

St Margaret's with St Nicholas Ward Forum matters to report / action taken November '15 to February '16

1: Constitution. The steering committee (SC) has re-drafted primarily in addition to clarification of responsibilities, process and reach, to include in the forum people who **work** in the ward in addition to those resident. The re-draft is now completed and will be presented to the forum - for approval and adoption - at the extraordinary general meeting of 10th February. Circulated to members.

2: Website. There has been a delay because of a fire at the accommodation of Wayne Hart (SC member) who is writing it and this has been further delayed because of a commission (his day job) which, unexpectedly, WH has to complete. In the interim Wayne has updated information on the site and other items have been included.

3. Silo site South Quay. Cllr Beales Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Industrial Assets and Ostap Paparega, Regeneration and Economic Manager, have been written to registering the ward forum's request for early involvement, in a consultative capacity, in the borough's consideration of the future of the waterfront and development of plans; this includes in the first instance sight of the detail of the process of procurement as referred to in "Next Steps" - December 2015 to February 2016. We are advised that the forum will be informed when the project is 'ready to go to market' and await further development.

4. Parking, South Quay. Proposals to impose parking charges, which were circulated in consultation to residents between March and April 2014, have been implemented and installation of parking meters is now complete. SC has been in correspondence with Norfolk County Council over the lack of consultation. Finally after two letters Tom McCabe, NCC Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services wrote: "I am sorry that you feel this scheme has been dealt with incorrectly. It is fair to say that there are lessons to be learnt around engaging with communities, which will be taken forward as this type of parking scheme is developed further across the county." He also expressed the desire: "I do hope that your community will continue to engage and work with the County Council to help us understand more fully the needs of residents and businesses in developing parking schemes going forward."

He reported there has now been 'constructive dialogue about further consultations and resident permit parking in the next year'. This would not have much effect on South Quay parking because 'I appreciate that this will not solve the immediate problem of parking from February but we are in discussion with Kings Lynn Borough Council to try and find mutually acceptable parking in the short term. However, I must stress that as highway authority, we are unable to control off street parking provision.'

And that appears to be that. On the quay SC understands that at least one resident of King Staithe Square has applied for and obtained a residents' space, and we would be interested to hear of other 'successes'. We continue to press for residents' parking there to be made available to those living in locality other than being confined to residents of the quay itself and King Staithe Sq.

There appears to be no overnight parking on the quay – in contrast to the main car parks where it is a more modest set sum. The information panel states that parking is for three hours and that a period of three hours has to pass before one can park on the Quay again. Pity therefore, the person who parks at, say, 11.00pm. They will have to shift their car at 02.00am, put it somewhere else until 05.00am, and then move it back to the South Quay. And so on, for the next twenty-four hours. If indeed this is what is really intended.

5. Dedicated resident's parking. As agreed at the last forum meeting the SC has pressed for this and wrote to Cllr David Pope, Portfolio Holder for ICT, Leisure and Open Space, Borough Council asking for places on the Boal Quay car park. This brought an email from Chris Bamfield, (CB) Executive Director, Leisure and Public Space, informing that annual parking permits are available on long-term car parks at £366.60 a year, this would include the Boal Quay car park (where) residents could purchase such permits.

NOT what the forum requested and of course rather more costly than the free parking on South Quay to which residents have been accustomed. CB has also offered a second option on the small car park adjacent to Boal Street, which the borough operates as a *permit holders only* car park and on which 'it would be possible to do some improvement works and to mark out 18 places for permit holders. Currently there are 12 permit holders and so at least a further six would be available. We would propose a charge of £436. 60 for a permit .' SC has written to say that welcome though the additional place may be, this park does need re-surfacing and is prone to vandalism.

6. Freebridge parking charges, Friars Street.

Cllr Bambridge has complained of the high charges - **£45 per month** - which Freebridge is to introduce. In response Ross Edwards, Community Project Team Leader replied: 'Our charges are less than the town centre parking permits to reflect their location in a residential area and we will be issuing a personal bay which is something that is not offered with town centre permits. Customers will get a guaranteed space, receiving a designated personal bay. This parking area will then be enforced to make sure that residents have access to their bays on a 24/7 basis. The permitting of this area will enable residents in the local vicinity to have better access of parking around their homes and this has been reflected in a very large uptake of the bays from residents of Friars Street, Checker Street and Southgate Street, with 15 residents showing firm interest.

7. Yellow lines were painted in Queen Street following the resurfacing earlier in the autumn, despite the fact that we had been advised by county highways that they were not necessary for traffic control. We wrote to ask why and got this reply from Quentin Brogdale, NCC Planning and Transportation Dept: 'The yellow lines were replaced through routine maintenance works, identified by the inspector for the area who was unaware that they are not required in the controlled zone, this was a genuine error on our part.

'To remove them now would make more of an impact and mess than leaving them to wear off gradually over time, so we do not plan to try removing them. I apologise for this error.'

A suggestion that a black aerosol spray used by NCC in the past had been effective is going to be trialled.

8. Cycling, Queen Street against one-way traffic and on the pavement.

Alarmed at the danger of this practice (not least to residents whose front doors open onto the pavement) forum members David and Carol Savage wrote to the borough council. They stated that the source of the problem seemed to be a sign on a new bollard erected in Saturday Market Place, which appears to give cyclists access into Queen Street. Asking for common sense to prevail, they said that the street should revert to one-way for all traffic, including cyclists, and the offending sign should be removed. NCC, acknowledging that this was a mistake, has now agreed: 1) A new 'Cycle Prohibition' sign will be installed on the light column next to the Queen Street/College Lane junction.

2) The 'Except Cycles' sub-plate sign is to be removed from the 'No Entry' sign at the junction of Church Street with Saturday Market Place. This was removed from the advertised traffic regulation order (TRO) so has no corresponding order in place.

These works will take place in due course.

The forum will continue to press for the necessary measures to be taken over cycling on pavements generally.

9. Planning.

Following forum policy of commenting upon and/or objecting to planning applications, which involve prominent and substantial sites and properties in the ward and listed buildings, SC commented on the proposals for Wennis public house. In general the scheme was welcome because it would improve a shabby and neglected building and, by providing residential as well as commercial premises, would result in people living in the town centre which contributes to their vibrancy. However reconsideration of the plans were requested because a) eight residential units were too many, potentially leading to cramped conditions and especially because there was no space for communal areas and b) the lack of parking in an area already very short of vehicular space for residents. Although not enforceable, there is no information on management of any let units and it was felt that it would have been useful if the way in which the building was to be used had been stated. To see the full letter contact Sally Turff, forum clerk: sally@smithandturff.demon.co.uk