

**Coventry City Council**  
**Minutes of the Meeting of Cabinet Member for City Services held at 3.00 pm on**  
**Monday, 19 November 2018**

Present:

Members: Councillor J Innes (Cabinet Member)  
Councillor R Lakha (Deputy Cabinet Member)  
Councillor T Sawdon (Shadow Cabinet Member)

Other Members: Councillors R Bailey, L Bigham, G Crookes, J Lepoidevin and  
J O'Boyle

Employees (by Directorate):

R Goodyer, Place Directorate  
L Knight, Place Directorate  
M Wilkinson, Place Directorate

## **Public Business**

### **35. Declarations of Interests**

There were no disclosable pecuniary interests.

### **36. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> September, 2019 were agreed as a true record, subject to the inclusion of the introduction of Average Speed Enforcement Cameras on London Road would also contribute to reducing traffic speeds in the area in Minute 29 headed 'Petition – Whitley Traffic Matters' and a description of the road layout and confirmation of the gritting routes in Minute 31 headed 'Petition – Return the Grit Bin to Overslade Crescent'.

### **37. Petition - Request to Reinstate Sleeping Policemen at Sutton Stop**

The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) concerning a petition bearing 14 signatures which had been submitted by Councillor Harvard, a Longford Ward Councillor, who was unable to attend the meeting. Councillor Bigham, also a Longford Ward Councillor, attended and spoke on behalf of the petitioners, along with Lonnie Downes, the petition organiser and Mike Fell, Secretary of Longford CAN Forum. The report had been requested by the petition organiser following the receipt of the determination letter. The petitioners were requesting improvements to traffic calming measures on the road into Sutton Stop, utilising sleeping policemen and clear signage to effectively slow traffic.

The report indicated that Sutton Stop was not adopted highway. A location plan was set out at an appendix to the report. The determination letter had advised that Sutton Stop was not adopted highway, nor under City Council ownership, therefore the Council was unable to install speed humps. Attempts had been made to determine the ownership of the land but it had not been possible to identify the

owner as the Land Registry did not hold any registration for it. A copy of the determination letter was set out at a second appendix.

Councillor Bigham read out observations from Councillor Harvard supporting the petitioners which highlighted the dangers for pedestrians who accessed the road to get to the canal and the local pub.

Lonnie Downs drew attention to a letter that had been sent by the Council to all residents and businesses of Hawkesbury Junction on 28<sup>th</sup> April 1998. The letter referred to the proposal to use European grant funding to undertake road improvements and that it was the Council's intention, subject to the works being carried out, to adopt the road and look after future maintenance. He referred to a visit that had taken place on 7<sup>th</sup> May, 1998. He referred to the £6,000 raised by residents and visitors in 1977/78 which paid for the road to be resurfaced and four sleeping police man installed. In 1998 when the road improvements were carried out, the sleeping policeman were removed, the road resurfaced, parking bays installed along with rumble strips. He indicated that residents wanted the policeman reinstated and a proper footpath.

Mike Fell reiterated the dangers for pedestrians, particularly the disabled highlighting the speeding traffic and the need for an improved highway and footway.

Councillor Innes, Cabinet Member suggested that further investigations be undertaken to determine if the Council could adopt the road.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(1) The petitioners' concerns be noted.**

**(2) Officers be requested to make further attempts to determine the ownership of the land and to investigate the possibility of the Council adopting the highway at Sutton Stop.**

**38. Petition - Broad Lane - Pedestrian Crossing and Safety Measures**

The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) concerning a petition bearing 184 signatures (134 paper and 50 e-signatures), which had been submitted by Councillor Lepoidevin, a Woodlands Ward Councillor and the petition organiser, who attended the meeting and spoke on behalf of the petitioners. The report had been requested by Councillor Lepoidevin following the receipt of the determination letter. The petitioners were requesting the installation of a pedestrian crossing at the junction of Jardine Crescent and Broad Lane and further road safety measures along the road.

The report indicated that Broad Lane was a local distributor road with residential and business premises along its route and was also a bus route. A location plan was set out at an appendix to the report. The determination letter had advised of the importance of targeting road safety measures in the city. A review of recorded personal injury collisions on Broad Lane between Banner Lane and A45 had not identified any clusters of collisions and no collisions at or near the site of the requested crossing. Consequently, the road had not been prioritised for

investigation as part of this year's safety scheme programme. The junction of Broad Lane and Jardine Crescent was to be added to the programme for the deployment of mobile vehicle-activated signs that reacted to vehicle speeds. Broad Lane would also continue to be monitored as part of the annual review of recorded personal injury collisions. A copy of the determination letter was set out at a second appendix.

Councillor Lepoidevin informed that residents had recently carried out two community speed watches on Broad Lane which had recorded speeding traffic. She requested clarification of when the mobile vehicle-activated speed signs would be deployed and also enquired about the deployment of the mobile signs which had been promised for Alderminster Road. Officers informed that new mobile vehicle-activated signs were currently being procured.

It was suggested that, in light of the development of Bannerbrook Park, perhaps the crossings and refuges on Broad Lane were no longer located at the most appropriate sites. Councillor Innes, Cabinet Member asked for this to be investigated.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(1) The petitioners' concerns be noted.**

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

**(3) Officers be requested to inform Councillor Lepoidevin about the timescales for the deployment of mobile vehicle activated signs at Broad Lane and Alderminster Road.**

**(4) Officers be requested to review the location of the pedestrian crossings and refuges along Broad Lane.**

**39. Petition - Keep Clear Box for Access to Seymour Close**

The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) concerning a petition bearing 24 e-signatures which was being supported by Councillor Bailey, a Cheylesmore Ward Councillor, who attended the meeting and spoke on behalf of the petitioners. The petition organiser was invited but was unable to attend. Jacquie White, local resident, spoke in support of the petitioners. The report had been requested by the petition organiser following the receipt of the determination letter. The petitioners were requesting that a box junction was installed on London Road at its junction with Seymour Close to assist vehicles entering and exiting Seymour Close.

The report indicated that Seymour Close was a cul-de-sac located off London Road. A location plan was set out at an appendix to the report. The determination letter had advised that CCTV had been utilised to monitor the traffic flows at the London Road/Seymour Road junctions on both weekdays and weekends. The monitoring did not show any significant blockage of the junction, only the

occasional delay of a few seconds was observed for a vehicle turning in, therefore it was not proposed to install a box junction.

The petition also advised of concerns relating to the speed of traffic on London Road. As part of this year's Local Safety Scheme programme average speed cameras would be installed on London Road, from its junction with Allard Way to its junction with the A46, which should address these concerns. A copy of the determination letter was set out at a second appendix.

Councillor Bailey and Mrs White spoke about the difficulties for residents to get in and out of Seymour Close, particularly at peak times. Councillor Innes, Cabinet Member, suggested the installation of CCTV to monitor the traffic situation following the introduction of the average speed cameras.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(1) The petitioners' concerns be noted.**

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

**(3) Approval be given for additional CCTV monitoring at the junction of London Road and Seymour Close early in the new year to assess the traffic situation following the installation of average speed cameras on London Road.**

**40. Objections to Proposed Revocation of Prohibition of Left Turn from Warwick Road into Westminster Road**

The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) concerning two objections that had been received to a Traffic Regulation Order, advertised on 20<sup>th</sup> September, 2018, which revoked the prohibition of the no left turn from Warwick Road into Westminster Road. The objectors, James Avery and George Riches, attended the meeting and spoke in support of their objections.

The report indicated that as part of the Station Master Plan works, it was proposed to temporarily increase the available off street car parking at Westminster Road with a public car park of 157 spaces and a private parking area with 47 spaces for Eaton House. Currently, due to existing traffic management arrangements, vehicles couldn't turn left from Warwick Road into Westminster Road where the car park entrance was located. Therefore to improve access it was proposed to permit the left turn and to change the road layout at the junction to facilitate this.

Following a 21 day objection period for the Traffic Regulation Order, the two objections received raised issues relating to the impact of the new route for traffic on vulnerable users in the area. Details of both objections were set out in the appendix to the report.

The first objection raised concerns which related to the objector's use of Westminster Road as part of the route to the station and the potential for rat running. The report indicated that to prevent drivers using Westminster Road as a cut through, it was proposed to create a 'no entry' part way along Westminster

Road so traffic entering from Warwick Road could only travel up to the car park entrance. A TRO concerning this proposal was advertised on 18<sup>th</sup> October and one response in support was received. The Cabinet Member noted that pedestrian dropped kerbs with tactile paving were already in place on Westminster Road. The new entry location would include a build out and cycle bypass which should also assist to slow down traffic.

The second objection related to cycle access in the area requesting physical and legal measures be taken to allow for safe and legal westbound cycling from the Warwick Road toucan crossing to the junction of Westminster Road and Grosvenor Road. A concern was raised about a lack of signage. The report highlighted that the proposed revocation would provide an alternative route on the carriageway for cyclists. The other issues had been passed to the Transport Delivery Team for consideration.

James Avery spoke about the vulnerability of pedestrians and cyclists and the need for reasonable adjustments to be made for them. He drew attention to the importance of always considering equality matters when decisions were being taken. George Riches referred to the potential for the significant increase in passengers at the train station over the next few years and the need to encourage walking and cycling. He highlighted the lack of signage from the station to the west of the city.

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

**(1) Approval be given for the City of Coventry (Warwick Road) (Prohibition of Left Turn Revocation) Order 2018 to be made operational.**

**(2) Officers be requested to investigate the signage on the cycle route from the train station to the west of the city.**

#### **41. Revisions to the Integrated Transport Block 2018/19 Capital Programme**

The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) which provided an update on the current Integrated Transport Capital Programme and sought approval for variations to the programme including the deferral of some of the original schemes and the provision for additional safety schemes, traffic management schemes and urban traffic management and control schemes.

The report indicated that the reason for the variations to the current programme related to a number of new priorities coming forward during the current financial year which required investigation/ support. The only way to include these additional schemes was to defer some of the existing schemes. The Cabinet Member noted that there was already an element of over-programming in the current programme. The schemes proposed to be deferred were the ones where investigations, designs and works had not yet commenced. Details about the schemes to be deferred and the new priority schemes were set out in an appendix to the report.

New priorities identified during the current year included two Average Speed Enforcement Cameras Schemes on London Road and Ansty Road which were

due to become operational before the end of 2018 and options for Longfellow Road to provide some safe crossing points for pedestrians and were currently the subject of consultation. All changes were fully funded within the capital programme.

The report referred to the award of an additional £250,000 grant funding from the West Midlands Combined Authority Congestion and Road Safety Programme Fund which would be used to improve four major signalised junctions on the key route network at Radford Road/ Beake Avenue, Radford Road/ Lydgate Road, Clifford Bridge Road/ Brinklow Road and London Road/ Daventry Road. The grant was awarded on the basis that the Council provided matched funding. Consequently some existing proposed junction improvements would need to be deferred to the next financial year.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(1) The revised Integrated Transport Capital Programme as detailed in the report and Appendix A be approved.**

**(2) Agreement be given that the Director of Transport and Highways has delegated authority, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for City Services, to adjust the 2018/19 programme to ensure it remains within approved budget and to enable any further changes to be made.**

**42. Petition - Traffic Calming Measures on Terry Road**

The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) concerning a petition bearing 165 signatures which had been submitted by Councillor O'Boyle, a St Michael's Ward Councillor, who attended the meeting and spoke on behalf of the petitioners. The petition organiser was also invited but was unable to attend. The report had been requested by Councillor O'Boyle prior to the determination letter being issued. The petitioners were requesting traffic calming measures on Terry Road in the area by the junction with St Georges Road, Blue Coat School and the sharp bend in the road.

The report indicated that Terry Road was a local distributor road with a mixture of residential and business premises and Blue Coat School. It was also a bus route. A location plan was set out at an appendix to the report. The Cabinet Member had considered the petition and her determination was set out at a second appendix. The report indicated that Coventry was continuing to work towards becoming a safer speed city. A review of the three year accident history of the site revealed there had been no personal injury collisions reported to the police. However, photographic evidence from the petitioners did show evidence of collisions. The location did not meet the safety scheme criteria. Terry Road was to be considered for a school-time advisory 20mph limit. Also, the centreline and hatching had recently been refreshed as part of the Council's planned road maintenance programme. Reference was made to the Community Speed Watch initiative which the petitioners could get involved with.

Councillor O'Boyle drew attention to the increase in traffic in the area, the speeding traffic and the blind corner at the entrance to Blue Coat School. He requested that contact be made with the school as they had their views on the

traffic problems and what actions were required. Councillor Innes, Cabinet Member asked about the costs of installing the 20mph speed limit signs and requested that officers consider bringing forward the school-time advisory 20mph into the current year's programme of works.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(1) The petitioners concerns be noted.**

**(2) The actions confirmed in the 'Petitions Determined By Letter and Petitions Deferred Pending Further Investigations' report dated 26<sup>th</sup> September, as detailed in paragraphs 1.6 to 1.8 of this report be endorsed.**

**(3) Officers be requested to contact Blue Coat Secondary School regarding their concerns about the traffic issues in Terry Road.**

**(4) Officers to consider bringing forward the school time advisory 20mph limit for Terry Road into the current year's programme of works.**

**43. 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.

Councillor Crookes, a Wainbody Ward Councillor attended the meeting and asked about progress with the petition requesting residents parking at the parking bays on Cannon Hill Road between the junctions with Orlescote Road and Atherstone Place. Councillor Sawdon, Shadow Cabinet Member, asked officers to look the problems being caused by cars parking on the grass verges on Cannon Hill Road south of the junction with Kenilworth Road.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(1) The actions being taken by officers as detailed in the appendix to the report, in response to the petitions received, be endorsed.**

**(2) Officers to investigate and report back to Councillor Crookes on the current position with the petition concerning a request for the layby style parking bays on Cannon Hill Road between the junctions of Orlescote Road and Atherstone Place to be residents parking.**

**(3) Officers be requested to investigate parking on the grass verges on Cannon Hill Road south of the junction with Kenilworth Road and to include this in the Cabinet Member report concerning the petition requesting speed restrictions and a safe crossing on Cannon Hill Road.**

**44. Outstanding Issues**

There were no outstanding issues.

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

There were no additional items of public business.

(Meeting closed at 4.20 pm)