



Environment, Development and Transport Committee

**Minutes of the Meeting held on Friday, 12 October 2018
at 10am in the Edwards Room, County Hall**

Present:

Mr M Wilby - Chair

Mr M Castle

M Chenery of Horsbrugh

Mr S Clancy (Vice-Chairman)

Mr P Duigan

Mr T East

Mr C Foulger

Mr B Long

Mr S Morpew

Ms J Oliver

Mr B Spratt

Mrs C Walker

Mr A White

Also Present:

Cllr Alexandra Kemp

1. Chairman's Announcements

- 1.1 The Chairman spoke about the passing of Adrian Gunson who was a Councillor on Norfolk County Council for over 40yrs and awarded an MBE for services to Norfolk; he helped start plans for the Norwich Distributor Road and was pleased to see it come to fruition. Mr Gunson was passionate about his job, transportation and planning. The Committee thanked him for what he achieved for Norfolk.
- 1.2 Mr T East spoke of his relationship with Mr Gunson in his early days on the Council who he recalled as an approachable man, and paid recognition to his supportive wife who helped him attend meetings when he had mobility problems. He recalled memories of Mr Gunson during elections and that he was supportive of all party views.
- 1.3 Mr B Spratt recalled working with Mr Gunson on the Pulham roundabout and A11 bypass; he paid tribute to Mr Gunson as a lovely man to work with
- 1.4 Mrs C Walker recalled Mr Gunson as a gentleman, and felt his loss was sad to both the Council and Conservative Party

2. Apologies and Substitutions

- 2.1 Apologies were received from Mr S Eyre (M Chenery of Horsbrugh substituting), Mr A Grant (Mr B Long) and Mr T Jermy (Mr S Morpew substituting)

3. Minutes

- 3.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 07 September 2018 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

4. Members to Declare any Interests

4.1 No interests were declared.

5. Urgent Business

5.1 There were no matters of urgent business.

6. Public Questions

6.1 Eight public questions were received and the answers circulated; see Appendix A.

7. Member Questions

7.1 Mr Castle spoke about the issues in his question: in the last 5 years, passenger numbers from Yarmouth had fallen in contrast to increasing numbers across Norfolk impacted by unreliability of trains; he felt it was important for Yarmouth to become a service for long distance trains and press for the Stansted service in the subsequent rail franchise.

7.2 Cllr Kemp asked a supplementary question: King's Lynn had been identified as having lower than national bus use; she felt the list should address that people couldn't access work by bus due to running times and some people in villages could not access health appointments. She asked if bus availability could be increased to reduce emissions and how funding would be achieved to do this while maximising use of bus lanes.

7.3 The Chairman replied that Officers would take these comments on board. As Leader of the Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk, Mr B Long knew of the emissions in King's Lynn. Diesel emission monitoring had designated an air quality management area in West Norfolk; some of the worst areas identified were on London road.

8. Verbal update from Members of the Committee about Member Working Groups or bodies that they sit on.

8.1 No updates were given.

9. Statement of Community Involvement

9.1 The Committee considered the report outlining Norfolk County Council's Statement of Community Involvement, reviewed in accordance with Norfolk County Council's adopted Minerals & Waste Development Scheme timetable to keep it up-to-date.

9.2 The Committee **RECOMMENDED** to Full Council to resolve to formally adopt the 2018 Norfolk Statement of Community Involvement (Appendix 1 to the report)

10. Annual review of enforcement policy

10.1 The Committee received the report outlining changes to the Enforcement Policy which had been reviewed and updated. The only major change was to the blue badge protocol

10.2 During discussion & in response to Member queries the following points were noted:

- It would be helpful for a summary of key areas of enforcement and key successes to be available to the public; Officers took this suggestion on board and **agreed** to

circulate information to Members of the Committee

- The issue of planning enforcement, raised in the report, had been discussed at a Norfolk Leaders meeting; it has been suggested, as per a similar scheme to that piloted in West Norfolk, a pool of funds could be created by a number of agencies to allow quick response to issues; the fund being replenished by the responsible agency
- The Head of Planning reported that the most effective agency from a legal perspective was the Environment Agency, so it would be best for them to take the lead with the Council's support
- The Assistant Director of Highways and Waste confirmed that the policy on culverts had not changed; private owners of culverts should engage with area highway staff if changes or repairs were needed and engage certified contractors

10.3 The Committee **CONFIRMED** the revised Community and Environmental Services Enforcement Policy and its annex documents meet the requirements of Environment, Development and Transport Committee services, prior to final approval by the Policy & Resources Committee who are the approval body for the policy.

11. Strategic and financial planning

11.1 The Committee considered the report giving an update on the Service Committee's detailed planning to feed into the Council's budget process for 2019-20.

11.2 During discussion & in response to Member queries the following points were noted:

- In the services reporting to Committee, the highest staff turnover was in Support and Development
- The Chairman clarified he said do-it-yourself waste was a "popular service to residents"
- The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services confirmed the only upward budget pressure at this stage was normal inflation; there were two unknowns: waste tonnage for disposal, which was on track so far, and winter costs
- The waste pressure assumption of £1.7m over the next three years was expected to be stable and provision already built into budgets.
- The interest on capital expenditure would be reflected in the Policy and Resources Committee overall position
- To release revenue savings, items under the revenue budget would be capitalised such as finger post replacement under Public Rights of Way, road markings in Norwich, fencing repairs, drainage repairs and routine works on kerbing repairs.
- The overall borrowing strategy did not look at specific assets but was matched to them where possible; assets were reflected in the minimum revenue provision set aside
- Financing options were being looked at and discussions held with contractors about upgrading further main road and residential street lights to LED
- There had been a reduction in posts from the CES Department structure over the last few years, and at the same time other externally funded posts had been added into the structure; the Head of Support and Development for Community and Environmental Services **agreed** to find out and circulate exact figures to Committee Members after the meeting
- It was noted that it was important to optimise energy use across the whole Council
- The street lighting contract was reviewed periodically to ensure value for money
- The business rates forecast would be reflected in the January 2019 report, however was a Policy and Resources Committee issue

11.3 1) The Committee unanimously **AGREED** to **CONSIDER** the content of the report and

the continuing progress of change and transformation of Environment Development and Transport services

- 2) The Committee unanimously **AGREED** to **NOTE** the Council's latest budget assumptions and pressures, and the resulting revised forecast budget gap of £45.322m, which had been updated by Policy and Resources Committee to reflect the latest available information and following Service Committee input in September (paragraph 4.3 and table 1 of the report)
- 3) The Committee unanimously **AGREED** to **NOTE** the revised council tax planning assumptions set out in table 2 of the report
- 4) With 9 votes for and 4 abstentions, the Committee **RESOLVED** to **AGREE** to **APPROVE** the proposed savings for the 2019-20 budget round for recommendation to Policy and Resources Committee in October (table 5 of the report), in particular confirming those savings that were recommended to require consultation as set out in paragraph 6.4 of the report
- 5) The Committee unanimously **AGREED** to **CONSIDER** further key areas of risk in relation to 2019-22 budget planning for the Committee's budgets, including any additional pressures and the robustness of existing planned savings as set out in table 4 of the report, noting that any changes may impact on the overall budget gap and would require additional offsetting savings to be found
- 6) The Committee unanimously **AGREED** to **NOTE** the budget planning timetable (section 7 of the report)

12. Annual Local Levy Setting for the Regional Flood and Coastal Committee

- 12.1 The Committee received the report seeking Norfolk County Council's position on the annual Local levy vote for the Eastern Regional Flood and Coastal Committee.
- 12.2 During discussion & in response to Member queries the following points were noted:
 - The Flood and Water Manager **agreed** to provide information as requested by the Vice-Chairman
 - As Norfolk County Council had two votes they could be outvoted; it was required to pay the levy as agreed by the Regional Flood and Coastal Committee
 - At the last vote Norfolk County Council were outvoted, with a 5% increase agreed
 - Some of the Councils involved had no internal drainage boards
 - The Chairman recommended to Committee a 3% increase
- 12.3 The Committee **AGREED** to put forward a 3% increase as Norfolk County Council's preferred position on the annual Local Levy at the Eastern Regional Flood and Coastal Committee meeting in October 2018

13. Consultation on shale gas

- 13.1 The Committee discussed the report outlining the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy consultation document seeking views on the criteria to be used for inclusion of shale gas production under the nationally significant infrastructure regime.
- 13.2 Mr T East **proposed**, seconded by Mr S Mophew, that the response over fracking was made stronger, emphasising how unwise and unpopular the government's proposal was to bypass local communities and Councils. He felt the decision should be made at a local level and raised concern about permitted planning rights being allowed by government. With 3 votes in favour and 10 votes against, the proposal was lost.
- 13.3 During discussion & in response to Member queries the following points were noted:
 - Some Members felt the response should be more emphatic

- On shore fracking operations were unlikely to be proposed in Norfolk
- Past work on fracking had proved the only scope for fracking in Norfolk was a very small possibility in the West of Norfolk
- The Council was not the determining body for national infrastructure projects; the consultation proposed taking powers of determination over this type of minerals development away from Councils

13.4 The Committee **AGREED** to respond to the above consultations in line with the comments listed in Appendix A and Appendix B attached to the report.

14. Recommendations of Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP) Board

14.1 The Committee considered the report outlining the recommendation from the Greater Norwich Development Partnership Board meeting on the 26 September 2018.

14.2 During discussion & in response to Member queries the following points were noted:

- Further investigation into registers for brownfield sites may be helpful; the Principal Planner **agreed** to send information to Mr B Spratt on this
- Government incentives would be needed to successfully bring forward developments on brownfield sites; Government lobbying would be needed
- Developing brownfield sites could be difficult due to pollution and Government incentives
- Board Members had received a briefing on growth options and new settlement requirements; if these became part of the plan they would be subject to wider scrutiny and consultation
- Members of the Planning Committee and their substitutes had received a training session on the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework)

14.3 The Committee **AGREED** to:

- **NOTE** progress on the production of the Greater Norwich Local Plan; and
- **ENDORSE** the consultation on new and revised site proposals

15. Norwich Western Link Update and Consultation Proposal

15.1 The Committee discussed the report providing an update on the progress of the Norwich Western Link project and the work undertaken since October 2017.

15.2 During discussion & in response to Member queries the following points were noted:

- The Broadland Northway (formerly Norwich Distributor Road, NDR) had been a success and good responses received
- High level objective H4 (improved environment) related to balancing the need for a solution for communities while working with environmental bodies on the impacts of the options; feedback from the consultation would be expected on these points
- Learning from the Broadland Northway project would be applied to the Norwich Western Link project
- Members had not received final costs for the Broadland Northway project; it was suggested that this information should be factored in to the Western Link project
- Including mitigations for project disruptions during construction was suggested as useful
- Surveys were being undertaken for the Broadland Northway monitoring process; results would be reported when available
- Norfolk had been shortlisted for the Transforming Cities Fund which could bring benefits for the Norwich area
- Dereham could benefit from the Norwich economic area after completion of the new

road and was included as one of the locations for consultation

- Cost of bat bridges and their effectiveness was discussed; there was a significant bat population around the Broadland Northway and all work on the project had been agreed with statutory environmental bodies. Bat bridges would be reviewed as part of the Broadland Northway monitoring work to inform their use in future projects
- The road would help with issues of rat running experienced in adjoining areas

15.3 The Committee:

1. **NOTED** the progress with the project
2. **AGREED** in principle to plan for the non-statutory consultation on shortlisting of options which will be subject to detailed approval at the November 2018 Committee meeting

16. Concessionary travel scheme for older and disabled people

16.1 The Committee received the report giving detail on the English National Concessionary Travel Scheme (ENCTS) and the situation on the ENCTS in Norfolk. At the time, not enough money was provided by Government to cover the scheme in Norfolk; there was no scope to make savings within the scheme as it was mandatory.

16.2 During discussion & in response to Member queries the following points were noted:

- It was suggested that petitions and lobbying by bus companies might be more effective than lobbying MPs; the Chairman felt all Norfolk MPs should be lobbied to target all areas of the County
- It was felt fairer funding should be received from Government
- The Head of Passenger Transport confirmed that lobbying was carried out in 2011; bus operators had written separately to their local MPs
- The Head of Passenger Transport **agreed** to provide evidence about progress of the service from 2011-2018 for Members to use when lobbying
- The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services clarified this was a national scheme and there was no hint it would be changed. Councils were required to administer the scheme, regardless of cost
- Hampshire had introduced a scheme where passengers made a small contribution towards bus fares
- The subsidy given to bus companies could help keep retain some rural bus routes
- Mr Castle proposed ruling out charging people for concessionary bus passes as he felt more funding should be provided by the Treasury. The Chairman felt a full review of the system should be asked for and the situation at Hampshire followed

16.3 The Committee:

- **NOTED** the contents of this report and the shortfall in concessionary funding, **AGREED** to seek support from Norfolk's MPs and **ASKED** the Chairman to write to MPs with evidence of figures that Norfolk was short, and to put Norfolk's case to Chris Grayling, MP, for a fairer settlement to cover the full costs of the English National Concessionary Travel Scheme for Norfolk, and for a full review of the system

17. A47 Blofield to Burlingham Dualling Scheme

17.1 The Committee considered the report outlining details for the proposal for the A47 Blofield to Burlingham Dualling Scheme. Highways England had issued proposals for comment; after this, they would come forward with proposals for a development consent order. The Secretary of State would make the final decision on the proposals and consent order. Development was expected to start in 2021 and finish in 2022.

- 17.2 During discussion & in response to Member queries the following points were noted:
- The Vice-Chair felt the Council should push the Blofield to Burlingham dualling scheme, and the other committed projects in the Road Investment Strategy one programme, with agencies and Committee should endorse the whole programme to ensure schemes progress as quickly as possible; he proposed that the Chairman write to the Minister to seek confirmation that the schemes would be delivered to the previously published timetables
 - Work on A47 improvements had progressed slowly since funding announcements & there were concerns about the Thickthorn Junction; work was needed to ensure work on schemes continued at pace and all schemes continued
 - Complete dualling of the A47 was welcomed
 - Environmental and flooding issues on the A47 should be resolved and clearly communicated to the public
 - Local residents had lobbied Committee about provision of a footbridge across the A47; it was felt Members should support the proposals and take this on board
 - The Interim Team Leader for Transport confirmed that discussions were underway related to Thickthorn Roundabout
- 17.3 The Committee:
- (a) **SUPPORTED** the principle of dualling the A47 between Blofield and Burlingham subject to the detailed issues and comments set out in the report being resolved with Highways England
 - (b) **AGREED** to highlight the suggestion for footbridges for pedestrians and cyclists in the response to the consultation, in addition to the items raised in the report
 - (c) **AGREED** that the Executive Director Community and Environmental Services agree the final response in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of Environment, Development and Transport Committee under delegated authority.

18. Performance Management

- 18.1 The Committee received the report based upon the revised Performance Management System implemented as of 1 April 2016 and providing data against the 2018/19 Vital Signs list from measures contained within the 'plans on a page'.
- 18.2 During discussion & in response to Member queries the following points were noted:
- It was requested that the 'out of focus crosses' be removed from future reports
 - The reporting issue for one of the highways indicators had been resolved and data would be included in future reports
 - The planning measure was being reviewed to ensure it could be shown in a way that gave a better indication of performance
- 18.3 The Committee **REVIEWED** and **COMMENTED** on the performance data, information and analysis presented in the body of the report and **DETERMINED** that the recommended actions identified are appropriate

19. Risk Management

- 19.1 The Committee considered the report giving information from the latest Environment Development and Transport Committee risk register as at October 2018, following the latest review conducted in September 2018.
- 19.2 The Committee **CONSIDERED**:
- a) The changes to EDT departmental risks since the last Risk Management report was reported to this Committee in July 2018, in Appendix A of the report

- b) The risks reported by exception in Appendix B of the report
- c) The summary of EDT departmental risks in Appendix C of the report
- d) The list of possible actions, suggested prompts and challenges presented for information in Appendix D of the report
- e) The background information to put the risk scoring into context, shown in Appendix E of the report

20. Finance monitoring

- 20.1 The Committee received the report providing financial monitoring information for the services reporting to this Committee for 2018-19.
- 20.2 The Committee **NOTED**:
- a) The 2018-19 revenue budget the Environment, Development and Transport Committee and the current forecast outturn position
 - b) The Capital programme for this Committee.
 - c) The balance of reserves brought forward to 2018-19.

21. Forward plan and decisions taken under delegated authority

- 21.1 The Committee reviewed the forward plan and decisions taken by Officers under delegated authority.
- 21.2 A further report on river de-maining would be added to the forward plan. This was discussed:
- Mr B Long declared an interest as acting chairman of the King's Lynn Internal Drainage Board, who had de-mained 3 rivers. He discussed that if water was managed before coming to drainage board areas it mitigated issues
 - The Committee had not agreed the previous report on river de-maining over concerns over cost-shunting, hidden costs to district councils and requiring more information about costs to district councils
 - When the report had last been presented to Committee, Members felt that feedback from District Councils on the de-maining was needed
- 21.3 Confirmation of the Rail Strategy for Norfolk and opinions for Rail Development for Norfolk would added to the forward plan.
- 23.4 The Committee:
1. **REVIEWED** the Forward Plan at Appendix A and identified the above additions
 2. **NOTED** the delegated decisions set out in Section 2 of this report.

The meeting closed at 12.05

**Mr Martin Wilby, Chairman,
Environment Development and Transport Committee**



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language, please contact Customer Services on 0344 800 8020, or Text Relay on 18001 800 8020 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

MEMBER/PUBLIC QUESTIONS TO ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: FRIDAY 12 OCTOBER 2018

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

5.1 Question from David Ellis

Are the Committee aware that at present the Residents of North Burlingham, Lingwood and Acle can walk or cycle directly between communities, but that the current Highways England A47 Dualling scheme removes those options?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

This question relates to the agenda item setting out the basis for the County Council's suggested response to Highways England's proposals to dual the A47 between Blofield to Birmingham.

Section 2.22 of the report deals with this issue.

Members will be aware that people walking or cycling between these communities will need to cross the existing A47 and that currently there is no provision for crossing movements. It is acknowledged that the proposals will not allow for direct crossing movements and that is why the report to Members is suggesting that the council replies to the consultation requesting that Highways England further considers this matter.

Highways England has indicated to officers that it might be possible for Highways England to apply for designated funds to improve pedestrian connections across the A47. This potentially provides the means to access additional funding for a crossing, allowing Highways England to deliver the dualling scheme within budget whilst also addressing the concerns.

I would support such a bid by Highways England.

5.2 Question from Isobel Ashworth

Are the Committee aware that the only foot/cycle link provided under the current Highways England A47 Dualling scheme, Burlingham to Lingwood, involves a 3km detour via Blofield?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

Again this relates to the agenda item on the A47 Blofield to Burlingham dualling proposals from Highways England.

Norfolk County Council is aware of the issue. This is dealt with in Section 2.23 of the report.

5.3 Question from Giles Mack

Are the Committee aware that the proposed White House flyover has no footpath provision for walkers or cyclists wanting to access Lingwood/Acle and that as a consequence, no Lingwood child can safely cross to Acle Academy, their designated school?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

Again this relates to the agenda item on the A47 Blofield to Burlingham dualling proposals from Highways England.

Whitehouse Flyover is the proposed new bridge across the A47 at the eastern end of the scheme at the B1140. The PEIR does not explicitly state whether pedestrian or cyclist provision would be incorporated at the junction.

Highways England have however indicated to officers that no provision is currently proposed but that it might be possible to accommodate some provision across the structure.

If Members are minded to support foot or cycle provision on this bridge, the county council's response could request Highways England consider suitable provision.

However, Members should note that there is currently no cycle or pedestrian facility at the existing junction, and the PEIR notes that from surveys "Very few NMU movements were recorded at the junctions of the A47 with the B1140 and South Walsham Road on each of the survey days. The only crossing movements of the A47 to access the side roads were undertaken by cyclists with a maximum two-way flow over the 12hr period of 9 users and this was observed on a Saturday."

The A47 has historically been a barrier in public access separating the two settlements of Burlingham and Lingwood. Burlingham Woods north of the A47, associated permissive paths and the Public Rights of Way network are all popular with pedestrians and dog walkers. The surveys conducted by Highways England support this, with 90 users having walked along Burlingham FP1 one Sunday, other days in the Highways England survey showed consistently high use, however it was noted that very few users, and on most days, no-one would choose to cross the A47. As a contrast the usage (according to Highways England PEIR Report) on the Public Rights of Way network south of the A47 was recorded as low. Two close settlements having such a huge contrast in usage indicates that the A47 is likely to be acting as a substantial barrier to walkers.

5.4 Question from Martin Goodson

Are the Committee aware that early schemes showed a footbridge at North Burlingham - but it has been erased from the present Highways England A47 Dualling scheme and that as a consequence no Burlingham child can safely and directly cross to Lingwood School, their designated school?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

This also relates to the agenda item on the A47 Blofield to Burlingham dualling proposals from Highways England.

Highways England has shown a number of different possible layouts for the proposal during the development of the scheme. However, the proposal that we are being asked to consider is that which they have published as part of the current consultation, and which does not show the footbridge at North Burlingham. The fact that this might have appeared in a previous version of the proposals is not considered material to our response.

It is accepted that, without a bridge, the route between Burlingham and Lingwood would be longer. Currently the distance between the centre of Burlingham and Lingwood Primary is around 2,800m. With the A47 dualling, and using the Blofield Overbridge, it would be around 4,500m.

As stated in the response to David Ellis the report to Members is suggesting that the council replies to the consultation requesting that Highways England further considers the matter of a footbridge at this point.

5.5 Question from Chris Gates

Are the Committee aware that from the outset the Residents of North Burlingham, Lingwood and Acle have asked Highways England for a crossing at North Burlingham and a short extension to the existing footpath that would complete the link to Acle, in line with the promises contained within HE publications to maintain existing access?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

Again this relates to the agenda item on the A47 Blofield to Burlingham dualling proposals from Highways England.

This is the first time that this has brought to the attention of the committee so the committee was not aware of this.

5.6 Question from Mark Hunt

Are the Committee aware that a petition raised at Burlingham and Lingwood to the proposal that "if Highways England were to provide a crossing at Burlingham and an extension to the footway to Acle I would use them" was signed by 607 and handed to Highways England at Acle on 22nd September?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

Again this relates to the agenda item on the A47 Blofield to Burlingham dualling proposals from Highways England.

This is the first time that this has brought to the attention of the committee, so the committee was not aware of this.

5.7 Question from Richard Morton

Are the Committee aware that in the 2015 joint NCC / Broadland DC A47 Dualling study, a crossing at Burlingham was characterised as “vital” to a Community otherwise to be severed by a dualled A47?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

Again this relates to the agenda item on the A47 Blofield to Burlingham dualling proposals from Highways England.

This is the first time that this has brought to the attention of the committee so the committee was not aware of this. I would ask that you give clarification of the report to which you refer as the 'joint Broadland / Norfolk County Council' one since officers are not aware of this report.

5.8 Question from Simon Callan

Would the Committee provide evidence to show why the proposed junction of the B1140 and A47 is safer for cyclists and the occasional pedestrian in crossing the road than a roundabout, and whether they would be willing to consider a roundabout for this junction. This is a very dangerous crossing and will be even more so when the dualling runs from Acle to Norwich. The A47 (A12) at Hopton had a new junction put in when the road was dualled but it had to be changed to a roundabout as the junction was too dangerous.

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

The proposals for dualling the A47, which in principle the county council fully support, are being made by Highways England. It would therefore be for Highways England to provide supporting evidence for their proposals.

Norfolk County Council is being consulted on the proposals and a basis for our suggested response is outlined in the EDT committee report, A47 Blofield to Burlingham Dualling Scheme. The suggested response, which committee will be asked to consider, is supportive of the principal of the proposed junction arrangement.

This is for a number of reasons, not least that grade separation provides the best solution for A47 traffic, enabling the road to serve its intended purpose as the main strategic trunk road connection to Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft.

Turning to the safety aspects, whilst roundabouts have a better safety record than most other junctions for cars and larger motor vehicles, it has long been known that they are one of the most hazardous junction types for cyclists. Transport Research Laboratory (TRL) report 285 states:

‘Roundabouts are a common junction type in the UK. They provide for a range of traffic movements and have a good overall accident record.

However, it has been known for some time that they are one of the most hazardous junction types for pedal cyclists and motor cyclists. A disproportionate number of pedal cyclists accidents occur at roundabouts

and cyclists tend to avoid large and busy roundabouts because they are difficult to negotiate safely.'

In terms of accident statistics, the report goes on to state:

'Pedal cycles were involved in 9% of all vehicle accidents at roundabouts, compared to 7% at T- or staggered junctions, 5% at crossroads, and 5% at non-junction sites. 11% of pedal cycle accidents at roundabouts were classified as fatal or serious, compared to 10% for all road users.'

The most frequent type of cyclist accident at roundabouts involves a circulating cyclist being struck by an entering motor vehicle, probably due to their lack of conspicuity compared to a motor vehicle.

An overbridge, as suggested in the proposals by Highways England, will remove pedestrians and cyclists from the main turning movements associated with the B1140/A47 junction. Those crossing movements that do occur will be at simple priority junctions and completely avoid the high speed A47 dual carriageway which is inherently more unsafe to cross at grade.

6. MEMBER QUESTIONS

6.1 Question from Cllr Mick Castle

I would like to ask the Chairman if he will make representations to Abellio Greater Anglia regarding the almost daily cancellation of early morning trains on the Gt Yarmouth – Norwich line which undermines passenger confidence and reflects adversely on the town as a place to do business.

Does he agree with me and the East Norfolk Transport Users Association that as one of the Country's top seaside resorts the town deserves to become the terminus for longer distance Abellio cross-country journeys to Cambridge and Stansted Airport once new trains become operational over the next 2 years?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

I agree that it is disappointing and unacceptable for train services to be routinely cancelled. I have asked officers to take this up with Greater Anglia to give an understanding about how often trains have been cancelled, and the reasons for any cancellations.

When a response has been received I can circulate this to members of the committee.

The terms of the franchise awarded to Greater Anglia by government do not include an extension (of the train service from Cambridge to Norwich) to Great Yarmouth. They do however include an extension of the service to Stansted Airport. Given that an extension to Great Yarmouth is not included in the franchise specification awarded by government, and the likely practical difficulties involved in extending services, I think it unlikely that this is something that could be achieved in the current franchise period, which runs until 2025.

6.2 Question from Cllr Alexandra Kemp

King's Lynn Transport Plan: Increasing Bus Travel & Restoring Hardings Way Cycle Counters

The Lynn Transport Plan identified West Norfolk has the third greatest increase of emissions in the UK. The Borough had the highest levels of CO2 per capita emissions in Norfolk in 2016; 29% higher than the Norfolk average; 34% higher than the England average. Use of public transport is lower than the national average: will the Committee ensure KLATS' Long List supports increased bus travel, walking and cycling into Lynn's town centre; and restore Hardings Way Bus Lane Cycle Counters to measure success in achieving modal shift?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

The document Councillor Kemp refers to is the recently issued Evidence Gathering report that identifies transport problems and opportunities in King's Lynn. This report draws information from a number of sources including stakeholder consultation and engagement and other published reports and is a document that informs the development of the King's Lynn Transport Strategy.

Based on this document a Long list of transport measures has been identified to be appraised and assessed to determine if they are suitable to be included in a transport strategy for the town. This long list includes all of the suggestions and ideas for transport measures that have been put forward by Councillors and stakeholders. The list includes measures to support increased bus travel, walking and cycling into King's Lynn town centre. As part of the evidence gathering, levels of walking and cycling have been counted on Hardings Way and future counts will enable us to determine the success of encouraging modal shift

The assessment and appraisal will use the Department for Transport (DfT) Early Appraisal Sifting Tool (EAST), and where appropriate, transport modelling. The process will score each possible intervention and determine whether they should be included in the short list from which a draft strategy of schemes and measures could be derived.