

## **Planning, Transportation, the Environment and Waste Overview and Scrutiny Panel**

### **Minutes of the Meeting held on 6 January 2010**

#### **Present:**

Mr S W Bett (Chairman)

Mr A D Adams	Mr T East
Mr R A Bearman	Mr B Iles
Mr A P Boswell	Mr J M Joyce
Mr J S Bremner	Mr B W C Long
Mr A J Byrne (Vice-Chairman)	Mr J M Ward
Mrs M Chapman-Allen	Mr A M White
Mr P G Cook	Mr R J Wright
Mr N D Dixon	

#### **Substitute Members:**

Mr T Tomkinson, for Mr M C Langwade.

#### **Cabinet Members Present:**

Mr A Gunson	Planning and Transportation
Mr I Monson	Waste and Environment

#### **Deputy Cabinet Member Present:**

Mr B H A Spratt	Planning and Transportation
-----------------	-----------------------------

#### **Also Present:**

Mr M Brindle  
Mr D Cox  
Mr G Jones  
Mr S Little  
Mr J Mooney

### **1. Apologies**

1.1 Apologies were received from Mr M C Langwade.

### **2. Minutes**

2.1 The minutes of the meeting that took place on 4 November 2010 were signed as a correct record.

### **3. Declarations of Interest**

3.1 Members declared the following interests:

- Mr T Adams declared a personal interest in items 9 and 10, being a member of the Norfolk Police Authority and the Norwich Highways Agency Joint Committee.
- Mr R Bearman declared a personal interest in items 9 and 10, being a Norwich City Councillor and non-voting member of the Norwich Highways Agency Joint Committee.
- Mr S Bett declared a personal interest in items 9 and 10, being a member of the Norfolk Police Authority.
- Mr B Bremner declared a personal interest in items 9 and 10, being a Norwich City Councillor and non-voting member of the Norwich Highways Agency Joint Committee.
- Mr A Byrne declared a personal interest in items 9 and 10, being a member of the Norfolk Police Authority and the Norwich Highways Agency Joint Committee.
- Mr B Iles declared a personal interest in items 9 (Street Lighting Policy) and 10 (Trading on the Highway), being a member of the Norfolk Police Authority.
- Mr B Long declared a personal interest in item 12 (The Wash Shoreline Management Plan – SMP - Consultation), being the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk lead on the SMP.

### **4. Matters of Urgent Business – Winter Maintenance**

4.1 The Committee received a report, which is attached at Appendix 1 to these minutes.

4.2 The Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation thanked the County Council workforce for the hard work undertaken over the Christmas period in dealing with the wintry weather. He advised that the Winter Maintenance policy had last been reviewed in 2005 and that the principal of which roads are gritted and cleared had remained largely the same. Over £1m had already been spent on gritting and snow clearance – about half of the budget had been spent in one month. He confirmed that the county was not running out of salt. Norfolk County Council's PFI meant that salt stocks were automatically replenished. The policy was very clear – gritting and snow clearance was carried out on a priority basis, with A and B roads, heavily trafficked C roads and main access roads to villages the highest priority. This also included the main shopping footways in Norwich, King's Lynn and Great Yarmouth. Other roads, footways and cycleways were done as and when possible. A combination of factors has made this more difficult in the recent spell, not least the freezing temperatures.

4.3 Mr East, who had requested that the issue be considered as urgent business, reported that this had been a truly testing time for disabled, frail and vulnerable people. This had been exacerbated by the absence of gritting of footways in market towns and the fact that gritting bins had not been replenished. He had raised the issue to seek clarification about the neglect of market town centres, to establish who was responsible for grit bins and because he had had a lot of enquiries about the lack of treatment of footways. Since the Winter Maintenance programme was five years old he felt it needed to be reviewed.

The Head of Highway Operations reported that there were over 700 grit bins around the county and that it was difficult to know when they were empty. It would be helpful if Parish Councils could contact the County Council if that was the case. Delays in

replenishing grit bins was mainly owing to the use of the snow ploughs, which had diverted resources as they required two people to operate them. The County Council had been doing all it could to clear as many roads and footways as possible, but it had to do this on a priority basis, which had been outlined by the Cabinet Member.

4.4 Members of the Panel commended front-line staff, who they felt had worked exceptionally hard in difficult circumstances. Members had received a large number of queries from residents about grit bins. Some felt more systematic communication was needed to ensure that everyone was clear about who was responsible for where they were placed and how they were refilled. It was suggested that a database showing the location of grit bins would be useful. Others felt that, particularly in rural areas, responsibility for grit bins worked well through volunteers assigned by the Parish and Town Councils. One Member suggested a discussion needed to take place with community groups and residents and called for volunteer grit wardens to be assigned, to report to the County Council when the bins needed refilling. It was also suggested a review of the Winter Maintenance Plan should take place at the Panel's March meeting.

4.5 In response to questions, the Panel noted the following key points:

- Residents could help by removing snow from pathways, by sweeping the snow into the gutter before it compacted into ice, and making use of the grit bins in place. The additional information that had been circulated clarified the situation about potential liability and officers undertook to publicise it widely.
- Norfolk County Council had benefited greatly from the PFI contract for the provision of salt. However, the Government was likely to set in place emergency arrangements what would override existing contractual arrangements. The County Council had made the point that the Government needed to pay regard to local arrangements but there was likely to be an increasing degree of national control over grit supplies in the coming days.
- The provision of grit bins was the responsibility of Parish Councils.
- The County Council did have arrangements with some farmers to clear snow. They were provided with snow ploughs and adaptations for their tractors. These arrangements were costly and were only used when they could be of real benefit and provided value for money.

4.6 The Panel noted the report and agreed that further information about the existing arrangements for grit bins should be circulated before the next meeting, to include details of the locations of grit bins. The Panel would then decide whether further scrutiny was needed.

## **5. Public Question Time**

### **5.1 Question from Councillor Brociek-Coulton (Norwich City)**

The Labour City Councillors are worried about the shutting down of lights from 12 midnight to 5am, in the country many of the residents are used to not having lights but in the outskirts of the City where our ward is it is essential to have the lights remain on. For instance you intend to shut down Bull Close Road, Spencer Street, Silver Street and Wodehouse Street. If your policy is put through to do this to the residents of Norwich then this area would be in total darkness apart from Silver Street. The Sewell Labour Councillors find this unacceptable. Why when such as small amount of money is being

saved is this being put through and why hasn't there been better consultation with the people who are being most effected our residents.

### **Response by the Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation**

The Cabinet Member thanked Councillor Brociek-Coulton for letting the Panel know her views. He confirmed that in terms of consultation, a number of exercises had been, and were being, carried out. These included:-

- A specific consultation with Norfolk Citizens Panel, the results of which were reported to this Panel in November last year
- The Council's current consultation on it's budget for next year, which includes part night lighting
- Letters to Parish and Town Councils, District Councils, the Police and other stakeholders to ask for their views.

If the proposal was agreed, there would also be further opportunities for local residents to make their views known as residents would be advised in advance of any works in their area.

He explained that introducing part night lighting would not only save £167,000 each year, but would also help to save significant amounts of CO2. The proposal being considered was to introduce part night lighting in areas where there was little through traffic and low traffic volumes – this would be in the middle of the night (midnight to 5am) at a time when few people were out and about. A number of exemptions to this had been identified, and it was possible that one of these may apply to the streets that she had mentioned, for example, it may be necessary to continue lighting the road humps on Spencer Street. Local issues like this would be considered before installing the new equipment needed for part night lighting.

Councillor Brociek-Coulton stressed that she hoped the County Council did consult with residents as many had concerns.

## **5.2 Question from Mr John Cook**

What consultation has the County Council undertaken with Norfolk Police in respect of plans to switch off street lights between midnight and 5am and what information has the Council obtained in respect of the impact of similar switch-offs elsewhere in Britain?

### **Response by the Chairman**

The Chairman explained that in developing proposals, the County Council had discussed them with Norfolk Police and they had been invited to formally let us know their views as part of the current consultation. In addition, we worked with Norfolk Police in developing the street lighting PFI contract that was already being implemented across Norfolk. This included carrying out work to identify areas of low crime in Norfolk, information which was now being used to inform the part night lighting proposal.

The report to Panel Members included information on some other Local Authorities that had already introduced or trialled part night lighting. For example, Essex County Council had carried out a trial in two predominantly rural districts. They achieved energy savings of 20% in those areas and no increase in crime was recorded. In

addition, there were some Parish Councils in Norfolk who had already introduced part-night lighting for the lights that they owned, and he was not aware that they had experienced any issues.

Mr Cook asked when the Police had been contacted about the proposal, as this may have led to them taking a different view.

The Chairman confirmed that it had been during December, but a written response would be provided to confirm exactly when.

## **6. Local Member Issues/Member Questions**

### **6.1 First Question from Graham Jones, Local Member for Mundesley Division**

The failure of the County Council to grit key areas of Mundesley during the recent snow and ice led to a significant number of falls including at least 4 visits to the hospital and a number of minor injuries. One of the fallers was an elderly lady of 74 who sustained a swollen knee injury and a bruised elbow. There was no gritting at all in the important Station Road or Back Street and that included roads and footpaths. These roads and footpaths were like an ice rink. Given that these are vital links to the Doctors surgery and the County Council's own Mundhaven Care Home will the Panel respond to the following questions:-

Assuming that the County Council accept that the gritting of roads and footpaths such as those described is a mark of a forward thinking civilised and caring authority who are mindful of the well being of its inhabitants, can the Panel advise of what planning, particularly in the area of risk assessment, took place prior to the adverse weather event that would enable these areas to be rendered reasonably safe for the inhabitants of Mundesley?

#### **Response by the Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation**

The Cabinet Member explained that the County Council, like all Highway Authorities, had an agreed Winter Maintenance Plan in place. The highest priorities (priority 1 and 2) were A and B roads together with a route into the major villages and footways in the main shopping areas of Norwich, King's Lynn and Great Yarmouth. Within a limited budget, roads had to be prioritised on the basis of traffic flows and strategic access. This ensured that as many people as possible had reasonable access to treated parts of the network, and could therefore reach places of work and key services, accepting that for some this would require adjustments to their normal route. The priorities were reviewed every year, and minor adjustments continued to be made. Any significant increase in the network covered would require additional resources to be made available.

During the recent spell of bad weather, as there was snow falling or forecast on several days we had to deploy two shifts of operatives to deal with the possibility of snow ploughing (which requires two operatives in each vehicle). To do this, we had to employ additional staff from our strategic partner, May Gurney, and other agencies. As a result, we did not have any operatives available to deal with footways. By 23 December, the main roads had been treated around 30 times.

The County Council had treated priority 3 roads (roads connecting strategic routes etc) on 3 occasions. There were also 750 grit bins provided around the County for residents to use on a self help basis. The depots received requests for additional assistance via Customer Service Centre, and these were responded to, where possible, by prioritising the resources available.

The Director of Planning and Transportation added that the Review of the Waste Management Programme was the risk assessment and annual assessment.

## **6.2 Second Question from Graham Jones, Local Member for Mundesley Division**

Given the serious risk to life and limb will the Panel order an immediate review of its plans for the gritting of these two areas of Mundesley and a county wide review of other areas ensuring that it consults widely in this respect, especially with local members, District and Parish Councils and local farmers.

### **Response by the Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation**

The current winter maintenance policy was agreed by Cabinet in 2005, following consideration by Panel and stakeholder consultation; although the new policy did not differ significantly from the one previously agreed in 1999. At the end of each winter maintenance season, officers review performance and update the operational plan to take account of experience, ready for the next season.

In relation to Mundesley we recognise the need to add Station Road to gritting routes and this is being implemented. While we will continue to review the priority network, and make adjustments where appropriate, a significant increase in winter maintenance would require substantial additional funding which is not available within existing budgets.

Probably the best way of improving the situation would be for residents and businesses, where possible, to sweep the snow into the gutter before it has a chance to compact into ice, as we are unlikely to be able to respond as quickly ourselves.

## **6.3 Question by Stephen Little, Local Member for Town Close Division**

Concerns have been expressed to me by residents that the turning off of street lights after 12 midnight in many residential streets in Town Close division, such as Newmarket Street, will potentially cause an increase in crime and fear of crime as well as compromise the safety of the many pedestrians returning home from pubs and clubs. Does the council consider that it has sufficient evidence to ensure that the safety of residents will not be compromised by this measure?

### **Response by the Chairman**

The Chairman explained that this had already been answered.

Mr Little emphasised that crime and the fear of crime needed to be dealt with in consultation with the Police.

## **7. Cabinet Member Feedback on Previous Overview and Scrutiny Panel Comments**

7.1 The Panel noted the annexed joint report (Item 7) by the Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation and the Cabinet Member for Waste and Environment, which provided some feedback on Cabinet discussion of the Panel's comments.

## **8. The Environmental Impact of Landfill**

8.1 The Panel considered the annexed report (Item 8) by the Director of Environment, Transport and Development, which summarised the legacy of landfill as a waste disposal method and the subsequent long term liability for the County Council.

8.2 In response to Member questions and comments, the Panel noted the following key points:

- The main aim of the waste team was to protect human health and natural resources. Where site checks showed there were risks, the County Council had installed appropriate monitoring arrangements. Where the risk is shown to be significant, action had been taken to control emissions. All assessments look at the history of the site, including the age of the waste, the composition and the environment the site was in.
- The legal argument set out in the Panel's report referred to unlicensed sites which were already closed. These were generally small pits with a very low risk and fell under the Contaminate Land legislation. Until a precedent was set by case law, it was not clear who had liability for these sites. The County Council had always said it may have liability, but the recent House of Lords ruling put that in some doubt. Officers continued to seek legal advice.
- The Environment Agency was the regulatory authority responsible for monitoring the levels of waste leaching into water systems. It had given permission for tipping to continue at Attlebridge.
- The County Council had no liability for the landfill site at Aldeby, which was run by WRG.
- The set-up costs to make a grid connection for electricity created from landfill gas were high. The County Council needed to prove that sufficient gas was being created to justify the capital outlay. The County Council had set up a project with the Environment Agency to looking at ways of dealing with low calorific gas.

8.3 The Panel noted the report.

## **9. Street lighting – part night lighting**

9.1 The Panel considered the annexed report (Item 9) by the Director of Environment, Transport and Development, which proposed a way forward for introducing part night lighting in Norfolk.

9.2 Mr Bremner had requested some additional information, which was circulated to the meeting and is attached to these minutes at Appendix 2. A summary of the consultation responses was also circulated and is attached to these minutes at Appendix 3.

9.3 Some Members were concerned that switching off lights in whole areas could affect feelings of safety, particularly in urban areas. Others felt that it was important to think differently and that the energy saving benefits of the proposal outweighed the perceived

threat of crime. Trials in Essex had shown that levels of night time crime had reduced and other media coverage had shown that lights did not deter crime. The public needed to be reassured. One Member suggested that the decision should not be made until the best evidence was available, including Norfolk Constabulary's report. He suggested that the Cabinet should postpone making a decision until:

- 1) It had looked at options for the County Council to source its own renewable energy. This would generate greater energy savings and generate income for the County Council through feed-in tariffs.
- 2) A pilot had been carried out in a safe area of Norwich City.
- 3) Wider consultation had been carried out, perhaps through a "Street Lighting Panel", to allow community groups and Local Members to make considered representation.

Another Member added that if more exemptions were made, less energy would be saved, which was a limited approach. Trialling new technology should be looked at and it was important to listen to the Police, other agencies and the Parish and Town Councils.

9.4 In response to Member questions and comments, the Panel noted the following key points:

- Technology to develop street lights that generate their own energy was in its infancy. Bridgend Council had found this type of street light was not cost effective and that their performance was poor.
- It would be possible for the County Council to purchase locally generated renewable energy.

9.5 The Chairman emphasised that the decision had not yet been made and that a consultation was taking place. Some streets would be exempt from the switch-off, for example if they had CCTV cameras, where there were remote footpaths and alleys linking residential streets or if the Police could demonstrate that the proposal might adversely affect crime levels.

9.6 The Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation confirmed that lights would not be switched-off in the centre of urban areas or any high or medium crime areas. The proposal would take three years to implement and local residents would be consulted with as each area was taken forward.

9.7 The Cabinet Member for Waste and Environment added that the County Council had a big task ahead to reduce carbon emissions. The Sustainability Team continued to explore opportunities for generating renewable energy.

9.8 The Panel asked the Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation to report its views to the Cabinet on 25 January and agreed to recommend to the Cabinet that, if it agreed to a change in the street lighting policy to enable part night lighting, and subject to the outcome of the Budget consultation:

- 1) Part night lighting be introduced on roads which are not classed as routes with through traffic value and where crime rates are low (lighting classes S5 and S6)
- 2) That it approve the delegation of the resolution of relevant issues including decisions on part-night lighting exemptions, to the Director of Environment, Transport and Development in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation.
- 3) That it approve the additional investment into street lighting, subject to the conditions above and sufficient funds being available from within the planning



and Transportation budget at the year end, and to set out a new reserve for this future investment.

9.9 Mr Bremner asked for the minute to record that he did not agree with points 1) and 2) at paragraph 9.8 above.

## **10. Removal and disposal of vehicles for sale on the highway**

10.1 The Panel considered the annexed report (Item 10) by the Director of Environment, Transport and Development, which set out the latest position in connection with the removal and disposal of vehicles for sale on the highway.

10.2 Mr East reminded the Panel that he had raised this issue for scrutiny. He was satisfied with the information in the report and did not feel that further scrutiny was needed.

10.3 The Panel noted the report.

## **11. Forward Work Programme: Scrutiny**

11.1 The Panel considered the annexed report (Item 11) by the Director of Environment, Transport and Development, which asked the Panel to review and develop the programme for scrutiny.

11.2 The Panel agreed the forward work programme.

## **12. The Wash Shoreline Management Plan**

12.1 The Panel considered the annexed report (Item 12) by the Director of Environment, Transport and Development, which asked the Panel to comment on the content of the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) as part of the formal consultation process.

12.2 The Panel welcomed Mr Mike Dugher, Northern Area Coastal Manager for the Environment Agency (EA).

12.3 The Head of Environment and Waste reported that the Cabinet had agreed the response, as set out in the report, but had raised concerns about the phrase 'no regrets' and felt that less emotive wording should be used.

12.4 Members raised concerns about the scientific basis on which the SMP had been drafted, the need to map a range of scenarios relating to sea level rises, the phrase 'no regrets', the lack of proper consideration of the historic environment and the cost of allowing land to be flooded.

12.5 In response to Member questions and comments, the Panel was advised that:

- SMPs were based on Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) guidance. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 2007 report had been published since but the EA had been advised that Defra figures were robust.
- Each SMP would have an action plan. One of the actions could be that the Wash SMP should be reviewed in light of any changes to the guidance.

- The EA had looked at a range of scenarios for inter-tidal ranges in the second and third Epochs, which was why it had got undetermined policies in some areas. Keeping this under review would be part of the action plan.
- The EA had had input from stakeholders throughout the process and none had raised any direct concerns about protection of the historic environment. If any representations were made as a result of the consultation these comments would be considered.
- The EA continued to invest in the current defences in PDZ 2, Wolferton Creek to South Hunstanton. Defra had questioned whether the current approaches were economically viable, which was why new approaches were being consulted upon as part of the SMP.

12.5 The Panel agreed that the proposed response, as set out in the annexed report, should be submitted to the Environment Agency by 15 January 2010.

### **13. Integrated Performance and Finance Monitoring Report**

13.1 The Panel considered the annexed report (Item 13) by the Director of Environment, Transport and Development, which set out progress against Planning and Transportation's service plan actions, risks and budget.

13.2 The Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation highlighted that the decision on funding for the Postwick Hub scheme had been approved, subject to acceptance of the Major Scheme Business Case for the Northern Distributor Route (NDR) by the Department for Transport.

13.3 The Cabinet Member for Waste and Environment confirmed that the County Council was still working on securing short term schemes to divert biodegradable waste from landfill and that a further report would be presented to the Panel in March.

13.4 The Panel noted the report.

### **14. Service and Budget Planning 2010-13**

14.1 The Panel considered the annexed report (Item 14) by the Director of Environment, Transport and Development, which set out proposals for service and financial planning for 2010/11-2012-13.

14.2 The Cabinet Members were asked if the County Council's environmental policy was likely to be hardest hit if cuts were implemented. The Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation emphasised that cuts needed to be made because there was a shortage of money, which he recognised was an issue for Planning and Transportation, and these would depend on what priority an area was given. The Cabinet Member for Waste and Environment said energy savings and sustainability was a priority for the County Council and he hoped that if it did have to make cuts a balance would be found that would not be detrimental to carbon emission savings.

14.3 The Panel asked the Cabinet Members to report the Panel's concerns to the Cabinet about the need to maintain proper resources for the Sustainability Team, as failing to meet national indicators could cost the County Council more money and have an impact on council tax payers. The Panel also agreed the list of prioritised bids for capital funding set out in the annexed report.

## **15. Local Transport Plan Settlement and Highways Capital Programme 2010-2012**

15.1 The Panel considered the annexed report (Item 15) by the Director of Environment, Transport and Development, which summarised the Local Transport Plan (LTP) Settlement for 2010/11 and suggested a highways capital programme for 2010/11/12.

15.2 The Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation drew the Panel's attention to paragraph 2.1 of the Panel's report which stated that there had been no increase for the structural maintenance budget in real terms since 2004. This meant that the County Council was struggling to maintain the quality of roads and it was evident the quality was deteriorating. To mitigate this, it was recommended that the Panel support the reallocation of funding to the structural maintenance budget. The recommendation suggested £1m, but a further £0.5m had been identified from bridges. The Cabinet Member also drew the Panel's attention to suggested improvements to public transport. He would have wished to do more, but highlighted that the improvements were spread across the county.

15.3 During discussion the following comments were made:

- The structural maintenance budget had been reduced by 32% in real terms and the volume of road repairs had been reduced by one third as a result.
- Although money was being spent on creating shared cycle paths in Thetford, people were not getting on their bikes. It was suggested that those funds could be reallocated.
- There was scope to shelve the pedestrian improvement in Hoveton. The project was subject to further modelling and there was a lot of local opposition, so the £130,000 could be reallocated.
- The Department for Transport guidance rated shared cycle paths as a low priority.

15.4 The Panel agreed to recommend to Cabinet that:

- 1) £1.5m of integrated transport and bridges funding should be reallocated to structural maintenance of roads, to partially address the deterioration in highway condition.
- 2) Chief Officer delegated powers should be used to manage the two year programme.

## **16. City Agency Review**

16.1 The Panel considered the annexed report (Item 16) by the Director of Environment, Transport and Development, which discussed the strategy and options for the Norwich City Highways Agency from April 2011.

16.2 Mr Adams, Chairman of the Norwich Highways Agency Joint Committee, urged the committee to support Option 3, as set out in the Panel's report, as being the best way forward. It was suggested that Option 2 also needed to be considered as the terms of the current agreement needed to be renegotiated.

- 16.4 The Panel agreed that Option 3, as set out in the annexed report, was the preferred approach subject with the addition of the need to minimise the cost of staff redeployment.

(The meeting closed at 12:45 pm)

Chairman



**If you need these Minutes in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Jo Martin on 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.**

**Planning and Transportation the Environment and Waste Overview  
and Scrutiny Panel  
6 January 2010  
Item No.**

**Winter Maintenance**

Report by the Director of Environment, Transport and Development

nary

During, and following, the recent spell of wintry weather, a number of Members have reported that they received comments and questions from their constituents about the Council's approach to winter maintenance. There have also been some concerns raised by residents via the local media. In light of this feedback, and the fact that it is likely that we will experience further bad weather this winter, this report is being considered as an urgent item. This will provide the opportunity for Panel Members to discuss any issues or concerns, and will help to clarify the Council's policy and practice.

This report summarises the Council's current policy and practice in relation to winter maintenance. The policy is to carry out gritting and snow clearance work on a priority basis. The highest priority is A and B roads, heavily trafficked C roads and main access roads to villages – which accounts for 1,900 miles – and includes the main shopping footways in Norwich, King's Lynn and Great Yarmouth.

Within a limited budget, roads have to be prioritised on the basis of traffic flows and strategic access. This ensures that as many people as possible have reasonable access to treated parts of the network, and can therefore reach places of work and key services, accepting that for some this will require adjustments to their normal route. The priorities are reviewed every year, and minor adjustments continue to be made. Any significant increase in the network covered would require additional resources to be made available.

So far this winter, the workforce has been deployed over 50 times to carry out winter maintenance duties – this has included employing up to 56 additional staff from our strategic Partner May Gurney, sub-contractors and other agencies to help deal with the recent spell of bad weather. This has included some gritting of footways, but resources available to do this have been limited because of the need to use operatives for the prolonged use of snow ploughs (which requires two operatives to be present in each vehicle). The cost of carrying out this work, up to 31 December 2009, is over £900k - this includes the cost of the 10,000 tonnes of salt which has been used.

**Action Required**

Members are asked to consider the Council's current policy and procedure and identify whether there are any areas suitable for further scrutiny.

## 1. **Background**

- 1.1. The Council's Winter Maintenance Policy was last reviewed in 2004/5 and agreed by Cabinet in January 2005 – although it did not differ significantly from the previous policy agreed in 1999. The review in 2004/5 was carried out following some recent changes in relevant legislation. For example, Section 41 of the Highways Act was amended to expressly include snow and ice in a Highway Authority's statutory duty to maintain the highway.
- 1.2. As part of the review, a consultation with stakeholders was carried out, the results of which were reported to PTEWED Review Panel on 25 November 2004. This showed that 56% said we treated enough of the road network when frost was predicted and 60% said we should not treat footways when ice was forecast.
- 1.3. Gritting routes are reviewed annually by officers, against the policy, and some additional roads have previously been added as part of this process.

## 2. **Winter Maintenance Policy and practice**

- 2.1. The County Council is responsible for all roads in Norfolk with the exception of those within Norwich City (which are the responsibility of the City Council, under the terms of the Agency Agreement) and trunk roads, A11, A47 and A12, which are the responsibility of the Highways Agency.
- 2.2. The Council's current Winter Maintenance Policy is to carry out precautionary salting on a priority basis when ice is likely to form and, at times of snowfall, to clear snow from the highway. The priorities, shown at Appendix A, were developed taking into account the available resources, associated costs of operations and extent to which we are able to provide a responsive service (for example we have a target standard to complete priority treatments within three hours).
- 2.3. Within a limited budget, roads have to be prioritised on the basis of traffic flows and strategic access. This ensures that as many people as possible have reasonable access to treated parts of the network, and can therefore reach places of work and key services, accepting that for some this will require adjustments to their normal route. This is important for the delivery of goods and movement of buses, not just private cars. The priorities are reviewed every year, and minor adjustments continue to be made. Any significant increase in the network covered would require additional resources to be made available.
- 2.4. Snow ploughs are fitted on vehicles and used, where appropriate, but this does involve the need for a 'mate' in each vehicle to safely carry out the operation. For clearance of very heavy snow drifts etc, excavators and earth-moving equipment are deployed when and where needed. A list of problematic gradients is also maintained – these are known areas where significant snowfall is likely to cause major traffic congestions. We are also able to deploy approximately 60 snow ploughs with the help of farmers. However, a significant snow fall is necessary for these to be effective and economic.
- 2.5. The current policy includes provision for clearance of footways, although, as can be seen at Appendix A, these are a lower priority than roads and therefore addressed as resources permit. The conditions on main roads will dictate how soon resources can be released for the lower priorities.

- 2.6. The County Council maintains a number of grit bins at known trouble spots such as problematic gradients, bends, footbridges etc for use by road users, and procedures in place for dealing with requests for new bins. Since 1995, the number of bins provided in Norfolk has risen from 205 to over 700, with a considerable number of Parish Councils providing the funding for the bins in their area.
- 2.7. The Department has a number of winter services procedures in place for staff, which are contained in the Winter Services Plan.

### 3. **Preparing for winter maintenance**

- 3.1. The Winter Services Plan is reviewed and updated each year, including taking account of feedback and experience from the previous year. The identified gritting routes are also reviewed, and new maps and instructions are produced if necessary.
- 3.2. Training and briefings are carried out for relevant staff, including operatives, Duty Officers and County Controllers. All of the vehicles are fully serviced and checked, and some 'dry runs' carried out. All of the Council's salt barns were restocked with salt.
- 3.3. The county council's gritters use 'Safecote' salt that has been treated with a sugar byproduct to improve spreading, allowing spreading rates to be 25% lower without any reduction in effectiveness. The 'Safecote' salt stored for gritting Norfolk's roads comes from Winsford, Cheshire. 2008-09 was the first winter season 'Safecote' salt was used in Norfolk.
- 3.4. A leaflet, which includes details of the gritting routes, is produced before each winter season and over 4,000 hard copies are distributed, including to all County Council Members, Parish and Town Councils and to District Councils for their Members. Copies are also available in libraries and on the internet at [http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/consumption/idcplg?IdcService=SS\\_GET\\_PAGE&ssDocName=NCC048988](http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/consumption/idcplg?IdcService=SS_GET_PAGE&ssDocName=NCC048988)

### 4. **Resources**

- 4.1. The total budget allocated for winter maintenance for county roads in 2009/10 is £1.9m for actions and salt (over £900,000 has been spent so far during 2009/10) with another £1.6m for fixed costs like standing charges, vehicle costs and salt storage. In practice, should this budget be exceeded we will generally continue to carry out winter maintenance to the standards defined by our Winter Maintenance Policy if possible, with the shortfall being met from reserves, as happened last winter.
- 4.2. The Council has a PFI contract in place with Salt Union for the provision of salt to the seven barns located around the county – 10,000 tonnes have been used so far in 2009/10. This approach has been held up nationally as good practice - and despite the salt shortages other counties experienced early in 2009, Norfolk did not run out of salt and we were able to continue gritting routes throughout the bad weather.
- 4.3. The County Surveyors Society has recently issued some guidance to local authorities about conserving salt by reducing service levels. Whilst our PFI with Salt Union ensures that our salt stock position is manageable at present, we may need to consider this if there is a reoccurrence of the National salt shortages. The implication being there are authorities who were not able to deal with the situation as well as we have.

- 4.4. The Council has a number of trained staff in place to deal with winter maintenance. In addition, we are able to employ staff from our strategic partner May Gurney, sub-contractors and other agencies during peaks e.g. periods of particularly bad weather – we employed 56 additional staff to deal with the recent spell of bad weather.
- 4.5. A full action to treat the priority routes identified at Appendix A requires 52 vehicles, covers a road network of 70 main roads (1,900 miles). It also takes three hours on the road, uses 285 tonnes of salt and costs £25,000 (£37,000 if taking into account the fixed costs e.g. cost of vehicles and salt storage).

## 5. **Taking action**

- 5.1. The Winter Services Plan sets out clear procedures for decision making, including guidance on the appropriate treatments for the predicted road conditions. Special weather forecasts are received daily, as well as information from the ice detector stations placed around the County.
- 5.2. Decisions on the most appropriate course of action are made by the County Controller, in conjunction with the Duty Area Manager. The County Controller is also supported by Duty Officers located at the County's Depots. Duty rotas are maintained and updated weekly for these roles. Operatives often work 12 hour days during peak periods,
- 5.3. Making these decisions includes taking account of the road surface temperature, precipitation (e.g. whether it has rained, is expected to rain, whether it is expected to freeze) and the road conditions (e.g. wet, wet patches or dry). Those making the decision will also be mindful of the limitations of any approach which they may select, for example:-
- In normal conditions, gritting routes take up to 3 ½ hours to implement from start to finish.
  - In snow ploughing conditions, these times will be more than doubled because of the need to travel in both directions on the road.
  - Snow ploughs are not able to completely clear snow from the road – they will clear snow only to the clearance of the blade from the road, to prevent damage to the road and equipment.
  - As temperatures fall the effectiveness of using salt can be reduced (note that salting the road can contribute to lowering the temperature of the road).
  - Heavy snowfall can reduce the effectiveness of salt.
  - After spreading salt on top of snow, a reasonable amount of traffic, including HGVs, is needed to ensure that it is 'worked in' to the snow so that it can be effective.
  - The clearance of footways is a labour intensive manual operation, as it is carried out by hand, and it more difficult once the snow has 'glazed over'.
- 5.4. So far during the 2009/10 winter, the workforce has been deployed more than 50 times to carry out winter maintenance activities. This has included some gritting of footways, but resources available to do this have been limited because of the need to use operatives for the prolonged use of snow ploughs (which requires two operatives to be present in each vehicle). The vast majority of these activities involved gritting all 1,900 miles of priority roads across the county.



5.5. Because our efforts at times of snow concentrate firstly on the main roads, the most effective action to improve footways would be for frontagers to sweep the snow into the gutter before it compacts into ice, and to make use of the grit bins in place. The householder is, of course, under no duty to do that on a publicly maintainable footway. If they decide to do it they are potentially liable if an accident is caused by their intervention but they will only be liable if it can be proved by the claimant that they did not take reasonable care in what they did. They are unlikely to be liable if they only partially cleared the snow (given that they have no duty to do it at all) but only if they did something which made the situation worse e.g. pouring hot water on the surface which then freezes.

## 6. **Resource Implications**

6.1. **Finance** : Forecasting expenditure on winter maintenance is difficult because of the unpredictability of weather conditions. However, it was recently agreed to release £0.200m additional funding from the Planning and Transportation Budget under-spend into winter maintenance, and this is included in the figure quoted in para 4.1.

6.2. **Staff** : See section 4 above.

6.3. **Property** : The Council has seven salt barns in place across the County.

## 7. **Other Implications**

7.1. **Legal Implications** : Section 41 of the Highways Act 1980 includes the following sub-section:-

“1(a) In particular, a highway authority is under a duty to ensure, so far, as is reasonable practicable, that safe passage along a highway is not endangered by snow and ice”

There is, however, no absolute duty to clear snow and ice. The duty on the highway authority is, as far as practicable, to ensure snow or ice does not endanger the safe passage; winter maintenance falls within this duty and involves a balance between the degree of risk and the steps necessary to eliminate it including the cost involved. Section 150 of the Highways Act also imposes a duty upon authorities to remove any obstructions of the highway resulting from accumulation of snow etc.

7.2. **Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)** : An equality impact assessment on the County's winter maintenance policy has been carried out. This highlighted a possibility inequality for older or disabled people, particularly those with mobility problems, because of the low priority given to treating footways. The current policy of providing grit bins and treating footways on a cost benefit/resource analysis basis was thought to be appropriate in terms of helping to mitigate this issue, bearing in mind that this problem is infrequent and has a temporary impact. In implementing the Policy, the County Controller is also able to use his discretion to provide additional service in areas where there accessibility dependencies.

7.3. **Communications** : The Department provides information to the local media during spells of bad weather to help keep residents updated, and the Customer Service Centre are able to provide information about gritting runs etc. Information on the existing policy and practice are available to view on the Council's website, and a gritting leaflet has been produced and shared with Parish and Town Councils and other stakeholders.

7.4. **Health and safety implications** : All winter maintenance staff are fully briefing/trained each year before carry out winter maintenance activities. All relevant risk assessments are in place.

8. **Section 17 – Crime and Disorder Act**

8.1. N/A

**Action Required**

- (i) Members are asked to consider the Council's current policy and procedure and identify whether there are any areas suitable for further scrutiny.

**Background Papers**

Report to PTEWED Review Panel 25 November 2004

NCC Winter Maintenance Policy, as set out in the report to Cabinet dated 31 January 2005

2009/10 Winter Services Plan

**Officer Contact**

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Telephone Number</b>	<b>Email address</b>
John Longhurst	01603 224290	john.longhurst@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 and ask for John Longhurst or textphone 0344 800 8011 and we will do our best to help.

Precautionary Gritting and Snow Clearance  
**Priorities for Treatment**

Subject	NCC Priorities	Situations when treated
<b>Roads</b>	<b>Priority 1 &amp; 2:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All primary and principal roads.</li> <li>• All Main distributor roads</li> <li>• All access roads (Local and HGV)</li> <li>• The most important urban traffic links with more than a local significance. This includes roads leading to important industrial and military establishments, hospitals, ambulance and fire stations.</li> <li>• Other roads serving a local purpose and connecting to strategic routes. This includes some roads leading to bus garages, important bus routes, important commuter routes, highways serving shopping centres, single access to villages, hamlets, rural communities, schools and known trouble spots but not all. *</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">When icy conditions are predicted.  (In times of prolonged snowfall as resources permit)</p>
	<b>Priority 3:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remaining roads serving a local purpose and connecting to strategic routes.</li> <li>• Local roads, including residential roads and local interconnecting roads but not all. *</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">After a prolonged period of icy or snowfall as resources permit.</p>
	<b>Priority 4:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remaining roads including estate roads not included in priority 1,2 or 3.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">After snowfall as resources permit, having first established reasonable conditions in clearing higher priority roads and footways.</p>
<b>Footways</b>	<b>Important Traffic Restricted routes within King's Lynn, Great Yarmouth and Norwich. *</b>	When frost is predicted or after snow.
	Main shopping areas and busy urban areas including footways leading to essential industrial establishments, hospitals, important bus routes and schools, and known trouble spots. *	Reactive Treatment After Prolonged Frost or Snow.

	<b>remaining footways.</b>	Reactive treatment after snowfall as resources permit, having first established reasonable conditions in clearing higher priority roads and footways.
<b>Cycleways</b>	<b>On - road cycleways.</b>	Treat as part of relative road priority.
	<b>Off - road cycleways.</b>	To treat as resources permit, having first established reasonable conditions in clearing priority roads, footways and on-road cycleways.

\*Based upon local discretion of Area Managers and Norwich City Councils Director of Development, considering the following:-

1. Wider transport and other priorities.
2. Accessibility dependencies.
3. Known problems including significant gradients, exposed areas and other topological factors.
4. Co-ordination and co-operation with other authorities.
5. Overall risk assessment including the need to maintain consistency.

## APPENDIX 2

### **1) When is the County Council going to present evidence from their own Community Safety Team at County Hall relating to their street lighting plans?**

The Council's Community Safety Team were consulted during the development of the proposals being considered by the Planning and Transportation the Environment and Waste (PTEW) Overview and Scrutiny Panel on 6 January 2010 – this is mentioned at para 3.5 in the report. The Team have not identified any issues or concerns in relation to the report, and noted that we are not proposing to implement part night lighting in high crime areas and that other authorities who have already trialled/implemented part night light have not had an increase in crime. A check of crime & disorder levels between midnight and 5am across Norfolk has been commissioned for identification of any hotspots requiring further investigation. The Team highlighted that it would be appropriate for some exemptions to implementation to be identified, for example for areas where CCTV is provided, and these are included in the report at Appendix C.

### **2) In late December the County Community Safety Team reported that they had not been asked to comment on these proposals or advise on crime and disorder aspects. Why was the County Community Safety Team specifically NOT asked to comment on these proposals or advise on crime and disorder, their special area of expertise?**

See 1 above.

### **3) The Police had been asked for comments and are still working on this, but at a force-level. Why does the Cabinet Member Cllr Gunson say "The lights that we are proposing to or turn off from midnight to 5am are in those areas defined as low crime by the Police", yet the Police have not replied?**

Officers worked with the Police during the development of the Street Lighting PFI contract, which is currently in place. This included identifying areas of low and high crime, using the same data and methodology adopted by Norfolk Police. Only those streets identified by the Police as low crime areas have been included in the proposal.

### **4) In compliance with Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act, County reports have a section in which authors are required to evaluate the impact of proposals on Crime and Disorder. As no Cities or Counties have sufficiently advanced with plans to have firm data to show whether or not crime and disorder will be affected by such a move, so who has been doing the evaluation?**

Essex County Council implemented the part night lighting trials in Maldon and Uttlesford in February and April 2007. These schemes have therefore been in place for almost three years. During that time there has been no significant change in crime statistics in these districts as distinct from the rest of Essex.

**5) The Community Safety Officer of Norwich City Council did not see the actual list of streets involved till I sent it to him. Why was he not consulted from the beginning, especially to do with Crime and Disorder?**

The Council's Community Safety Team were consulted on the proposals (see 1 above). The City Council has also been consulted on the proposals, as have the other local authorities in Norfolk, and have been sent a copy of the full list of affected roads. Cabinet will be able to consider any consultation responses in making their decision on 25 January.

**6) When were the Community Safety officers of Norwich, Great Yarmouth and all the other District Councils consulted? Why was there no consultation?**

See 5 above.

**7) When were the Architect Liaison Officer (ALO) shown the proposals by the County Council. Why was there no consultation?**

The proposals were shared with the Police in November 2009 and a meeting was held with two architectural Liaison Officers early in December.

**8) CCTV is specifically mentioned, yet areas of the City covered by CCTV are to be blacked out. Why was the CCTV department at City Hall not consulted?**

The list of affected roads and lights that has been circulated lists all of the low crime areas in Norfolk which have type S5 or S6 lights in place which are owned and maintained by the County Council. The list of exemptions identified have not yet been applied to this list, and in practice there are likely to be some areas on the list that are not suitable for the implementation of part night lighting – this includes areas covered by CCTV. The suitability of part night lighting for each of these roads lists will be assessed before any local implementation decisions are made.

**9) How many other CCTV departments in County and Districts have not been consulted?**

We have consulted all local authorities in Norfolk. There is not a need to specifically consult with CCTV departments and we are not proposing to implement part night lighting in areas with CCTV.

**10) I am interested in the comment in the County's letter which says that exemptions will be considered for "Sites where the Police can demonstrate that there will be an increase in crime if lights are switched off, or where they can demonstrate that switching lights off directly affects the ability to reduce crime." What data has been used?**

We will need to liaise with the Police on instances like this, and we are currently consulting them on the proposals.

**11) There is no evidence from the documentation available that any crime and disorder data has been used in the decision-making process. What (if any) evaluation has been done of the possible effects?**

See 3 above

**12) Cllr Gunson writes “No lights would be converted to part night lighting in high crime areas or on busy roads or thoroughfares.” Indeed, for Norwich as a whole, the proportion of lights that would be converted is 7,388 out of 13,954, i.e. about half. Why is half of Norwich to be blacked out?**

The number of type S5 or S6 lights in low crime areas of Norwich, on roads that do not have a high value of through traffic represents around half of the Council's lighting stock in the area, the same proportion as in the rest of the county. The proposal to be considered by the PTEW Overview and Scrutiny Panel is that these lights would, unless one of the exemptions applies, be turned off from midnight to 5am.

**13) In the report Street Lighting Policy, paragraph 3.4 says “ The high and medium crime areas comprised parts of Bowthorpe , Lakenham, Mancroft, Mile Cross and Thorpe Hamlet wards in Norwich, Central and Northgate and Nelson Wards in Great Yarmouth, Fairstead Ward in Kings Lynn and Saxon Ward in Thetford” Whole streets in these wards in Norwich will be blacked out at Midnight, including most of Mile Cross Ward. Does that make any sense? How many areas of Kings Lynn, Thetford and Great Yarmouth are to be blacked out at Midnight?**

The high and medium crime areas comprise parts of areas like Bowthorpe, Lakenham etc, but not all of these areas. The list of roads and would be affected by the proposal only includes those roads in low crime areas.

The total number of lights that may be affected by the proposal represents approximately half of the County Council's lighting stock (25,000 out of 49,500). For the areas you mention, those affected represent:-

Great Yarmouth – 62%  
King's Lynn – 56%  
Thetford – 61%

Note that these figures only relate to the County Council's lighting stock. In practice, there may be a number of other lights owned/maintained by district or parish councils, and these are not included in the proposals.

**14) All the lights in Beecheno Road, Stevenson Road and Gilbard Road are in the list for the Midnight Black-out. This is the area known as the Larkman. Is this a sensible idea?**

As mentioned above, the proposal is to implement part night lighting for S5 and S6 type lighting in low crime areas on roads where there is little through traffic. These roads fall within this definition.

**15) Nearly all the streets in the West Earlham in Norwich are down for the Midnight Black-out – the whole area in darkness. Is this a sensible idea?**

See 14 above.

Also, it should be noted that there are already large parts of the County where no street lights are provided at all.

**16) City Centre streets and Lanes are down to be Blacked-Out at Midnight, where jewellers are based, where Police Night-time Economy Public Order Patrols operate, red light areas, even the War Memorial and Gardens, will all suffer the Midnight Black-Out. Why did the County Officers make up these nonsensical lists without any consultation? Why did the Cabinet Member let these lists go out without proper consultation?**

These areas may be covered by the identified exemptions.

We are currently carrying out a consultation on the proposals for the implementation of part night light, and the list of lights that could be affected by this has been circulated so that people are able to put it in the context of their local area. There will be further consultation with local residents and parish councils in advance of carrying out any work in their area.

**17) It says in the first line of the report, in the Summary – “At the meeting in November, the Panel agreed to endorse a change in street lighting policy to enable part night lighting.” That is not true. We agreed “...to seek Cabinet approval to a change in street lighting policy to remove the commitment to light throughout the night when street lighting is provided.” Why have the officers only suggested a massive black-out of whole areas, including half of Norwich?**

As mentioned above, the proposal is to implement part night lighting for S5 and S6 type lighting in low crime areas on roads where there is little through traffic.

**18) Again the Cabinet member writes: "I note the various points which you make about perceptions of safety at night,..." If over half the female population of Norwich feel unsafe in the dark how does the Cabinet Member propose we help reduce that figure by making sure that there is far, far more dark in Norwich? What targets do we have for reducing fear of Crime?**

The report being considered by Panel recognises that street lighting can contribute to residents perceptions and feelings of safety, and that this may be more likely or extreme for people who feel vulnerable, and this may typically be women, older people and some disabled people. The impact that the implementation of part night lighting may have on this is clearly something that we will need to keep an eye on, and consider whether any additional exemptions should be applied. The Council also has targets to reduce CO2 emissions and make cost savings. All these need to be considered in the round.



It is important to emphasise that experience from other parts of the country who have trialled or implemented part night lighting is that it did not result in an increase in crime or accidents.

**19) “There is a clear gender split on after dark safety with 26% men feeling unsafe and 51% of women.” That is in Norwich as a whole and in some areas, City Centre and others the figures will be far higher. In two wards I would suggest the figures will be more like 75% of women feeling unsafe in the dark. I would guess that would be the same for areas of Thetford, Kings Lynn, Great Yarmouth, etc. What does the Norfolk Place Survey say for after dark feelings of safety in each of these areas?**

See 18 above.

The results of the place survey shown that, across the county, 55% of people feel safe and outside in their local area after dark. When split by districts, the range is from 69% of respondents in North Norfolk feeling safe after dark, and 46% in Norwich after dark.

**20) Why has the relevant information from the Norfolk Place Survey not been given in this report?**

See 18 above.

The results of the Norfolk Place Survey have been previously shared with Members. In addition, the results of the Citizens Panel survey that included questions to test perceptions to street lighting was reported to Panel in November.

**21) Why has the suggestion to take out every third light at midnight not been followed up, and investigated?**

This was considered during the development of the proposal, but was not considered to be appropriate for the reasons set out in Appendix A of the report. If the Panel would like some further work to be done to work up a proposal based on this option this can be done and brought back to the March Panel meeting.

**22) Why are we rushing into this without any proper consultation, without any real research?**

The PTEW Overview and Scrutiny Panel have previously discussed the idea of part night lighting on two occasions last year. A survey has also been carried out with Norfolk Citizens Panel – the results of which were reported to Panel at the meeting in November 2009.

A consultation on the principle of part night lighting is underway with Parish and Town councils, district councils, Norfolk Police and key stakeholders. There will also be opportunity for further consultation with local residents in advance of implementing proposals in any particular area.

In terms of research, officers have made contact with the other local authorities who have already trialled or implemented part night lighting and have reviewed the technology available.

**APPENDIX 3**

**Street Lighting Policy – Item 9**  
**Part night lighting - summary of consultation responses**  
**as at 5 January 2010**

**Volumes**

<b>Consultee</b>	<b>No consulted</b>	<b>No who have asked questions or requested additional information</b>	<b>No who have responded to the consultation</b>
Parish and Town Councils who would be directly affected by the proposals	153	22	14
District councils	7	1	2
Other stakeholders e.g. emergency services and transport providers.	32	0	3

**Summary of views contained in responses**

<b>Comments</b>	<b>Parish and Town Councils</b>	<b>District Councils/ councillors</b>	<b>Other stakeholders</b>
1. Some Parishes have said that they are interested in changing the lights that they own/maintain to part night lighting also.	2	0	0
2. Some Parishes have said that they have already introduced part night lighting for all or some of the lights that they own/maintain – and have they have not experienced any problems as a result.	2	0	0
3. Concern that the proposal would mean some parts of the Parish to be fully lit, and others not – resulting in a patchy approach.	2	0	0
4. Concern that proposal would affect lights in some areas with many elderly residents.	3	0	1
5. People feel safer with lights on, and part night lighting may increase crime, disorder, anti-social behaviour or accidents.	2	1	1

6. Do not support the provision of any street lights.	1	0	0
7. Object to the proposal as they relate to the centres of Cromer, Fakenham, North Walsham, Sheringham and Wells where the District Council operates CCTV.	0	1	0
8. Environmental benefits can be achieved – including carbon reduction and light pollution.	1	0	1
9. Alternative technology should be considered.	1	0	0

### List of respondees

	Support	Oppose	Other
<b>Parish and Town Councils</b>			
Old Catton		✓	
Wiggenhall St Mary Magdalene		✓	
East Harling	✓		
Hemsby		✓	
Roydon	✓		
Sedgeford	✓		
Hempnall	✓		
Taverham		✓	
North Walsham		✓	
Saham Toney	✓		
Docking		✓	
Hethersett	✓		
Ryburgh			✓
Necton		✓	
<b>District Councils</b>			
Norwich			✓#
North Norfolk		✓*	
<b>Other stakeholders</b>			
Living Streets (formerly the Pedestrians Association)		✓	
CPRE/Norfolk	✓		
Shirley Weymouth		✓	

– Great Yarmouth Borough Councillor			
--	--	--	--

#Some concerns raised about crime and disorder and highway issues, and recommendations made for how NCC should proceed.

\*Oppose the introduction of part night lighting in areas where CCTV is provided by the Borough Council. Initial response – more detailed response to be submitted.