

(1) Reason why decision is being called in:

The Cabinet appears not to have paid sufficient attention to the fact that the consultation carried out by the council resulted in scant support for the proposals. The report says at paragraph 4.10 the council received 663 responses, but that the proposals were supported by only 43.4% of those that responded. That is in our view insufficient for such major expenditure, and such that will have a major impact on the A1010 corridor.

The report states that a "business walk" was carried out on the 9 September and 12 September 2016 and although the report does not give the result of that business walk, when officers were asked at the Cabinet there was no clear evidence of support for the proposals by businesses along the A1010. That is unsurprising in our view because this will have an impact on those businesses.

Again there appears to have been no direct consultation with the bus company operators, and there of course a number of routes that operate along the A1010. It was significant and telling that when asked, officers were unable to identify just how many bus routes there were.

There are also significant parking implications.

Paragraph 5.81 of the report shows that some 47% of residents' bays will disappear under these proposals as will some pay and display spaces, and 26% of much used waiting and loading bays. We are told that "informal parking" has been reduced along the length of the corridor and it is said that this can be accommodated in side roads, an assertion we do not accept and which has not been fully explained. In an attempt to mitigate this, it is said that if properties have off carriageway space they will be offered a free crossover but when asked how many such properties existed, officers again had no information.

The Economic Impact Assessment makes plain there is very little to be gained from this exercise even in a better case situation post construction, but a significant decline is expected in a worse case scenario. The point here is any detrimental impact is not one that can be easily absorbed by struggling businesses.

On air quality and health, the report is ambiguous. It says at paragraph 5.10.4 that the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) recognises the profound effect of poor air quality on both health and health inequalities but paragraph 5.10.5 records "it is unfortunate that some of the draft recommendations that contradict NICE's own guidance are likely to actually increase pollution". They clearly recommend, as is recorded in paragraph 5.10.5, off road or quiet streets for cycle routes. That is unsurprising to us since if you encourage cyclists to travel along routes which are heavily congested with lorries, buses and cars forcing the cyclists to breathe in foul air, they are likely to go elsewhere rather than use the proposed lanes.

Lastly the congestion and journey times are going to be significantly extended, and insufficient attention has been paid to the delays to bus passengers, car passengers and all other vehicles which will affect the borough and national economy.

(2) **Outline of proposed alternative action:**

Refer back to Cabinet for further consideration.

(3) **Do you believe the decision is outside the policy framework?**

No

(4) **If Yes, give reasons:** n/a

FOR DST USE ONLY:

Checked by Proper Officer for validation –

Name of Proper Officer:

Date:

Asmat Hussain

29-12-2016

