side of Heartsease Lane | |
| Partridge Way | PL/TR/3329/757 |
| Sprowston Road/ Gilman Road | PL/TR/3329/758 |
| Sprowston Road/ Shipfield | PL/TR/3329/759 |
| Sprowston Road/ Wall Road | PL/TR/3329/760 |
| White House Court | PL/TR/3329/761 |

- (2) note that any objections received will be considered at future committee meetings.

13. Transport for Norwich CCAG1 – Project 19 – traffic calming for 20mph in the city centre

The transportation network manager apologised for the poor quality of the plans attached to the report and said that she had taken this up with her team to ensure that this was addressed. She advised members of a slight revision to the plans associated with the new crossing at Ber Street and said that the build out had been extended but was not material.

During discussion some members said that it would be useful to receive A3 versions of plans if possible. Members welcomed the proposals and looked forward to implementation as soon as possible.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to:

- (1) acknowledge the response to the consultation;
- (2) ask the head of city development services to complete the necessary statutory processes associated with the installation of the traffic calming as below:
 - (a) Ber Street – Plan No. CCAG-CON-202a;
 - (b) Duke Street – Plan No. CCAG-CON-502;
 - (c) Rouen Road / King Street – Plan Nos. CCAG19-CON-402a and 403;
 - (d) Westwick Street – Plan No. CCAG-CON-302a.

14. Major road works – regular monitoring

RESOLVED, having considered the report of the head of city development services, to note the report.

CHAIR

Appendix

Item 8, Car club expansion

- Car club bays listed were agreed for future consultation
- Detailed information for each car club bay will be provided for the Traffic Regulation Order consultation when these are rolled out on a phased basis
- Phasing of new car club bays is dependent on growth and trends in car club membership and funding for new car club vehicles
- Additional car club bay locations may be delivered through new developments

| | | |
|----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Abbot Road | Britannia Road | Godric Place 1 |
| Adelaide Street | Brunswick Road 2 | Godric Place 2 |
| Albany Road 1 | Buckland Rise | Greenways 1 (west) |
| Albany Road 2 | Bury Street | Greenways 2 (west) |
| All Saints Green 1 | Cadge Road area | Greenways 3 (east) |
| All Saints Green 2 | Caernarvon Road | Greyfriars Road 3 |
| All Saints Green 3 | (junction with Milford | Greyfriars Road 4 |
| All Saints Green 4 | Road) | Guernsey Road |
| Angel Road (south) | Calvert Street 1 | Hall Road |
| Armes Street (west) | Calvert Street 2 | (District centre) |
| Atthill Road | Cannel Green 1 | Hall Road 1 (layby) |
| Avenue Road 2 | (Pockthorpe estate) | Hall Road 2 (layby) |
| Aylsham Road | Cannel Green 2 | Hardy Road |
| (near Hauteyn Court) | Cecil Road (east) | Harpsfield |
| Aylsham Road | Cecil Road (west) | Havelock Road |
| (near Royal Legion) | Chapel Field East 2 | Havers Road near Lidl |
| Bank Plain 1 | Clarendon Road 2 | Helena Road |
| Bank Plain 2 | Clarkson Road | Hilary Avenue |
| Bank Plain 3 | Colegate 2 | Hotblack Road |
| Bank Plain 4 | (adj Octogan Chapel) | Ipswich Road |
| Bank Plain 5 | Colegate 3 | Ivy Road |
| Benjamin Gooch Way 1 | (adj Octogan Chapel) | Jessop Road 1 |
| Benjamin Gooch Way 2 | College Road (centre) | (adj St Francis school) |
| Ber Street (north) | College Road (north) | Jessop Road 2 |
| Ber Street (south) | Coslany Street 1 | Jewson Road |
| Bethel Street 1 | Coslany Street 2 | King Street 2 (south) |
| Bethel Street 2 | Crome Road 1 | Knowland Grove (east) |
| Bethel Street 3 | Crome Road 2 | Knowsley Road 1 |
| Bethel Street 4 | Cutler Way | Knowsley Road 2 |
| Beverley Road | Denmark Road 1 | Knowsley Road 3 |
| Bignold Road (south) | Denmark Road 2 | Lavengro Road |
| Bishopgate | Dover Street | Lilburne Avenue |
| Bishy Barnabee Way | Drayton Road | Lionwood Road (west |
| (Three Score) | Earlham West Centre | side) |
| Blackfriars Street 1 | Edinburgh Road 2 | Livingstone Street |
| Blackfriars Street 2 | Fiddle Wood Road | Locksley Road |
| Bladewater Road | Fishergate 2 | Long John Hill |
| Borrowdale Drive | Gertrude Road | Lothian Street |
| Bowers Avenue | (single bay) | Lower Clarence Road |
| Bowthorpe Road | Girton Road | Malbrook Road |
| Branford Road | Gladstone Road | Marauder Road |
| Branksome Road | Glebe Road (south) | Marlborough Road |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Maud Street | Rouen Road 4 | St Phillips Road (Belle Vue) |
| Mill Hill Road (north) | Rugge Drive (Chalfont Walk) | Stacy Road (east) |
| Mill Hill Road (south) | Rupert Street 1 (opp Vauxhall St shops) | Stacy Road (west) |
| Mill Hill Road 1 (centre - by Clarendon Steps) | Rupert Street 2 (opp Vauxhall Street shops) | Stafford Street 2 (east) |
| Mill Hill Road 2 (centre - by Clarendon Steps) | Salter Avenue | Stafford Street 3 (east) |
| Mountergate 1 | Sandy Lane (east) | Starling Road 1 |
| Mountergate 2 | Shipstone Road 2 | Starling Road 2 |
| Mountergate 3 | Silver Road 1 | Steward Street |
| Mountergate 4 | Silver Road 1 (north) | Suckling Avenue |
| Mousehold Avenue 1 | Silver Road 2 | Surrey Street 2 |
| Mousehold Avenue 2 | Silver Road 2 (north) | Sussex Street 1 |
| Muriel Road | Silver Street | Telegraph Lane East |
| Nelson Street (north) | Southwell Road | The Avenues 1 (former bus stop) |
| Netherwood Green 1 | Springbank | The Avenues 2 (former bus stop) |
| Netherwood Green 2 | Sprowston Road (near Wall Road) | The Runnel |
| Norman Road | Sprowston Road 1 (adj RC church) | Tuckswood Centre |
| Northcote Road (east) | Sprowston Road 1 (opp Aldi) | Turner Road |
| Northumberland Street | Sprowston Road 2 (adj RC church) | Victoria Street |
| Northumberland Street (near Blazer Court) | Sprowston Road 2 (opp Aldi) | Vincent Road |
| Oak Lane | St Albans Road | Wall Road |
| Oak Street (centre) | St Benedicts Street 1 (Charing Cross) | Watling Road (near shops and tower blocks) |
| Oak Street 1(south) | St Benedicts Street 2 (Charing Cross) | Wellesley Avenue North by surgery |
| Oak Street 2 (south) | St Benedicts Street 2 (west) | Wentworth Green |
| Onley Street | St Benedicts Street 3 (Charing Cross) | West Pottergate |
| Opie Street (Van bay) | St Benedicts Street 4 (Charing Cross) | Westwick Street 1 (north) |
| Oxford Steet | St Clements Hill 2 | Westwick Street 2 (north) |
| Park Lane 2 | St Faiths Lane 1 (east) | Whitehall Road |
| Parmenter Road (near shops) | St Faiths Lane 2 (east) | Wingfield Road |
| Penn Grove | St Faiths Lane 3 (east) | Witard Road (Roundabout) |
| Pettus Road (north) | St Faiths Lane 4 (east) | Witard Road (Roundabout) |
| Philadelphia Lane | St Giles 2 (west) | Witard Road 1 (near Plumstead Road) |
| Plantsman Close | St Giles Street 1 (east) | Witard Road 2 (near Plumstead Rd) |
| Portersfield Road 1 | St Giles Street 2 (east) | Woodhill Rise |
| Portersfield Road 2 | St Giles Street 3 (east) | Yarmouth Road (Chinese restaurant) |
| Pottergate | St Giles Street 4 (east) | Yaxley Way |
| Rawley Road | St Leonards Road | |
| Recorder Road 2 | St Leonards Road | |
| Recreation Road 1 | St Martins Road | |
| Recreation Road 2 | St Phillips Road | |
| Redwell Street 1 | | |
| Redwell Street 2 | | |
| Redwell Street 3 | | |
| Redwell Street 4 | | |
| Rouen Road 1 (near Morgans Buildings) | | |
| Rouen Road 2 (near Morgans Buildings) | | |
| Rouen Road 3 | | |