

## <u>Minutes of the Meeting of the</u> <u>LEISURE AND ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE</u> (HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION STREAM)

Held: WEDNESDAY, 2 MARCH 2005 at 5.30pm

## <u>PRESENT:</u>

<u>Councillor Thompson – (Chair – Highways and Transportation Stream)</u> <u>Councillor Panchbhaya – Liberal Democrat Spokesperson</u> <u>Councillor Wann – Labour Spokesperson</u>

> Councillor Allen Councillor Hall

Councillor Ramsdale Councillor Tessier

Also in Attendance

## **Councillor Kitterick – Cabinet Member for Transport**

## 68. TRANSPORT CAPITAL PROGRAMME

The Service Director, Highways and Transportation, submitted a report which sought comments on proposals for spending next financial year's transport capital programme, for both Integrated Transport and Capital Maintenance. It was noted that the allocation within the Single Capital Pot for Capital Maintenance was £3.226 million, and that the allocation for Integrated Transport was £6.388 million, plus £0.494 million from developer contributions. It was noted that 20% of the allocation for Capital Maintenance had previously been taken corporately, but that this year it was proposed to use 100% of the allocation. The Scrutiny Committee was informed that the report needed to be considered by full Council.

Officers informed Members that there was an error in Appendix C to the report: HRA Carriageway Repairs should have an estimated cost of £270,000 and Upperton Road Viaduct should have an estimated cost of £230,000.

With regard to developer contributions for residents' parking schemes, a Member asked where the money would be held until 2007 when these schemes could be implemented. In response, Members were informed that the money would be put into a holding account. It was noted that developer contributions would not normally be shown in the capital programme. The contribution shown in the report repays the Council for expenditure previously funded from Integrated Transport.

A Member referred to paragraph 6.19c) on page 9, and asked who was responsible for the success regarding the extra bus passengers on route 17 mentioned in the report. It was heard that First Bus had reorganised one of their services due to falling demand and as a result had improved the service, which had led to a 40% increase in passengers. The Committee was informed that the bus company wished to introduce low-floor buses, but that these could not get over the road humps in Melbourne Road, so it was intended to modify the humps in order to support the improvement of the bus service.

In response to a Member's question, the Committee was informed that First Bus had already purchased quite a lot of Star-trak enabled buses, and Arriva had fewer but were hoping to invest in more next year. It was stated that discussions were also underway with Centrebus. In addition to Star-trak, it was also planned to create 'talking' bus stops for the visually impaired, and the City Council was working closely with the relevant charities to locate these.

A Member expressed concern that work on Belgrave Road had now been delayed until 2006/07, and questioned whether there would be a period, prior to 2006/07, when the work required could be carried out with minimal impact to local businesses. In response it was stated that discussions with businesses were underway, and it was hoped that work would begin in February or March 2006, but that the work would be partly financed from the 2006/07 budget.

A Member expressed a view that there should be a moratorium on other roadworks in the locality during work on the Upperton Road Viaduct. Officers reported that no works would be planned on alternative routes, although emergency works could not be prevented.

Attention was drawn to line number 46 of Appendix D, relating to small business cycle parking grants, and a Member asked what the cycle parking grant was for. Members were informed that this was a contribution to businesses for them to provide cycle parking facilities for staff and customers.

With regard to the proposal to create two short inbound bus lanes on London Road, Members were informed that by introducing a bus lane and changing the operation of the traffic signals at the junction of London Road and Stoneygate Road, journey times would also be reduced for car drivers, and bus travel would become more attractive to those outside of the city boundary, which could decrease the number of cars on the road. It was stated that almost the same number of people travelled by bus along the radial routes into the City at peak times as travelled by car. Councillor Thompson and Councillor Allen wished it to be recorded that they did not support the introduction of bus lanes on London Road.

Councillor Thompson, seconded by Councillor Allen, recommended that Cabinet remove from the scheme the proposal to create bus lanes on London Road.

Upon being put to the vote, the motion was LOST.

RESOLVED:

- 1) That Cabinet be recommended to take the above comments into consideration;
- 2) That the report be noted.