

Coventry City Council
Minutes of the Meeting of Cabinet Member for City Services held at 11.00 am on
Monday, 14 November 2016

Present:

Members: Councillor J Innes (Cabinet Member)
Councillor M Hammon (Shadow Cabinet Member)

Other Members: Councillor R Lakha (Deputy Cabinet Member)
Councillors R Bailey

Employees (by Directorate):

M Coggins, Place Directorate
L Knight, Resources Directorate
J Logue, Place Directorate
S McGinty, Resources Directorate
K Seager, Place Directorate
M Wilkinson, Place Directorate

Apologies: There were no apologies

Public Business

22. Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

23. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 10th October, 2016 were signed as a true record. There were no matters arising.

24. Driving Assessments for New Applicant Drivers and Hackney Carriage Wheelchair Assessments for New Applicant and Additional Hackney Carriage Drivers

The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Executive Director of Place which sought approval for the Driver Vehicle Standards Agency (DVSA) driving assessment and the DVSA Hackney Carriage wheelchair assessment being replaced by equivalent assessment and testing by the City Council qualified driving assessment officers.

The report indicated that at their meeting on 30th November, 1994 the Licensing and Regulatory Committee decided to include wheelchair testing within the then driving assessment for new applicant drivers, carried out by licensing officers. At the meeting on 28th November, 2000 the Committee approved the introduction of a new Hackney Carriage and Private Hire driving test assessment and also a Hackney Carriage wheelchair assessment being provided by the Driving Standards Agency (later to become the DVSA).

The City Council received a letter from the DVSA dated 31st August, 2016 sent to all Chief Executives of local authorities informing them that the provision of driving assessments for Hackney Carriage and Private Hire drivers and the wheelchair assessments for Hackney Carriage drivers were being withdrawn from 31st December, 2016. Applicant drivers had been unable to book these tests from mid-September as the DVSA was fully booked.

It was proposed that the City Council provide the assessments with effect from 9th January, 2017 at a cost of £70 for the driving assessment and £25 for the wheelchair assessment, or a combined fee of £90 for both tests.

RESOLVED that approval be given that it will be the Council policy from 9th January, 2017 that the DVSA driving assessment and the Hackney Carriage wheelchair assessment is replaced by an equivalent assessment and testing by the City Council's qualified driving assessment officers.

25. **Objection to Traffic Regulation Order - Proposed Revocation of Right Turn Only (Whitley/ A444)**

The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Executive Director of Place concerning six objections that had been received to the Traffic Regulation Order to revoke the right turn only from the A444 northbound off slip on to the over bridge to Jaguar Land Rover/hotel complex. Two of the objectors, Mr Latimer and Mr Ross attended the meeting and outlined their concerns. Councillor Bailey, a Cheylesmore Ward Councillor also attended the meeting for the consideration of this item.

The report indicated that on 7th February, 2014 planning permission was granted for the construction of highways infrastructure comprising a new bridge over the A444 (the Whitley Junction improvement scheme). Changes to the road layout required Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) to assist with traffic management changes. One of the TROs only permitted traffic to be able to turn right from the A444 northbound off slip on to the over bridge.

The Members were informed that a significant proportion of road users were now turning left at the top of the slip road access. The existing junction layout and alignment would not allow for a change in layout to prevent vehicles turning left. Traffic turning left also had the benefit of no oncoming traffic flow which allowed vehicles to utilise both lanes when turning left.

As a consequence it was decided to revoke the right turn only order and the TRO was advertised on 6th October, 2016 and 6 objections were received. Further information on the individual objections and responses to the issues raised was set out in an appendix to the report.

Members noted that enforcement of the right turn only order was an issue for the Police who did not have resources to provide continual enforcement at the junction.

Mr Latimer outlined his concerns relating to the impact for Cheylesmore residents of the revocation. He also sought clarification about changes to the original scheme design. It was emphasised that changes often occurred as detailed

designs were developed and that traffic monitoring was always undertaken and modifications introduced to enable the free flow of traffic.

Mr Ross, Jaguar Land Rover expressed concerns about the lack of consultation with JLR regarding the traffic issues and the proposed revocation. He requested the opportunity for his company to be able to understand why the enforcement had failed, indicating that it was wrong to legalise the illegal movements. He highlighted the importance of the continued good working relationship between the City Council and JLR.

RESOLVED that, having considered the objections, consideration of the report be deferred to allow for a meeting with the Cabinet Member, Deputy Cabinet Member, Shadow Cabinet Member, Ward Councillors, officers, representatives from Jaguar Land Rover and the objectors to consider all of the issues raised and a further report be submitted to a future Cabinet Member meeting, if appropriate.

26. **Objections to Ringwood Highway Area 20mph Zone**

The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Executive Director of Place concerning two objections that had been received to the Traffic Regulation Order to change the speed limit at Ringwood Highway area to 20mph. One of the objectors, Mr Gillett attended the meeting and outlined his concerns.

The report indicated that on 25th March, 2014 the Cabinet Member for Public Services committed to the aspiration for Coventry becoming a 20mph city and in September of that year the Cabinet Member approved the proposal that a number of areas which already had traffic calming were to become 20mph zones including the Ringwood Highway area (Minutes 101/13 and 38/14 refer).

Local residents were consulted on the proposal for Ringwood Highway, over 100 responses were received with 87% of respondents supporting the proposal. The Traffic Regulation Order to change the speed limit to 20mph was advertised on 6th October, 2016 and two objections were received. The first objector advised that the scheme was 'a waste of my money' while the second objector informed that there wasn't a speeding problem, there had been no accidents. Details of both objections and responses to the issues raised were set out in an appendix to the report.

Mr Gillett informed that he had lived in the area for 52 years and he was not aware of a speeding problem in the area. He felt that creating a 20mph limit would create more problems as drivers would become frustrated by cars travelling at this speed. He requested clarification about accidents in the vicinity. Mr Gillett also detailed the problems currently experienced by buses created by parked cars in the vicinity of the shops meaning it was difficult for the buses to turn.

RESOLVED that:

(1) Having considered the objections to the 20mph zone, the implementation of the 'City of Coventry (Ringwood Highway Area) (20mph Zone) Order 2016 be approved.

(2) Officers be requested to investigate the concerns raised regarding the problems being experienced by buses on Ringwood Highway.

27. Objection to Waiting Restrictions, Forknell Avenue/ Lutterworth Avenue

Further to Minute 13/16, the Cabinet Member considered a report of the Executive Director of Place concerning an objection that had been received concerning a Traffic Regulation Order relating to proposed double yellow lines at the junction of Forknell Avenue/ Lutterworth Avenue. The objector was invited to the meeting but was unable to attend.

The report indicated that the Traffic Regulation Orders relating to proposed new waiting restrictions and amendments to existing restrictions, including the junction of Forknell Avenue/ Lutterworth Avenue, were advertised on 30th June, 2016. Objections were considered at the Cabinet Member meeting on 15th August, 2016. Unfortunately one of the objections was not included in the process.

The request for double yellow lines had been submitted via the Upper Stoke Ward Forum. The residents that attended the Forum meeting had raised road safety concerns advising that the level of traffic in the area had increased and that there was a danger posed by cars parked too close to the junction, limiting visibility. Details of the objection and the response to the issues raised were set out in an appendix attached to the report. The objector's main concern was that the lines would prevent him parking outside his property and his grandchildren would have to walk from the car to the property on a daily basis.

RESOLVED that, having considered the objection, the restrictions as advertised at the junction of Forknell Avenue/Lutterworth Avenue be approved.

28. Petitions Determined by Letter and Petitions Deferred Pending Further Investigations

The Cabinet Member for City Services considered a report of the Executive Director of Place that 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. Attention was drawn to the fact that if 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 were informed 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 a 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.

29. **Outstanding Issues**

The Cabinet Member noted a report of the Executive Director of Resources that contained a list of outstanding issues and summarised the current position in respect of each item.

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

There were no other items of public business.

(Meeting closed at 11.55 am)