Coventry City Council
Minutes of the Meeting of Cabinet Member for City Services held at 3.00 pm on Monday, 21 January 2019

Present:

Members: Councillor P Hetherton (Cabinet Member)
Councillor R Lakha (Deputy Cabinet Member)
Councillor T Sawdon (Shadow Cabinet Member)

Other Members: Councillors: R Bailey, R Brown, L Kelly, P Male, K Sandhu and G Williams

Employees:

C Archer, Place Directorate
R Goodyer, Place Directorate
L Knight, Place Directorate
J Steele, Place Directorate
C Whitehouse, Place Directorate

Public Business

50. **Declarations of Interests**

There were no declarations of interest.

51. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 11th December, 2018 were agreed as a true record. There were no matters arising.

52. **Petition - Cannon Hill Road Speed Restriction and Safe Crossing**

The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) concerning a petition bearing 662 signatures (512 paper and 150 e-signatures) which had been submitted by Councillor Sawdon, a Wainbody Ward Councillor, who spoke on behalf of the petitioners. The petition organiser, Lydia Barrow, was invited but was unable to attend. She had submitted her views in writing and these were read out at the meeting. The report had been requested by Councillor Sawdon prior to a determination letter being issued. The petitioners were requesting speed restrictions and a safe crossing on Cannon Hill Road.

The report indicated that Cannon Hill Road connected the A45 to Kenilworth Road (A429). The A45 was one of the busiest radial routes into and out of Coventry. The Kenilworth Road was also a busy road, also being one of the radial routes into and out of the city. Carriageway markings including 'Dragons' Teeth' had been installed on the approaches to the bend on Cannon Hill Road. In addition, two Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) were operational on Cannon Hill Road. A location plan was set out at an Appendix to the report.

The Cabinet Member had originally considered the petition requesting that the issue was dealt with by determination letter. A copy of the determination letter was set out at a second appendix. The letter informed that there has been one recorded personal injury collision on Cannon Hill Road in the last three years. Therefore, the road did not meet the safety scheme criteria for consideration for the installation of a crossing. However, the location would be considered for a school-time advisory 20mph speed limit in the 2019/20 programme of works.

The petition also advised of concerns relating to large vehicles using Cannon Hill Road. A traffic survey was to be arranged in early 2019, and the results would be analysed to determine whether a weight restriction was suitable at the location.

The report also indicated that, subsequent to the receipt of the petition, a request was made to examine Cannon Hill Road's junction with Kenilworth Road. Concerns highlighted parked vehicles at this junction advising they reduced visibility for drivers entering and exiting Cannon Hill Road. However double yellow lines for junction protection had already been installed at this location and site visits undertaken revealed no evidence of vehicles causing obstruction.

The statement from the petition organiser informed that, since the cessation of the school crossing patrol, the road had got busier and traffic speeds had increased, with the road being used as a rat run. Approximately 50% of the Cannon Hill Primary School's pupils crossed this busy road so the petitioners were requesting a permanent crossing facility.

Councillor Sawdon informed of discussions between representatives at Warwick University and local residents which had resulted in a series of measures being drawn up. There was an acknowledgement of the opportunity for Section 106 funding to finance these works. He also informed of concerns about vehicles parking on the grass verge at the Kenilworth Road end of the street and the subsequent damage that was occurring.

RESOLVED that:

(1) The petitioners concerns be noted.

(2) The action confirmed by determination letter to the petition spokesperson, as detailed in paragraph 1.5 of the report, be endorsed.

(3) The ongoing discussions and work regarding future Section 106 funding for additional measures be noted.

53. **Petitions - Provision of a Zebra Crossing on Tile Hill Lane, Outside West Coventry Academy**

The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) concerning a petition bearing 658 e-signatures which was being supported by Councillor Kelly, an Assistant Police and Crime Commissioner, who attended the meeting and spoke on behalf of the petitioners. The petition organiser had been invited but was unable to attend. Councillor Male, a Woodlands Ward Councillor, also attended for this item. Three pupils and a member of staff from West Coventry Academy were in attendance. The report had been requested by the

petition organiser following the receipt of the determination letter. The petitioners were requesting the provision of a zebra crossing on Tile Hill Lane in close proximity to West Coventry Academy. A second petition, bearing 455 e-signatures, supported by Councillor Kelly, had subsequently been received from students at the school requesting safety measures on Tile Hill Lane and Nutbrook Avenue.

The report indicated West Coventry Academy was located to the north of Tile Hill Lane. The School's main vehicular and pedestrian entrance was located on Nutbrook Avenue; the area around this entrance had a School Keep Clear Marking located outside the school by the pedestrian exit and a school time no waiting restriction on the opposite side of the road. There was an additional pedestrian access on the northern side of Tile Hill Lane (west of Gravel Hill); this entrance had two bus stops which were located opposite each other on Tile Hill Lane. The existing Traffic Regulation Order created an area where parking was prevented at school entry and exit times on Nutbrook Avenue. A location plan was set out at an appendix to the report.

The determination letter had advised that there had been no personal injury collisions on Tile Hill Lane where the crossing was requested in the last three years, so the location did not meet the safety scheme criteria for a crossing. Also a crossing at this location could become a road safety hazard as drivers would have limited forward visibility due to the crest of the hill. A copy of the determination letter was set out at a second appendix. The report detailed some additional works recommended for Tile Hill Lane which included gateway features and splitter islands near the school.

A student representative from the school outlined the road safety issues at the location. Councillor Male suggested the possibility of using Section 106 funding from developments in the area to fund additional road safety measures in the vicinity of the school.

RESOLVED that:

(1) The petitioners concerns be noted.

(2) It be endorsed that the actions confirmed by the determination letter to the petition spokesperson, as detailed in paragraph 1.7 and appendix b to the report, be undertaken.

(3) The alternative solution highlighted in paragraph 2.3 of the report be approved.

54. **Petition - Safe Crossing to Co-op Store, Earlsdon High Street**

The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) concerning a petition, bearing 129 signatures, which had been submitted by Councillor Sandhu, an Earlsdon Ward Councillor, who attended the meeting along with Avril Boswell, the petition organiser, and they spoke on behalf of the petitioners. The report had been requested by the petition organiser following the receipt of the determination letter. The petitioners were requesting a safe crossing on Earlsdon Street by the Co-op Store.

The report indicated that Earlsdon Street was a busy street with a mix of shops, pubs, cafes and residential properties. A library, school and church were also located nearby. The Co-op referred to in the petition was located at the north eastern end of Earlsdon Street near to a 5 arm roundabout, which had zebra crossings across three of the arms. Another zebra crossing was located further along Earlsdon Street by the junction with Providence Street. There were 4 bus stops on Earlsdon Street, 2 of which were located near to the Co-op. There were a mix of waiting restrictions on Earlsdon Street which included double yellow lines and limited waiting. A location plan was set out at an appendix to the report.

The determination letter had advised that there had been two slight personal injury collisions in the last three years so the location didn't meet the criteria for the local safety scheme.

Officers had investigated whether an alternative crossing solution was possible. One possibility considered was the installation of a refuge island closer to the roundabout to try to assist pedestrians to cross, but unfortunately there was not enough available road space to do this and still allow buses and other large vehicles to pass. Another possibility was a central refuge, but this was not suitable in the requested location due to the proximity of the bus stops. To install additional crossing measures in the location requested would require substantial changes to how the road is used in terms of the positioning/removal of bus stops and parking bays.

The Cabinet Member was informed that the concerns relating to parking had been passed to the City Council's Parking Services Team and issues relating to the condition of the footway would be addressed by current procedures.

The petition organiser detailed the difficulties for local residents when crossing Earlsdon High Street and informed of her personal injury accident and an accident which had occurred the previous day. She also referred to the issue of pollution form vehicle fumes.

RESOLVED that:

(1) The petitioners concerns be noted

(2) It be endorsed that the actions confirmed by determination letter to the petition spokesperson, as detailed in paragraphs 1.5 to 1.7 of the report, are undertaken.

55. **Objections to Proposed Waiting Restrictions (Variation 7)**

The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) concerning objections that had been received to a Traffic Regulation Order advertised on 8th November, 2018 relating to proposed new waiting restrictions and amendments to existing waiting restrictions in a number of Wards across the City. A total of 51 objections were received which included three petitions. Six responses in support of proposals were also received. A summary of the proposed restrictions, objections and responses were set out in an appendix to the report. All the respondents were invited to the meeting and a number attended. Councillors

Bailey, Brown, Sandhu and Williams also attended in respect of proposed waiting restrictions in their Wards.

Councillors Bailey and Brown referred to the parking issues at Ashington Grove and to the views of petitioners from the vicinity. They supported the recommendation not to install the proposed restriction but to monitor the situation. Councillor Sandhu and an objector attended in respect of the proposal for Babbacombe Road and informed of inconsiderate parking at the location. It was recommended that the double lines be extended by a further 8 metres and this would be advertised in the next waiting restriction review.

Councillors Bailey and Brown and 5 objectors attended in respect of the proposals for Benedictine Road/ The Monks Croft. There were concerns that the proposals would create more parking problems than already existed. In light of the issues raised it was recommended that the residents of The Monks Croft would be consulted about the possibility of being part of a residents parking scheme and that double yellow lines just be installed on the Benedictine Road side of the grassed triangle and also on what was referred to as the short side of the triangle.

Councillor Williams and one objector attended the meeting in respect of the proposal for Brownshill Green Road/ Brackenhurst Drive and Brownshill Green Road/ Holloway Field and they spoke on behalf of the local petitioners who were concerned about the parking implications for residents of the local flats. It was suggested that the restrictions should not be implemented.

Councillor Bailey also spoke in support of the proposal for John Grace Street. Two objectors attended the meeting to highlight their concerns about the parking issues at Potters Green Road. In light of the concerns it was recommended that the proposal to remove an existing area of restricted parking remained in operation and as part of the next review it would be changed to no waiting at any time.

Two objectors attended and highlighted the implications for personal circumstances in respect of the proposal for The Avenues. In view of the concerns it was recommended that the proposed double yellow lines be installed just at the junctions and then monitoring be undertaken i.e. a phased approach. The Cabinet Member recommended consultation with the local Ward Councillors.

Two objectors attended in respect of the proposals for Tremelay Drive and Ridefort Close. They detailed the issues that would arise if the restrictions were implemented. In response it was decided to undertake consultation with local residents.

The cost of introducing the proposed TRO would be funded from the Highways Maintenance and Investment Capital Programme budget through the Local Transport Plan.

RESOLVED that, having considered the objections to the proposed waiting restrictions:

(1) The implementation of the restrictions as advertised at Ainsdale Close, Aldermans Green Road, John Grace Street, St Christians Road, Thurlestone Road and Torbay Rd/Kendal Rise.

(2) Approval be given that the restrictions are not implemented on Ashington Grove but the situation is monitored and in the event the Police advise of issues relating to dangerous or obstructive parking occurring, new proposals be advertised.

(3) The proposed double yellow lines are installed as advertised on Babbacombe Road be approved and that a further extension (approx. 8m) to the double yellow lines is advertised as part of the next waiting restriction review.

(4) Approval be given that the proposed school time no stopping restriction is not installed on Eden Road and the School Keep Clear marking is removed. Also, that the proposed double yellow lines on Eden Road are installed as advertised.

(5) The installation of restrictions as proposed on Potters Green Road be approved, apart from the proposal to remove an existing area of no waiting, Monday to Friday, 3pm-4.30pm, except buses restriction (currently marked with double yellow lines). Approval be given that the 'afternoon' restriction remains in operation and as part of the next waiting restriction review a change of this restriction to no waiting at any time is advertised. Once the changes have been made monitor and review to take place.

(6) The installation of the proposed double yellow lines at the junctions within 'The Avenues' area be approved. Approval be given not to install the other restrictions. Once the double yellow lines are installed, monitor to see if they have assisted and consult again about possible restrictions and introduce any new proposal as an experimental TRO.

(7) Approval be given that the restrictions are implemented as proposed on Trossachs Road and High Park Close and install additional markings to assist with the positioning of vehicles in the layby outside 2-10 Trossachs Road.

(8) The restrictions advertised for Brownshill Green Road be removed from the process, with further consideration being given to the proposal in due course due to the other issues raised.

(9) The restrictions advertised for Tremelay Drive and Ridefort Close be removed from the process to allow for further consultation with local residents and Ward Councillors.

(10) The residents of The Monks Croft be consulted about the possibility of being part of a residents parking scheme and double yellow lines be installed on the Benedictine Road side of the grassed triangle and also on what is referred to as the short side of the triangle (which is the side opposite 98 Benedictine Road and The Monks Croft.

(11) Approval be given that the proposed Traffic Regulation Order is made operational.

56. **Petitions Determined by Letter and Petitions Deferred Pending Further Investigations**

The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) which provided a summary of the recent petitions received that were to be determined by letter, or where decisions had been deferred pending further investigations and holding letters were being circulated. Details of the individual petitions were set out in an appendix attached to the report and included target dates for action. The report was submitted for monitoring and transparency purposes.

The report indicated that each petition had been dealt with on an individual basis, with the Cabinet Member considering advice from officers on appropriate action to respond to the petitioners' request. When it had been decided to respond to the petition without formal consideration at a Cabinet Member meeting, both the relevant Councillor/petition organiser could still request that their petition be the subject of a Cabinet Member report.

Members noted that where holding letters were being sent, this was because further investigation work was required. Once matters had been investigated either a follow up letter would be sent or a report submitted to a future Cabinet Member meeting.

RESOLVED that the actions being taken by officers as detailed in the appendix to the report, in response to the petitions received, be endorsed.

57. **Outstanding Issues**

There were no outstanding issues.

58. **Any other items of Public Business**

There were no additional items of business.

(Meeting closed at 5.25 pm)