

Environment, Development and Transport Committee

**Minutes of the Meeting held on Friday, 18 January 2019
at 10am in the Edwards Room, County Hall**

Present:

Mr M Wilby (Chairman)

Mr M Castle

Mr P Duigan

Mr T East

Mr S Eyre

Mr J Fisher

Mr C Foulger

Mr A Grant

Mr T Jermy

Mr M Kiddle-Morris

Mr B Spratt

Mrs C Walker

Mr T White

1. Apologies and Substitutions

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Mr S Clancy (Mark Kiddle-Morris substituting) and Mrs J Oliver (John Fisher substituting).

2. Minutes

- 2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 9 November 2018 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman

3. Members to Declare any Interests

- 3.1 Mr J Fisher declared a pecuniary interest on item 16, "Review of Norwich Highways Agency Agreement", as Chairman of Norwich Highways Agency Committee

4. Urgent Business

- 4.1 The Chairman shared the following urgent business with Committee:
- Planning permission had been granted for work on the Hempnall Crossroads Roundabout
 - The Chairman had sent a letter to Mr O'Sullivan, the Chief Executive of Highways England, about the ongoing trial related to snails on the Acle Straight. In it he asked for reassurance that this would not delay the dualling of the road
 - The Great Yarmouth Third River crossing contract had been awarded to BAM-Farrans
- 4.2 Cllr Spratt thanked Norfolk County Council (NCC) for their work to improve the Hempnall Crossroads junction

5. Public Questions

- 5.1 Eleven public questions were received, and the answers circulated; see appendix A

5.2 The following members of the public asked supplementary questions:

- Mr A Boswell felt the answer to his question gave no commitment that the Council would ensure policies were compliant with the Climate Change Act and asked how they would ensure climate change mitigation was in line with regulations of the Act when they paid the bill of the Western Link
 - The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services replied that Officers would ensure they respected regulations from Government when drawing up the plan
- Mr A Cawdron noted that the WSP report declared the Western Link business case would be available by December 2018; he felt there was an absence of a compelling case and coherent strategy in the documents available. He asked, despite millions of pounds of public money spend on advance studies for the Broadland Northway, competition costs and borrowing charges were not yet declared; before declaring further money on this road should the Audit Committee examine historic actions related to the project?
 - The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services clarified that Audit Committee had looked at the Broadland Northway scheme and contract. Government approval and financial assistance for the Western Link were yet to be gained; if there was no compelling case covering social & environmental issues the Council would not be successful
- Mr M Crutchley noted that Norfolk did not have money to build the Western Link and would be dependent on Government for this; given the amount of money involved, he asked if the Council should abandon the plan until they knew Government would support it and, in the meantime, spend the money on more desperately needed services like Children's Centres and Adult Social Care
 - The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services replied that to produce a business case and proposition, the Council had to go through a rigorous process as set out by Government. The Council had been clear about their infrastructure priorities, including the Norwich Western Link, and there had been strong public demand for the scheme; in light of this, Members had decided to go ahead with the scheme
- Mr P Lanyon noted that the Aarhus convention required member states to safeguard the rights of citizens to access information at the earliest opportunity in the process; he asked for information on the specific processes followed by the Council to ensure compliance with the Aarhus convention
 - The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services **agreed** to provide a written response to Mr Lanyon after the meeting
- Mr R Hawker was concerned that the consultation presented only the options selected by WSP and the only public transport route considered practical was option 74; he noted that the local liaison group was promised the report would consider public transport options to provide solutions to transport problems. As these options were not presented Mr Hawker asked how the Committee proposed to make viable public transport options available
 - The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services replied that the Committee had determined that the 4 options in the report on the findings from WSP in December 2018 were appropriate to take forward
- Ms H Pinto welcomed acknowledgement of the need to reduce the carbon footprint but noted that public transport in rural areas was unreliable and inadequate, with patchy cycle lanes and walkways. She noted that emissions were above average and carbon reductions were a responsibility of the Committee; she asked if the Council would declare a climate emergency and scrap further road building plans to fund sustainable infrastructure projects
 - The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services replied that the Committee had a broad remit and would continue to work to strike a balance between looking after Norfolk's long-term future and ensuring a

vibrant economy

- Mr J Graham asked, considering that there was reported to be a decade to decarbonise and Norfolk was vulnerable to climate change, how more roads qualified as good infrastructure
 - The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services replied that the infrastructure plan did not focus solely on road building but also working with people to develop offshore wind farms and develop broadband to reduce need to travel for business, among other infrastructure strategies

6. Member Questions

- 6.1 Five Member questions were received and the answers circulated; see Appendix A
- 6.2 Cllr T Adams asked a supplementary question: he asked if the last paragraph in the answer to his question was a commitment that the issue of providing crossings to support visually impaired pedestrians would be resolved. The Executive Director confirmed that the answer did confirm this.
- 6.3 Point of Order
- Mrs C Walker wished it to be minuted that she was unhappy with the manner of chairing; she felt the Chairman had a duty to be courteous to all members of the public and Members attending and felt this duty was not being met
- 6.4 Cllr A Kemp was concerned that the Hardings Way South Traffic Order would create a safety hazard and as it was the subject of a complaint to the Local Government Ombudsman she felt it should not go ahead; she was unhappy with the Borough Council's plans to allow 300-500 home developments along the A10 Corridor. Noting the importance placed on the West Winch Relief Road in the Norfolk Infrastructure Plan she asked why the Broadland Northway and Great Yarmouth River Crossing had been brought to Committee and Council for consideration but not the West Winch Relief Road
- The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services replied that the Council, in its role as Highways Authority, would consider its response to this but continued to work with the borough council to assess and promote the West Winch housing access road
- 6.5 Cllr S Dark commented on the response to the questions raised by himself and Cllrs Jamieson and Chenery in relation to item 13, "Norfolk Safety Camera Partnership". There was no local objection to the average speed cameras; the questions put to Committee had addressed local concern about junctions on this road. Cllr Dark was reassured by the Chairman's comments in the responses, and by the engagement of Officers that work to look at these junctions would alleviate concerns of residents

7. Verbal update/feedback from Members of the Committee regarding Member Working Groups or bodies that they sit on.

- 7.1 Members requested that Officers ensured Local Members were informed of developments and new information before it was released to the press; the Chairman confirmed this would be taken up with the press communications team.

8. Amendment to Minutes of 6 July 2018

- 8.1.1 The Committee **AGREED** to amend the minutes of the meeting of the 6 July 2018 at paragraph 4.4 to include the underlined text, below:

- 8.1.2 With 9 votes 9 in favour, 3 against and 1 abstention the Committee AGREED to:
- 1) Consider the findings of the equality impact assessment, attached at Appendix B to this report, and in doing so, note the Council's duty under the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need to:
 - Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act;
 - Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
 - 2) Consider and agree the mitigating action proposed in the equality impact assessment
 - 3) To consider the objections raised and the supporting information contained within this report and decide whether or not to approve the Norfolk County Council (King's Lynn, Various Roads) (Bus and Cycle Lane) Amendment Traffic Regulation Order.
 - 4) Having considered the matters set out in 1), 2) and 3) above the Committee agreed that the proposed Traffic Regulation Order should be made

9. Demaining rivers (re-designation of main rivers as ordinary watercourse)

- 9.1 The Committee received the report outlining Environment Agency proposals to designate three stretches of Main River as Ordinary Watercourses, as part of a pilot project to establish a process for 'demaining'.
- 9.2 The following points were discussed and noted:
- It was suggested there may be confusion over which role was carried out by which authority; Officers confirmed that the powers for monitoring water quality would remain with the Environment Agency who were the regulator
 - The efficacy of the IDB (Internal Drainage Board) in providing water quality protection compared to current arrangements was queried; the Officer reported that the IDB guidelines were approved by Natural England and the Environment Agency
 - The Officer confirmed that the IDB were not a statutory planning consultee, however, they had a planning team to review planning applications and send in feedback when relevant; where a development would discharge into a watercourse within an IDB area, IDB consent was required, therefore developers had to comply with IDB bylaws as well as planning bylaws
 - The Officer felt that having an internal board and frameworks with local contractors was a strength as there was no tie-in to large, national frameworks
 - Money spent by the IDB to maintain the water systems in Norfolk was re-allocated annually as appropriate based on a review. Funds would be re-designated to do the proposed work on the river Tud without increasing rates or levies. Bylaws levied a charge on developers if developments would put more water into a river, generating money for sustainable maintenance of the river
 - Demaining would provide the IDB with more freedom to do maintenance on small rivers
- 9.3 The Chairman **proposed** to take recommendation 2, proposal 2, seconded by Mr T Jermy. This was **AGREED** unanimously
- 9.4 The Committee
1. **CONSIDERED** the Environment Agency's proposals for de-maining in Norfolk and **AGREED** the Committee's position on the proposals so that it can be taken

into account before a decision is made on the way forward.

2. The Committee **AGREED**:

2. To support the proposals in principle, subject to the relevant District Councils confirming their support

10. Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing

10.1.1 The Committee considered the report on the Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing project, giving a general update and an update on the statutory pre-application consultation that is required prior to making an application for a Development Consent Order

10.1.2 Officers introduced the report to Members

- A further report would be brought to Committee in March 2019
- The consultation showed there was continued good support for the project
- Members heard an update on procurement, which the Committee had previously agreed to delegate to the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services in consultation with the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services, Leader, Deputy Leader and Chairman of EDT Committee
 - Procurement was completed in December and the contract was awarded to a joint venture between BAM Nuttall and Farrans
 - During the standstill period no challenge was received
 - Sub-contractors and sub-consultants had been agreed; the bridge designers were an Irish company and steel fabrication would be carried out by a company based in the North East of England. Using UK companies reduced Brexit risks for the project
 - Initial meetings with BAM-Farrans had been productive

The following points were discussed and noted:

- 10.2
- It was noted that the new bridge would relieve traffic congestion in Yarmouth and in turn reduce Carbon Dioxide levels; improving movement of traffic through Yarmouth was discussed as crucial to the town, to provide relief from traffic travelling to the south of Yarmouth where there was currently no bridge
 - Members spoke in support of the project, describing it as a necessity for the area; the Chairman noted this was one of the Council's highway priorities
 - When asked, the Officer confirmed that work on the bridge was due to begin in late 2020 and was estimated to be completed in 2023
 - In response to comments about the neutral language in the consultation, the Officer clarified that since the consultation was a statutory process when complying with guidelines it had been necessary to remain neutral
 - Preliminary indications from the consultation responses were shown in the report; detail on the percentage of respondents in support of the River Crossing would be provided in a more detailed report at the next committee meeting

10.3 The Committee:

1. **NOTED** the preliminary outcomes of the statutory consultation described in the report and the further work required to develop the Development Consent Order application
2. **NOTED** the final consultation results including the final scheme to be submitted as an application for a Development Consent Order including any proposed changes to the scheme as a result of the statutory consultation, will be reported to Committee on 8 March 2019

11. Review of the county council's Local Transport Plan

- 11.1 The Committee discussed the report proposing a review of the County Council's Local Transport Plan to ensure that the plan continued to deliver the Council's objectives and priorities including underpinning the county council's priority transport projects and to ensure that the County Council continued to meet the requirements of the Local Transport Act 2008 to have an up-to-date plan
- 11.2 The following points were discussed and noted
- The original plan was adopted in 2011 and therefore needed updating
 - It was felt that £60,000 for the peer review seemed high; the Interim Team Leader, transport, confirmed this was an estimate for a strategic environmental assessment and consultation, which were both requirements. It was hoped that savings could be made on the initial estimate
 - Members suggested additional items to add to the plan, such as around heritage railways; the Interim Team Leader confirmed the transport plan would look at a range of options
 - The inclusion of the Norwich to Liverpool railway line in the plan was welcomed
 - Members thanked the Chairman for the reassurance received about dualling of the Acle Straight during item 5, Urgent Business
 - The Interim Team Leader confirmed that the implementation plan was updated regularly and actions reviewed
 - The local transport plan was key to underpinning major transport infrastructure projects
- 11.3 The Chairman **proposed** that a member working group was set up to look at the plan. The Committee **AGREED** the proposal.
- 11.4 The Committee
1. **AGREED** to review the Local Transport Plan.
 - **AGREED** that a Member working group be set up to review the Transport plan, consisting of Tony White, Bev Spratt, Andy Grant, Phillip Duigan, Colleen Walker, Tim East and Mick Castle

12. Highway capital programme and Transport Asset Management Plan (TAMP)

- 12.1 The Committee considered the report summarising the government settlement and proposed allocations for the capital programme and asset planning 2019/20
- 12.2 The following points were discussed and noted:
- The Assistant Director, Highways & Waste, was not able to give information on the maintenance status of Safety Cameras; he **agreed** to find out information from the Safety Camera Partnership and circulate to the Committee
 - It was queried whether there was resource to use the additional Government funding by the end of the 2017-18 financial year; the Assistant Director, Highways & Waste, confirmed there were works set out to deliver this and the funding was planned to be spent
 - A Member queried whether, with additional funding in place there would still be issues related to structural maintenance and bridge strength; it was confirmed that the spending review set out significant additional funds coming in in the next 18 months; funding remained challenging moving forward
 - It was confirmed for Members that the Local Member funding would not be carried over if not used, however, it could be pooled with other Members' funding or used with parish partnership bids

- Members asked for the Broadland Northway safety results report; this would be shared with the Committee once complete
- It was clarified in response to a query that the 'design fee' was an internal re-charge
- Work would be needed to develop scope for Members to input into the list after the new Governance structure had been adopted
- Mrs C Walker raised the issue of some damaged traffic lights in her district; the Assistant Director, Highways & Waste, **agreed** to raise this at an upcoming meeting with Highways England for urgent attention
- It was clarified for Members that progress of comments or complaints about safety cameras passed on to the Safety Camera Partnership were not tracked; Members asked that they were copied in to such correspondences

12.3 The Committee **RECOMMENDED** that Full Council approves as part of the capital programme:

1. The proposed allocations and programme for 2019/20 and indicative allocations for 2020/21/22 (as set out in Appendices A, B, C and D of the report)
2. The adoption of the 2016 Code of Practice "Well-Managed Highway Infrastructure" following the successful implementation of the improvement plan
3. The Transport Asset Management Plan (TAMP) for 2019/20 - 22/23
4. The proposed road hierarchy changes detailed in Section 5.2 and Appendix F of the report

13. Norfolk Safety camera partnership

13.1.1 The Chairman addressed the Committee; he acknowledged that speed restrictions and cameras on the A149 had been on the Committees radar for some time; whilst the Committee were extremely sympathetic to everyone involved in the previous day's incident and wished everyone a speedy recovery, it was not the place of the Committee to speculate on the cause of the road incident; he asked Members to base the debate on facts and figures that County Council Officers had provided in the report submitted the previous week. He felt it was important that the decision was made based on the duty to protect the people across all of Norfolk.

13.1.2 The Committee considered the report updating Members on the work of a Member Task and Finish Group on casualty reduction/road safety, which was set up by the Communities Committee and the intention to move to a 'safe system' approach

13.1.3 Officers introduced the report:

- The proposal in the report to implement average speed cameras was within the area where the accident had occurred the day before;
- Two sections of the A149 also in the area of the accident, were within the area of the scheme to reduce 60mph to 50mph and carry out low cost junction works

13.2 The following points were discussed and noted:

- Members asked when the average speed cameras would be put in place; the Assistant Director, Highways & Waste, replied that the materials for these cameras had been procured and work would proceed as soon as possible, given agreement of the Committee
- The timescale of introducing speed reductions to 50mph was queried; the Assistant Director, Highways & Waste, replied that this was subject to a Traffic Regulation Order and would need to go through statutory processes before coming into force
- Junction works on the A149 would proceed as soon as possible, prior to the start

of the summer season 2019

- A Member wished the occupants of the car and the Duke of Edinburgh well after the accident
- It was suggested by Members that a more robust approach should be taken to reduce Road Traffic Accidents in Norfolk
- Increased Local Member input on safety cameras was noted as positive
- In response to comments on the high number of incidents on Norfolk Roads, the Assistant Director, Highways & Waste, reported that the task and finish group was set up due to the rising number of people killed or seriously injured. Junction modifications and other strategies were being looked at as well as road safety cameras; there was no additional funding for this work and opportunities for external funding were being looked at
- A Member discussed the issues related to fast vehicles driving through small villages and the lack of a robust approach in place to support residents. The police were looked to for support with enforcing existing speed limits
- It was noted that the accident the day before had highlighted issues on Norfolk's roads; driver education and safety cameras were noted as important
- Officers were also looking to extend the 50mph limit from north of Dersingham bypass and carry out low cost junction works at Lamsey Lane
- In response to a query from the Chairman, the Assistant Director, Highways & Waste, confirmed that the average speed cameras would cover approximately 10 miles, from Knight's Hill, Kings Lynn to B1440 roundabout at Snettisham

13.3 The Committee:

1. **APPROVED** the process for identification and implementation of new safety camera schemes, as set out in Appendix B of the report
2. **APPROVED** the recommendation from the Assistant Director Highways and Waste to permit the A149 safety camera scheme to proceed to implementation
3. **AGREED** in principle to the promotion of a 50mph speed limit, subject to the necessary statutory processes, and associated low cost junction improvements, for the two sections of A149 identified in paragraphs 3.7.4. and 3.7.5 of the report

14. Commercialisation of Highways Services

14.1.1 The Committee reviewed the report setting out the conclusions of the further work that has been carried out related to the commercialisation of Highway Services; there was a proposal to establish an arm's length company with NORSE for the delivery of the highways services.

14.1.2 Since the report was last brought to Committee in 2018, a member working group was set up and further work had concluded.

14.2 The following points were discussed and noted:

- Mr B Spratt thanked the team for their work doing hedge and ditch maintenance, tarmacking of roads and filling potholes. The Chairman passed on thanks from Members of the public about drainage work recently completed in Harleston
- The approach towards the £500,000 proposed saving was queried; the Assistant Director, Highways & Waste, replied that area 'client' teams would remain within the Council, however, road workers, laboratory staff, vehicle maintenance staff and highway training team would change to become more commercial in a bid to increase efficiency
- A Member queried changes to staff pension provision and pay. Officers confirmed that no redundancy reserve had been built in as NORSE was looking

to grow the business through gaining additional work; Staff would transfer on the same pay; there may be more opportunities for staff through overtime

- The Executive Director reported that there was scope through the transfer to grow highway works nationally through Norse and provide different solutions for other Councils
- It was noted that trade union representatives were not present at the meeting, and queried whether they were content with the proposals; the Assistant Director, Highways & Waste, confirmed that trade union representatives had been informed and met with.
- Reassurance was requested that the business would not be solely run for profit; Officers reassured Members there service level agreement had been drafted which clarified underlying the relationships with clients, NCC and NORSE, including Key Performance Indicators to ensure service delivery remained efficient; this also set out the governance structure to indicate how issues would be addressed
- A Member felt the staff consultation and outcome should have been included in the report
- As NORSE was owned by the Council, Officers were able to influence and engage with them; given experience from other services which had transferred to NORSE, Officers felt that the move would be positive for the service
- Officers confirmed that to develop the proposal, the cost consisted only of Officer time at NORSE and NCC, which was absorbed by each team
- the Assistant Director, Highways & Waste, **agreed** to provide detail of inflation on the savings within the business case to Mr Jermy

14.3 With 9 votes for and 4 against the Committee

1. **AGREED** to enter into a commercial arrangement with Norse Highways Ltd (when established) for the delivery of the highway services listed in para 2.1.1 of the report, to start 1 October 2019.
2. **DELEGATED** responsibility to the Assistant Director (Highways and Waste), in consultation with the Head of Procurement, Committee Chair and Vice Chair, to prepare, agree and implement a Service Level Agreement (SLA) between the County Council and Norse Highways Ltd to deliver the services listed in para 2.1.1 below, on the basis that the SLA includes provision of the components listed in para 2.1.2 of the report .

14.4 There was a break from 11:55 to 12:10

15. **Transforming Cities – Update on Norwich being shortlisted for major transport funding**

15.1 The Committee received the report discussing the successful shortlisting as one of the 12 city areas eligible for a share of £1.2bn funding from the Transforming Cities Fund, and work which would be done with the Department for Transport to develop business cases for projects to take forward in the period up to 2022/23

15.2 The following points were discussed and noted:

- Officers clarified for Members there was originally anticipated to be one call for applications, but this was split into 2 “tranches”. Tranche 1 consisted of £60m of schemes which were ready to deliver immediately
- Tranche 2 would consist of the main bulk of funding and Officers would work with the Department of Transport to complete applications for this tranche. Guidance for tranche 2 was expected in summer 2019

- Officers were responding to Government recommendations on how to proceed with applications
- It was suggested that the importance of Local Member input into the decision-making process should be reported
- The risk to gaining funding from Government if current working relationships changed was queried; Officers reassured Members that there were strong working partnerships in place
- There was a suggestion that a Transport for Norwich Member working group should be set up; Mr Jermy asked for assurance that County Councillors on this group would also be City Councillors; the Chairman planned to propose one Member each from the Conservative, Labour and Liberal Democrat groups; it would be up to these groups who they chose to put forward
 - In response to a question about the role of Park and Ride Services, the Transport for Norwich Manager replied that Officers planned to look at the role of park and ride, management of sites and their locations; if needed there would be funding available through Transforming Cities to address infrastructure and operation

15.3 The Committee:

1. **NOTED** the current position regarding Norwich being one of 12 cities shortlisted for major transport funding through the TCF
2. **AGREED** to the proposed governance arrangements
3. **NOTED** the schemes being presented for Tranche 1 funding
4. **AGREED** the issues to address through Tranche 2 funding
5. **AGREED** the guiding principles and delivery themes derived from reviewing the existing transport strategy for Norwich to support the TCF

16.1 Review of Norwich Highways Agency Agreement

16.1.1 The Committee discussed the report outlining the arrangements in place with Norwich City Council via the Highways Agency Agreement, and giving proposals of how this could evolve in the future

16.1.2 Officers introduced the report to Members:

- When the report was last presented to the Committee it was decided to defer for a year to allow time for more decisions to be made
- A detailed review had identified and implemented £48,000 of savings; both options presented in the report would deliver savings for the County Council and the decision on the way forward would be finely balanced.

16.2 The following points were discussed and noted:

- Some Members spoke in support of maintaining the agreement, noting that the partnership with the City Council had been valuable, and there was no compelling case for a change; other Members spoke in favour of terminating the partnership
- Income from parking charges in Great Yarmouth and King's Lynn were noted as an important source of income for the Norfolk Parking Partnership
- Mr East suggested a Greater Norwich Highways Agency might be helpful
- A Member suggested that more information on other changes other than the financial ones would have been helpful to see in the report

16.3.1 The Chairman, seconded by Mr Spratt, **PROPOSED** option A, "give 12 months' notice to terminate the existing agreement so that the County Council delivers all the remaining highway and traffic functions that are currently delegated to the City

Council. This would be effective from 1 April 2020”

16.3.2 Mr T East **PROPOSED**, seconded by Mrs C Walker, that the decision was delayed by a year for a more complete and comprehensive report including Greater Norwich.

16.3.3 With 3 votes for and 9 against, Mr East’s proposal was lost

16.3.4 With 8 votes for and 4 against, the Chairman’s proposal for option A was **AGREED**

16.4 The Committee:

1. **DISCUSSED** the details of this review of the Norwich Highways Agency Agreement
2. **DECIDED**, with 8 votes for and 4 against, to give 12 months’ notice to terminate the existing agreement so that the County Council delivers all the remaining highway and traffic functions that are currently delegated to the City Council. This would be effective from 1 April 2020

17. Strategic and Financial Planning 2019-20 to 2022-23

17.1.1 The Committee considered and discussed the report showing proposals to inform Norfolk County Council’s decisions on council tax, contribute to the Council setting a legal budget for 2019-20, allow the Committee to take a careful view of all the relevant issues to agree budget proposals for 2019-20 and the Medium Term Financial Strategy to 2021-22 and make recommendations on these to the Policy and Resources Committee.

17.2 The following points were discussed and noted:

- The return on the investment in street lighting was queried; the Finance Business Partner, Community and Environmental Services, replied that the revenue saving was from the existing street lighting programme and a business case would be drawn up for continued investment
- The Head of Support and Development updated members on vacancy management processes; front line vacancies were prioritised, and workload reallocated following which unfilled vacant posts would be evaluated. If it was considered that these vacant posts were no longer needed they would be deleted; this related to posts that had been vacant for some months
- Mr East suggested that “rural impact assessments” should be amended to read “urban and rural impact assessments”

17.3 The Committee unanimously:

- 1) **CONSIDERED** the **CONTENT** of this report and the continuing progress of change and transformation of EDT services
- 2) **CONSIDERED** and **AGREED** the service-specific budgeting issues for 2019-20 as set out in section 5
- 3) **CONSIDERED** and **COMMENTED** on the Committee’s specific budget proposals for 2019- 20 to 2021-22
- 4) **CONSIDERED** the findings of equality and rural impact assessments, attached at Appendix 1 to this report, and in doing so, **NOTED** the Council’s duty under the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need to:
 - Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act
 - Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it
 - Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it

- 5) **CONSIDERED** and **AGREED** any mitigating actions proposed in the equality and rural impact assessments
- 6) **CONSIDERED** the **ADVICE** of the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services, and recommended to Policy and Resources Committee that the Council's budget includes an inflationary increase of 2.99% in council tax in 2019-20, within the council tax referendum limit of 3.00% for the year
- 7) **AGREED** and **RECOMMENDED** to Policy and Resources Committee the draft Committee Revenue Budget as set out in Appendix 2 including all of the savings for 2019-20 to 2021-22 as set out

For consideration by Policy and Resources Committee on 28 January 2019, to enable Policy and Resources Committee to recommend a sound, whole-Council budget to Full Council on 11 February 2019.

- 8) **AGREED** and **RECOMMENDED** the Capital Programme and schemes relevant to this Committee as set out in Appendix 3 to Policy and Resources Committee for consideration on 28 January 2019, to enable Policy and Resources Committee to recommend a Capital Programme to Full Council on 11 February 2019

18. Performance management

- 18.1 The Committee received the report based on the revised Performance Management System, which was implemented as of 1 April 2016
- 18.2 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 providing information from the latest risk register as at January 2019, following the latest review conducted in December 2018. The reporting of risk is aligned with, and complements, the performance and financial reporting to the Committee.
- 19.2 The latest mitigations for the third river crossing were confirmed as included in the report
- 19.3 The Committee **CONSIDERED**:
 - a) The changes to EDT departmental risks since the last Risk Management report was reported to this Committee in October 2018, in Appendix A of the report
 - b) The risk 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 following points were discussed and noted:
- The Finance Business Partner for Community and Environmental Services confirmed the capital programme was on track; reserves were held due to timing of projects and more detail would be included in the next report
 - Culture heritage and planning showed a significant decrease; it was confirmed to Members that this was not related to Norwich Castle
 - A Member asked whether the reduction to waste management related to Household Waste disposal charges; it was confirmed that this related to kerbside waste volumes
- 20.3 The Committee **NOTED**:
- a) The 2018-19 revenue budget for 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 and the forecast use for 2019-20.
- 21. Forward Plan and decisions taken under delegated authority**
- 21.1 The Committee reviewed the forward plan and delegated decisions taken by Officers
- 21.2 The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services confirmed that the urgent decision taken related to Boreas Windfarm under delegated authority had involved consultation of Local Members
- 21.3 The Committee:
1. **REVIEWED** the Forward Plan at Appendix A and identify any additions, deletions or changes to reflect key issues and priorities the Committee wishes to consider.
 2. **NOTED** the delegated decisions taken as set out in Section 2.

The meeting closed at 12.45

**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, DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE : 18 JANUARY 2019

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

5.1 Question from Mr Vee Pond

I would like to know why there are not any road exits from Costessey. There is going to be more traffic from the new housing sites. All filtering on to Dereham Road. There was a bus lane that went through Long Water and they found that the buses were too long to turn round. So they closed it. Why can't they open that road again? They closed Bawburgh Lane. I think they should have put one through Ringland as well. I also hope they would consider an exit from the new development on to the bypass. All these exits are possible. Going in to other directions if thought out sensibly.

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

There are a number of recently built and new housing developments under construction in the Costessey/Longwater area. Each of these has provided an assessment of its transport impacts and proposed mitigation measures which have been or will be provided when certain trigger points are met. These agreed measures have been objectively assessed and represent what, within current planning law, we could reasonably expect the developers to provide to mitigate their impacts. Collectively, from the housing and employment developments in the area, the following measures have been identified to provide additional highway capacity.

1. Free flow left turn slip road from William Frost Way to Dereham Road
2. Widening Dereham Road between the Longwater roundabout and the new traffic lights at Lodge Farm 2
3. Longwater Lane/Dereham Road junction improvement
4. Dereham Road widening to two lanes in each direction (east section)
5. Part signalisation of the Longwater southern (Showground) roundabout
6. Free flow slip road from Dereham Road westbound onto A47 eastbound
7. A47 eastbound off slip road improvement

Items 1 and 2 have been built and items 3 and 4 are under construction using a mixture of developer and government funding. Item 5 will be provided when an agreed threshold of housing completions is met on the Lodge Farm 2 site. This developer has also made a provision of land for item 6 but a funding source needs to be found before this could be progressed, as is the case for item 7.

In addition to these measures, development work has been undertaken on a new route from the A1074 Dereham Road (close to the Lodge Farm 2 access) to the Longwater area at the Ernest Gage Avenue roundabout. This will provide a second access into the Longwater/Queens Hill area and relieve the current access at William Frost Way. Funding will need to be identified before this scheme can be progressed further.

To the north of the Longwater/Queens Hill area, a bus only route has been built onto Ringland Lane to encourage travel by public transport. When the Queens Hill development was conceived, a government appointed Planning Inspector determined that this route should not be open to general traffic.

An access from the Lodge Farm 2 housing development directly onto the A47 trunk road has never been proposed and is not a requirement of the extant planning permission currently under construction. It is also extremely unlikely that a new access would be allowed under current Department for Transport and Highways England guidelines.

5.2 Question from Ms Marilyn Edgeley

I would like to ask the committee to consider countryside access and lack of footpaths on main roads in my area of Haddiscoe.

Being a keen walker and sometime cyclist I am very disappointed that the area I live in is lacking the above. There is a number of lovely villages such as Loud, Somerleyton and Fritton that although are within a few miles are not accessible by walking or cycling as the main Beccles to Yarmouth road has no continuous footpath. The council should be promoting walking and cycling in all areas of the county to encourage people to live healthy lives.

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

Norfolk Trails are managed to national standards with strong emphasis on improving the health, wellbeing and prosperity of the county, bolstering tourism and contributing to the conservation and understanding of our outstanding natural and historic environment. Norfolk Trails team has developed further opportunities for short walks and circuits, many with a geographical focus such as market towns or that integrate with public transport.

The parish of Haddiscoe currently has 5 registered public footpaths and 3 public bridleways. However, there are opportunities for the public to apply to add new public rights of way to the legal record (definitive map) or to have the status of an existing right of way upgraded e.g. from a public footpath to a public bridleway or higher, which would then allow for cycling. There is information about this on our website in the 'unrecorded public rights of way' section. <https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/out-and-about-in-norfolk/public-rights-of-way/about-public-rights-of-way>.

A useful way of improving pedestrian facilities are footway trods. These are a way of providing a low-cost footpath by using unbound material instead of asphalt while still remaining fit for purpose.

It can provide an aesthetically acceptable solution in sensitive rural settings and is intended to provide a less expensive option over a muddy track or grass verge, typically providing a level surface, greater width and improved drainage.

The preferred route to access funding for footway trods is the Parish Partnership Scheme. Whereby we jointly fund works with the parish on a typically 50/50 basis, see attached link to our website.

<https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/what-we-do-and-how-we-work/policy-performance-and-partnerships/partnerships/parish-partnerships-scheme>

Typically the Parish Partnership Scheme funds in the region of 10 to 25 trods each year. Proposals require the support of the parish council.

5.2.1 Supplementary question

Haddiscoe has very few footpaths could the county council liaise with farmers and encourage them to leave paths around crop fields to give walkers access to land and encourage farmers to replant hedgerows and help wildlife.

I feel very strongly that the council should help protect our county and make it attractive for residents and tourists and the long-term benefits to health if we promote walking.

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

Previous government (DEFRA) funded agricultural schemes have included payments to landowners to provide wider beneficial elements such as permissive access. Unfortunately, payment for the access element was withdrawn by the government a few years ago and so many landowners have chosen not to continue with providing access unpaid. Looking forward there may be new opportunities for renewed access into the countryside and environmental improvements with the Environment Secretary suggesting that farmers will be rewarded with subsidies for providing these.

5.3 Question from Dr Andrew Boswell (consultant, Climate Emergency Planning and Policy, Norwich)

EDT plays a major role in developing the Greater Norwich Local Plan and your officers will know of the legal obligation on local authorities to have climate change mitigation policies in development plan documents. Last year, the revised NPPF stated that plans should take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change which is in line with the objectives and provisions of the Climate Change Act 2008 [NPPF2 149 & footnote 48]. Will the EDT commit to ensuring that policies of the Greater Norwich Local Plan are in line with the objectives and provisions of the

Climate Change Act 2008 and advice from the Committee on Climate Change?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

As set out on pages 90 to 91 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) “Growth Options” document consulted on in early 2018, the emerging local plan will continue the current approach of following legislative and National Planning Policy Framework requirements to include policies to ensure that the development and use of land contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change. This will include planning for development in suitable locations and policies covering flood risk, water supply, biodiversity, energy and landscape.

5.4 Question from Mr Andrew M Cawdron (member of the Wensum Valley Alliance)

In October 2017, the Norwich Western Link Technical Report was included/tailed in the EDT meeting and subsequently a £1m pounds worth of fees was authorised for 2018. In that report on page 70 was the suggested timetable for establishing the Business Case for the project which was programmed to complete by December 2018. This was to prove the compelling case for the scheme as part of a coherent wider strategy. Has this work (including the coherent wider strategy), been done to schedule and if so will a copy be made public please?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

An initial business case assessment and evidence gathering, through both technical work and the initial consultation carried out in summer 2018, have been completed. These informed the Options Appraisal Report (OAR) that was used to determine the shortlist of four options that the Council are consulting on between 26 November 2018 and 18 January 2019. Details of the consultation and the OAR were published in previous reports to EDT Committee in October and November 2018. The consultation report provided to the 12 October 2018 Committee set out an updated programme for delivery and the details of this were also set out in section 8 of the OAR, reported to Committee on 9 November 2018, which were:

- Public consultation (round 2) Late 2018
- Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) Spring 2019
- Outline Business Case (OBC) Late 2019
- Preliminary Design Early-mid 2020
- Public consultation (round 3) Late 2020
- Full Business Case (FBC) Summer 2022
- Tender Period Mid 2020
- Construction Phase Late 2022

The Strategic Outline Business Case will be made available to the public. All work being completed for the project is within the budget allocations provided.

More recently, in December 2018, the Department for Transport published new guidance on the funding of 'local major' schemes, such as the Norwich Western Link, as part of the National Roads Fund. The Council is therefore reviewing these new requirements and its programme for development of the scheme in light of this guidance.

5.5 Question from Mr Mark Crutchley

At a time when budgets are under enormous pressure and the council is proposing swingeing cuts to children centres, adult social care and rural bus services amongst others, it nonetheless proposes to waste £2m on design work for the Western Link. A road which would destroy glorious countryside and damagingly increase greenhouse gas emissions at a time when their reduction is essential.

Will the council align its spending priorities with the needs of its poorer residents who most need its support, rather than those of the developers who will be the prime beneficiaries of this destructive road, and abandon the idea of a Western Link?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

The Council has a wide remit of services and recognises the importance of making the best use of resources that are available. Investing in Norfolk's transport networks is vital to help everyone get around the county quickly, easily and safely. Better transport infrastructure also enables our existing businesses to grow and attracts new businesses to start-up and relocate here, creating more jobs, which is good for the county's economy and the people who live here.

The Norwich Western Link will have a wide range of benefits including improving the quality of life for local residents, improving emergency response times, supporting economic growth and improving network resilience and connectivity. Our public consultation last summer, which attracted more than 1,700 responses, demonstrated there was very strong public support for a new or improved link between the A47 and Broadland Northway.

5.6 Question from Mr Peter Lanyon

What processes did the Council undergo to ensure that the recent consultation process on the Norwich Western Link was compliant with Articles 6, 7 and 8 of the Aarhus Convention?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

The Council developed its proposals for the consultation for the project and reported these to the EDT Committee in October 2018. This included details of a previous consultation completed in the summer of 2018. The Council is satisfied that the consultation is in accordance with the requirements of the Aarhus Convention.

5.7 Question from Mr Richard Hawker

The 476-page Options Assessment Report is only available on-line. The EDT committee did not agree to my earlier suggestion that a copy be placed in the Forum. The public did not have reasonable time or opportunity, therefore, to read this report before the consultation was approved for launch; nor did the EDT committee. I have raised many queries on this report, and they have yet to be answered; no doubt many more will arise. Will the Committee please arrange for printed copies to be put in the Forum and Dereham libraries, and arrange meetings with the public and/or the LLG to scrutinise in detail the report?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

The Options Appraisal Report was published via the Council's website a week before the 9 November 2018 EDT Committee meeting with the Committee papers. The shortlist of options determined from this work are subject to public consultation between 26 November 2018 and 18 January 2019 in order for all those interested to scrutinise the work undertaken and the proposed options and also to gather more information on what proposals should be taken forward. Fourteen public consultation events have been held throughout the consultation period, giving members of the public the opportunity to ask any questions they have regarding the project.

As the Options Appraisal Report is available online there are no plans for printed copies to be made available at libraries. A printed copy has been made available at County Hall and this facility has been used by interested individuals when requested.

5.8 Question from Dr Hayley Pinto

The 1.5oC IPCC report was described by Antonio Guterres (UN Secretary General) as "an ear-splitting wake up call."

Norfolk faces threats, including (not limited to): property loss through coastal erosion, flooding, impacts on the Broads, water scarcity and heatwaves impacting agriculture & public health.

Norfolk must respond, rapidly reducing our carbon footprint across the county, not just council activities; to achieve carbon neutrality in a timeframe compliant with science and the Paris Agreement.

Environment, Development and Transport has greatest potential to shape the transformative changes needed to achieve emission cuts and should lead.

Following the ground-breaking IPCC Report, will Norfolk County Council declare a climate emergency as a first step?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

Norfolk County Council is already developing and implementing work to reduce the carbon footprint of the county and proactively mitigate climate change and associated impacts through a series of innovative projects.

Through a number of detailed initiatives, the NCC Environment Team is incorporating climate change into much of its work, both through individual projects and also processes. We are also working to ensure that these approaches are embedded not just into decisions made regarding those local to Norfolk, but also the vital tourism market which relies so heavily on Norfolk's varied and unique natural heritage.

5.9 Question from Mr James Graham

I am a PhD graduate and researcher from UEA, with a long history of studying climate science, policy and systems. I am submitting the question below regarding the planning of the final stretch of the NDR.

The Norwich Western Link road is explicitly carbon orientated infrastructure when the latest science (IPCC) indicates that we have approximately a decade to entirely decarbonise our economy and infrastructure. It will also mean more development of the Wensum valley. Will the council commit to removing the £2m in the EDT budget for road design until it is ready to think seriously about the long term impacts of such a road on our capability to meet our responsibilities to the current generation? You, in this room are capable of and responsible for making these kinds of assessments and it behoves you to do so in the face of the needed transition.

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

The Council aims, through the delivery of good infrastructure, to maintain and enhance the transport network in Norfolk and is currently delivering a range of sustainable improvements that will benefit a large cross-section of the travelling public. In recent years we have invested many millions of pounds in supporting and encouraging people to use more sustainable modes of transport, for example by creating dedicated cycle paths and bus lanes, improving pedestrian crossings and running a free bicycle loan scheme in some of the county's more deprived areas.

The Council has confirmed the delivery of the Norwich Western Link as one of its priority infrastructure projects, and therefore sees this investment as important for Norfolk and Norwich. Our public consultation last summer, which attracted more than 1,700 responses, demonstrated there was very

strong public support for a new or improved link between the A47 and Broadland Northway.

5.10 Question from Ms Jacqui McCarney

The Council report says that discussions with Natural England and the Environment Agency in July 2017 suggest a bridge crossing “could be acceptable”. Will you please immediately publish details of these discussions, and all correspondence between Natural England and the Environment Agency and the County Council? The released material should be complete, and include any detailed design and mitigation proposals, that exist or have been discussed.

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

Subject to agreement with Natural England and the Environment Agency, these details will be published on the Council’s project website, using the following link:

<https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/major-projects-and-improvement-plans/norwich/norwich-western-link>

5.11 Question from Mr Hereward McGillivay

There is no evidence that building new roads ever resolves traffic problems, rather it encourages greater car usage, worsening congestion and increasing pollution. Estimates for the NDR show it substantially increasing in greenhouse gas emissions.

There is a wide scientific consensus that we need to rapidly adapt our policies to the climate emergency and completely eliminate greenhouse gas emissions. Local authorities must be part of the solution. The Council agreed with Government to write detailed feasibility studies for public transport. Will you now prioritise public transport options to reduce emissions over a road which will inevitably increase them?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

The Council aims, through the delivery of good infrastructure, to maintain and enhance the transport network in Norfolk and is currently delivering a range of sustainable improvements that will benefit a large cross-section of the travelling public. In recent years we have invested many millions of pounds in supporting and encouraging people to use more sustainable modes of transport, for example by creating dedicated cycle paths and bus lanes, improving pedestrian crossings and running a free bicycle loan scheme in some of the county’s more deprived areas.

The Council has confirmed the delivery of the Norwich Western Link as one of its priority infrastructure projects, and therefore sees this investment as important for Norfolk and Norwich. Our public consultation last summer, which attracted more than 1,700 responses, demonstrated there was very

strong public support for a new or improved link between the A47 and Broadland Northway.

6. MEMBER QUESTIONS

6.1 Question from Councillor Alexandra Kemp

Infrastructure in King's Lynn South

Development along the A10, before a bypass, would have severe economic consequences, congesting the high-tech corridor to Cambridge. HM Planning Inspectorate determined, in the Local Plan, "significant new traffic must be restricted until the Link Road is open". Can the Committee confirm Highways will not agree to major development - 300+ new homes on the A10, accessing the A10 only via a new roundabout, before the bypass is built; and West Winch Relief Road, a significant part of Norfolk Infrastructure Plan, must be a bypass - Highways England confirms an "estate road" is insufficient for through traffic.

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

The planned growth of 3000 dwellings in West Winch is committed through the Borough Council's adopted Local Plan. Through its examination the Local Planning Authority accepted the advice of the Planning Inspectorate to restrict significant development until the West Winch Housing Access Road (WWHAR) is in place. Piecemeal development without the coordinated delivery of the WWHAR is unlikely to be acceptable (understanding this is not a decision taken by Norfolk County Council). We are currently assessing the transport implications associated with current planning applications to ensure this happens.

Recognising its importance we are working in partnership with the Borough Council to continue scheme development for the WWHAR with a view to submitting a planning application for the road at the earliest opportunity. In parallel a single overarching planning application for the remainder of the growth area is likely to come forward.

6.2 Question from Councillor Tim Adams

It has come to my attention that there are still a number of Pelican Crossings in Norfolk without any audible indication function to help visually impaired pedestrians use the crossings.

Would the Committee and its successor commit to reviewing this matter with the purpose of ensuring that these pedestrian crossings do become accessible for visually impaired users?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

For clarification, and in order to avoid any misunderstanding, it should be noted that there are a number of signalised pedestrian crossing types installed within Norfolk – PELICAN,PUFFIN/TOUCAN,PEGASUS – in addition there are also pedestrian crossing facilities provided at many signalised junctions.

All of the crossings in Norfolk are provided with equipment to aid people with visual impairments – either an audible signal, a rotating tactile cone or in some instances both where it is acceptable to do so.

- Audible signal – This is located in the push button box. They can only be used on single crossings (not where they are staggered with a central island) or where all pedestrian phases at a junction operate at the same time. This is to ensure that there is no risk that visually impaired pedestrians can mistake the sound of an adjacent crossing. In some circumstances where a crossing is in close proximity to residential properties, the audible signal can be omitted or switched off overnight to avoid a noise nuisance.
- Rotating tactile cone – The tactile unit is located within the push button box with a small knurled metal cone protruding out of the bottom of the housing. The cone rotates for a fixed period at the commencement of the fixed green man period, and by holding their hand on the cone, pedestrians with visual and hearing impairments know when it is safe to cross.

With this in mind, it is felt that no wide scale review is necessary. However, if an issue or specific concern can be identified at any particular site(s) then this could be assessed accordingly.

6.3 Point of clarification from Councillors Stuart Dark, Andrew Jamieson and Michael Chenery as the Local Members affected by Item 13: Norfolk Safety Camera Partnership

Para. 3. 5.1 reads Local members were ‘informed about the scheme by the Highways Service after it had been approved by the SCP. They raised concerns from the local community about speed limits and safety issues at a number of junctions.’

The first part of this paragraph is factually inaccurate - To our knowledge the first time the local members or Parish Councils affected were made aware of this particular average speed camera scheme was when the West edition of the EDP announced it as a prominent, major article not by any prior notification or warning by Highways Officers. This was also not at the ‘approval’ stage but once the cameras had been bought and paid for and an imminent works date set - the very end of the process. This caused real concern in constituents, blindsided their Parish Councils and their County Councillors causing them to engage NCC Highways on the back foot and not the other way round. A meeting was set at which Councillors were informed by SCP staff with Highways officers present that any intervention was too late and this scheme had been approved, equipment bought,

contractors appointed and 'this will be happening' (This is supported by para. 3.94 of the report - which advises members of this committee of the risk of not proceeding with this particular scheme as the SCP has 'committed funding and equipment purchased' with NCC Highways officers involvement and may attempt to get it back).

Secondly, The latter part of Para. 3.5.1 could be interpreted as this was the first time concerns re particular junctions and certain speed limits were raised from the local community. This is not true. To our knowledge there have been many occasions where the affected parishes have formally contacted NCC Highways over the years, usually following serious accidents to be informed accident data did not hit the redesign investment threshold and no, not even slight, remedial works undertaken.

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

The report acknowledges that the process for engaging Local Members in Safety Camera Partnership schemes has not been as robust as we would expect, and does not engage Local Members at an early stage in the development of schemes. There is a proposed new process that should address this.

In relation to para 3.5.1, it was not the intention to imply that concerns about junctions had not previously be raised by the local community.

6.4 Question from Councillors Stuart Dark, Andrew Jamieson and Michael Chenery as the Local Members affected by Item 13: Norfolk Safety Camera Partnership

Whilst welcoming this paper's recommendation that in the future the local member protocol be adhered to by Highways Officers re SCP activity, given all the above and;

Established best practise around 'decision making' is if you have the time you consult as widely as possible, particularly with people who have better local knowledge.

Para. 2.4.2 stating that NCC Highways officers had been involved in decision making around this scheme for over 3 years, since 2015 and para. 3.8.3 stating it is the Highways authority which ultimately permits the SCP to allow the siting of such schemes - ie. NCC Highways major role

Does the Chair concur that the constituents of the affected parishes and their lawfully elected, mandated representatives and legally constituted parish councils have not been best served in this particular process with regard to consultation and collaboration? And if this is the case, can we have his assurances that Highways Officers will be made to fully understand the severity of what has occurred here with regard to democracy, not just process, and that they take this back to the SCP and any other similar 'decision making' joint bodies they are involved in

highlighting the need to consult early and in detail with elected representatives, not just as a point of procedure but as a point of principal to protect other members, parishes and their constituents in the future.

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

As I have said in the response above, there is an acknowledgement that the process has not been ideal, and a new process is proposed to address this.

There is already a well established process that the highways service use to engage communities in proposed schemes, including engagement with Local Members at an early stage, which works well. The proposed new process will bring Safety Camera Partnership schemes in line with this, enabling Local Member views and representations to be taken into account before a final decision on a way forward.

6.5 Question from Councillors Stuart Dark, Andrew Jamieson and Michael Chenery as the Local Members affected by Item 13: Norfolk Safety Camera Partnership

With due regard to the other paper before committee today regarding the good work of the Task and Finish Group, there is a real concern by us members with regard to the potential negative skewing of Norfolk's accident prevention activity away from the most appropriate response towards 'average speed cameras' as evidenced in this paper and scheme and that this will create a self-perpetuating cycle. We have already highlighted earlier the fact that local parishes have for sometime been highlighting a small number of specific junctions or inappropriate speed limits (due to increased urbanisation etc) which are playing a disproportionate role in accidents in the region under consideration. However, para. 3.7.2 describes a high level impact 'return formula' applied by NCC Highways to assess the worthiness of any remedial action at a specific site. Despite NCC Highways officers agreeing the junctions and inappropriate speed limit areas locally highlighted are the major contributors to the accidents in the proposed camera scheme region, they have not to date been assessed as worthy of individual intervention. Nor, to the knowledge of members or parishes has any significantly increased police marked/unmarked traffic enforcement activity taken place in the area of the proposed scheme. Yet, these handful of locations have all been condensed together to create the SCP justification needed for a several mile long entire route scheme enforcing, apart from in one area, the existing regularly adhered to speed limit, raising unaddressed local concerns re any real accident reduction benefit and questions of proportionality and detrimental impact on the public. Para. 3.9.2 states such Average Speed Camera Schemes are 'fully funded by the SCP' thus making them intuitively attractive to NCC Highways and the paper shows they make revenue which goes back in to the scheme to finance not only their particular route, but other cameras and activities making them attractive to the SCP. Given these financial incentives for all involved to go

a certain direction and the circumstances around this particular scheme can the Chair please give his assurances that sufficient 'checks and balances' are in place to ensure the criteria used to determine accident prevention and application of it by NCC Highways officers gives the public the best possible remedy not an inappropriate lower cost option?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

I am sure that you appreciate that officers receive many requests from communities and Members for changes and improvements to the road network in their area. We do not have sufficient funding to be able to address all of these immediately. The Highways Network Safety team monitor the performance of all the road network and identify safety improvements.

In terms of solutions, I can assure you that officers consider all options and seek to put in place interventions that can best meet the risk in each location. Whilst the cost of an intervention is a factor, this is on a return-on-investment basis rather than a skewing towards particular solutions i.e. officers will seek to identify solutions which offer the greatest benefit with the available budget.

The programme of highway improvement schemes is approved by Members each year, and the 2019/20 allocation is on the agenda for discussion at this meeting today. You will see from the proposed programme that there is a wide range of schemes proposed.

6.6 Question from Councillors Stuart Dark, Andrew Jamieson and Michael Chenery as the Local Members affected by Item 13: Norfolk Safety Camera Partnership

Given the lack of prior remedial action at the highlighted specific locations and lack of local engagement in this particular scheme and the fact that the EDP prominently promoted the fact that the average speed cameras installed on the A17 generated revenue from 800 speeding tickets in their first 10 months of operation there is real local concern that the residents of the affected parishes and those using this route are going to be used as a 'cash cow' for funding other schemes, rather than this being about genuine accident reduction. This is not helped by the fact that the one central change in the current proposed scheme (at para. 3.75) indicates a slightly perplexing firm intention to lower the speed limit on a single carriageway either direction rural section of road through woodland with limited turnings whilst the paper only vaguely signals an intention to 'look at' reducing the speed limit on a locally know 'black spot' section of busy by-pass bisecting a village with many turnings, houses and signage indicating people in the carriageway and to 'look at' at some point in 2019/20 the highlighted junctions of local concern.

Can the Chair please reassure us members, parishes and constituents in the affected route that this is not the case by firming up the Council's

commitment with a definitive, clear, short timescale for NCC Highways Officers to positively look at the known junctions and areas of local concern as a top priority as the paper has numerous references to 'looking at' and at 'sometime in 2019/20' but no real, quantifiable drive or timeline to do so?.

Ideally, given the current situation, not of local members or residents doing, this should be short and preferably commenced immediately or as near to the start of the introduction of the Average Speed Camera Scheme, if approved, as possible to help restore public trust.

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

As I have said above, officers will review and prioritise work based on risk. I understand that the Assistant Director Highways has already written to you to confirm the improvement schemes that have been included in the proposed 2019/20 highways programme. The Committee will consider the programme today and, once approved, highways officers will be able to timetable work in more detail. I am sure that officers will contact Local Members about timescales for delivering the schemes in their divisions as soon as they are able.

In terms of assessing the impact of the safety cameras, and other improvements, it is usual practice for a safety audit to be carried out to assess the impact of new schemes, and this will take place on the A149 at the appropriate time.

6.7 Question from Councillors Stuart Dark, Andrew Jamieson and Michael Chenery as the Local Members affected by Item 13: Norfolk Safety Camera Partnership

Can the Chair please give local residents reassurance that the issue of the A149, the main arterial route in this part of the County connecting tourists from the UK to Hunstanton and the coast beyond and residents to their main market town and the rest of the UK (so vital for business and the economy) is being looked at strategically and holistically re improving infrastructure and safety and for investment as per current best practice rather than piecemeal improvements here and there and if this is the case, given the experience of this issue, that local residents and their representatives will be consulted and involved in the process... so that things improve away from the predictable annual gridlock.

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

I am happy to give that reassurance.

Officers will continue to take opportunities to identify suitable funding, including through funding bids, that could deliver improvements.