

Coventry City Council
Minutes of the Meeting of Cabinet Member for City Services held at 3.00 pm on
Monday, 2 December 2019

Present:

Members: Councillor P Hetherton (Cabinet Member)
Councillor G Lloyd (Deputy Cabinet Member)

Other Members: Councillors R Bailey, J McNicholas, J Mutton, G Ridley and
G Williams

Employees:

C Archer, Place Directorate
M Coggins, Place Directorate
T Cowley, Place Directorate
L Knight, Resources Directorate
M Wilkinson, Place Directorate

Apologies: Councillor T Mayer

Public Business

45. Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

46. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 21st October were agreed and signed as a true record. There were no matters arising.

47. Petition - Residents Parking Scheme on Walsgrave Road End of Church Lane

The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) concerning a petition, bearing 8 signatures, which had been submitted by Councillor McNicholas, a Lower Stoke Ward Councillor, who attended the meeting along with 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 residents' parking scheme on the Walsgrave Road end of Church Lane.

The report indicated that Church Lane was a residential road and Walsgrave Road (A4600) was part of a main arterial route into Coventry. At the top of Church Lane, there was a parade of shops on the eastern side of the road that continued onto Walsgrave Road. Outside the shops, there were five parking bays where waiting was limited to one hour Monday to Saturday between 7am and 7pm, with no return permitted within 2 hours. There were additional parking bays subject to the same waiting restriction on Walsgrave Road. Walsgrave Road was part of a Red Route, which meant that stopping was not permitted outside the marked parking bays. A

location plan detailing the parking restrictions was attached at an appendix to the report.

A review of the personal recorded injury collision history for the last 3 years on the northern section of Church Lane shows that there were 3 personal injury collisions involving vehicles turning into or out of Church Lane from Walsgrave Road.

The Cabinet Member was informed that Residents' parking schemes were usually only considered for a whole street or an area where most residents did not have access to off-street parking. Most of the properties at the northern end of Church Lane had driveways. If a vehicle was obstructing a vehicular dropped kerb, the Council's Parking Enforcement Team could take action. However, a vehicle could be parked across a vehicular dropped kerb with the permission of the resident. Due to the number of properties with driveways, there was limited space available for on-street parking on the section of Church Lane in question and surveys had shown that this was fully utilised.

The determination letter had advised of the situation relating to residents' parking schemes and that the section of Church Lane referred to did not qualify for consideration as a residents' parking scheme. A copy of the determination letter was set out at a further appendix.

Councillor McNicholas and the petition organiser drew attention to the parking issues being experienced by local residents on a daily basis which included inconsiderate parking by employees and customers of local businesses. It was suggested that local businesses be contacted to encourage parking at the rear of their premises and that regular enforcement of the vicinity could be undertaken. The option of a residents parking scheme for the wider area was discussed.

RESOLVED that:

(1) The petitioners' concerns be noted.

(2) Arrangements be put in place for a meeting with the petition spokesperson, Ward Councillors and officers to discuss options to help alleviate the parking problems being experienced by residents, with Ward Councillors and officers contacting local businesses asking them to park at the rear of their premises rather than in Church Lane.

(3) Approval be given for regular enforcement being carried out at the Walsgrave Road end of Church Lane.

48. Petition - Request for Residents Parking Scheme in Benedictine Road to be Extended to The Monks Croft

The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) concerning a petition, bearing 15 signatures, which had been submitted by Councillor Bailey, a Cheylesmore Ward Councillor, who attended the meeting along with three local residents who spoke on behalf of the petitioners. The report had been requested by the petition organiser following the receipt of the determination letter. The petition organiser was unable to attend. The petitioners

were requesting that the Cheylesmore East Residents Parking Scheme be extended to include The Monks Croft.

The report indicated that the Cheylesmore East, Cheylesmore West and Earlsdon Residents' Parking Schemes came into operation in 2015. Since the installation of these schemes, petitions had been received requesting that the schemes were extended due to the transference of commuter parking into areas outside the scheme.

Benedictine Road and The Monks Croft were part of the original 2014 proposals, but not implemented due to insufficient support. A location plan was set out in an appendix to the report. In response to a petition from Benedictine Road, both Benedictine Road and The Monks Croft residents were consulted in 2017 as to whether they now wanted to be part of the residents' parking scheme. The residents' parking scheme criteria included that 60% of households must be in support of a scheme before the scheme could be progressed. The required support was not received for the whole of Benedictine Road and The Monks Croft, however there was sufficient support for a scheme on the section of Benedictine Road from its junction with Carthusian Road to its cul de sac end and this was implemented. After the scheme was installed a further petition was received from residents of Benedictine Road (living outside of the scheme area) asking for the scheme to be extended to include the whole road.

The Cabinet Member was informed that residents of The Monks Croft had also petitioned about parking issues. The response was to propose double yellow lines around the 'grass triangle' at the junction of The Monks Croft and Benedictine Road. The legal process was commenced, but objections were received. In response to the objections it was agreed to install a reduced length of double yellow lines. It was also agreed to consult with residents as to whether they wanted to be included in the Cheylesmore East Residents' Parking Scheme, when the Benedictine Road extension was advertised.

In May 2019 The Monks Croft residents were consulted about being part of a residents' parking scheme, but there was not sufficient support and no further action was undertaken to include The Monks Croft in the proposed scheme extension. This petition was received following the latest consultation.

The determination letter had therefore advised that the recent consultation undertaken prior to the petition, asking residents if they wanted The Monks Croft to be included in a proposed extension to the existing residents' parking scheme, did not meet the required criteria of 60% of households being in favour. Consequently, the proposed extension of the existing scheme would not include The Monks Croft. However, a further consultation with The Monks Croft residents would be undertaken 12 months after the scheme extension. A copy of the determination letter was set out at a second appendix.

The local residents sought clarification as to why six properties on Benedictine Road would be included in the scheme for The Monks Croft and informed of parking and speeding issues in the road caused by people parking during the day whilst at work. In light of the potential support for a scheme, a further consultation was recommended.

RESOLVED that:

(1) The petitioners' concerns be noted.

(2) Approval be given for a further consultation on the extension of the Residents' Parking Scheme in Benedictine Road to The Monks Croft to be undertaken in January 2020.

49. Petition - Close the Exit from Chace Avenue onto London Road

The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) concerning a petition, bearing 54 e-signatures. The petition organiser was invited to the meeting but was unable to attend. The report had been requested by the petition organiser following the receipt of the determination letter. The petitioners were requesting the closure of the exit from Chace Avenue onto London Road. A local resident attended to outline his concerns about traffic issues in Carnegie Close. Councillor Bailey, a Cheylesmore Ward Councillor and Councillor J Mutton, a Binley and Willenhall Ward Councillor also attended for the consideration of this item.

The report indicated that Chace Avenue was a residential road and London Road (B4110) was one of the main arterial routes into Coventry. London Road had a 40mph speed limit and in this area Average Speed Enforcement had been in operation since January 2019. A location plan was set out at an appendix to the report.

A traffic regulation order (TRO), was introduced in 1973 which prohibited vehicles, except buses, from turning right from London Road into Chace Avenue and from turning right out of Chace Ave on to London Road. A review of the personal recorded injury collision history for the last 3 years on London Road between its junctions with Chace Avenue and Carnegie Close showed that 4 personal injury collision had been recorded. None of the collisions involved a vehicle turning right in to or out of Chace Avenue.

The petition referred to a number of drivers undertaking the illegal right turn out of Chace Avenue; this restriction was enforceable by the Police. The petition also referred to drivers turning left out of Chace Avenue and then utilising Carnegie Close to turn around, to be able to travel towards the city centre without having made the illegal right turn manoeuvre. Drivers wishing to turn right on to London Road should access St James Lane and make this manoeuvre at its signalised junction with London Road.

The determination letter had advised that Chace Avenue provided an important access to and from a residential area and was also a bus diversion route. Consequently, it was not proposed to make any changes to the road layout to close this junction. A copy of the determination letter was set out at a second appendix. Councillor Mutton expressed support for this recommendation and highlighted the problems that would occur if the petitioners' request was implemented.

RESOLVED that:

(1) The petitioners' concerns be noted.

(2) The actions confirmed by determination letter to the petition spokesperson, as detailed in paragraph 1.9 of the report, be endorsed.

50. **Petition - Replacement of the Pavement Surface at Ross Close**

The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) concerning a petition, bearing 21 signatures, which had been submitted by Councillor Ridley, a Woodlands Ward Councillor, who attended the meeting along with the petition organiser and they spoke on behalf of the petitioners. The petitioners were requesting the replacement of the pavement surface at Ross Close.

The report indicated that Ross Close was a local residential cul-de-sac, which serves 14 properties and was situated off Sutherland Avenue. A location plan was set out at an appendix to the report. Records showed that the last annual programmed safety inspection took place on 22nd August 2019, at which time four intervention level defects were identified, all of which had now been repaired. There had been no customer enquiries made in the last 12 months.

Following receipt of the petition an engineer made a separate visit on 4th September in order to complete an assessment of the construction and overall condition of the pavements. The pavements were of a slab construction. Both the road and pavements were somewhat aged and although not aesthetically pleasing at the time of inspection there were no intervention level defects identified.

The Cabinet Member was informed that following the engineer's assessment, and given the current condition and usage, the recommended treatment would be to take up the slabs and replace with a bituminous surface. This treatment would only take place if a priority score was reached by the Councils Asset Management System. The Pavement would then be included in a future capital funded improvement programme, budget permitting. Until such time any defects at or above our intervention levels as identified would continue to be made safe. The estimated cost of the repair was approximately £18,000.

The petition organiser detailed his concerns regarding the state of the pavement surface at Ross Close which included health and safety issues and enquired about the likely timescale for any potential works. Councillor Ridley sought clarification about the assessment process for the Asset Management System.

RESOLVED that:

(1) The petitioners' concerns be noted.

(2) Approval be given that the pavements at Ross Close be held on the City Council's forward programme list and their condition will continue to be monitored and scored against all other similar sites citywide.

51. **Objection to Proposed Waiting Restrictions - Browns Lane**

Further to Minute 40/19, the Cabinet Member considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) concerning an objection which had been received to proposed double yellow (no waiting at any time) restriction for Browns Lane at its junction with Lyons Drive. The proposal was part of a Traffic Regulation Order relating to proposed new waiting restrictions and amendments to existing restrictions advertised on 13th June. The item had been scheduled to be considered at the three previous Cabinet Member meetings but had been deferred in response to requests of the objector. The objector attended the meeting for the consideration of this item and outlined his concerns. Councillor Williams, a Bablake Ward Councillor, also attended for this item.

The report indicated that the request for the extension of the existing double yellow lines on Brown's Lane at its junction with Lyons Drive had been made by a resident who advised of safety concerns when turning right out of Lyons Drive due to reduced visibility caused by parked vehicles on Browns Lane. The proposal in response, as advertised, was detailed in an appendix to the report.

Generally, 10 metres of double yellow lines were provided for junction protection, this was in accordance with the advice from the Highway Code regarding parking at a junction. This was to provide visibility at a junction. 10 metres was the length of double yellow lines originally installed at the junction, therefore the request to extend the double yellow lines further was carefully considered; as whilst it was not a duty of the City Council to provide on street parking, the Council were aware of the impact introducing double yellow lines could have on residents and their visitors who parked on street. A photo taken by an Officer investigating the request was included in the appendix and this showed the impact of parking on visibility at the Lyons Drive junction.

As part of the statutory procedure, the TRO was advertised in the local press and notices were posted on lamp columns in the area of the proposed restrictions on 13th June 2019, advising that any formal objections should be made in writing by 4th July 2019. In addition, letters were also sent to residents who would be directly affected due to waiting restrictions being installed on the public highway outside their property. One objection was received to the Brown's Lane proposal, the details of which were set out in the appendix.

Due to the delay in hearing the objection to the Browns Lane proposal, it was removed from the original TRO, which was sealed. The Cabinet Member was informed that if any proposal relating to the introduction of double yellow lines was approved, the legal process including the statutory objection period would be undertaken. The recommended proposal was to undertake the legal process to install the restrictions as originally advertised at Browns Lane.

The objector reported that he was not aware of any accidents at the vicinity in the past four years; it was an advantage to have vehicles parked there as they provided a barrier from the glare of the sun; there would be a reduction in parking for residents; and the current restrictions already met the 10 metre criteria for junction protection as advised in the Highway Code. The option of a reduction in the length of proposed waiting restrictions was discussed.

RESOLVED that, having considered the objection to the proposed waiting restriction, approval be given for a site visit to be undertaken with officers and the Cabinet Member to determine the proposed length of double yellow lines to be provided on Browns Lane at its junction with Lyons Drive for junction protection.

52. **Objections to Proposed Waiting Restrictions - Burnsall Road**

The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) concerning two objections that were received to proposed new waiting restrictions on Burnsall Road which were advertised in a Traffic Regulation Order on 1st August 2019. Both objectors were invited to the meeting but were unable to attend.

The report indicated that the proposed waiting restrictions were 'No Waiting, Monday to Friday, 8am – 5pm' on both sides of a section of Burnsall Road. The restrictions were proposed in response to issues raised relating to parked cars obstructing access for heavy good vehicles into adjacent businesses. As part of the statutory procedure, the Traffic Regulation Order was advertised in the local press and notices were posted on lamp columns in the area of the proposed restrictions on 1st August 2019, advising that any formal objections should be made in writing by 22nd August 2019. In addition to the statutory procedure, on 16th August letters were also sent to residents/businesses who may be affected due to the proposed changes; the objection period was also extended to 29th August 2019.

Details of the two objections to the proposal and responses to the objections were summarised in an appendix to the report. The recommended proposal in response to the objections was to reduce the extent of the proposed restriction, thereby installing the restriction on the southern side of Burnsall Road and not the northern side. This would still address the issues of cars parking in a manner which prevented large vehicles being able to turn into the premises on the northern side of the road, as it was the road space required for the turning manoeuvre which had been highlighted as causing access problems. The Cabinet Member noted that Objector 1 had confirmed that this change would address their concerns. It was the intention that if the restriction was installed the situation would continue to be monitored.

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

(1) Approval be given for a shorter length of 'No Waiting, Monday to Friday, 8.00 am to 5.00 pm being installed on Burnsall Road than that originally advertised, only installing the proposed restriction on the southern side of the road and not the northern side.

(2) Approval be given for the proposed Traffic Regulation Order to be made operational.

53. **Review of Conditions of Fitness for Private Hire Vehicles**

The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) which sought approval to lower the seating capacity of passengers in private hire vehicles and also to approve that electric and electric hybrid vehicles were suitable to be licensed as private hire vehicles.

The report indicated that on 11th December 2012 the Cabinet Member (City Services) ratified a previous Licensing & Regulatory Committee Report of 31 May 2005 concerning the Conditions of Fitness for Private Hire Vehicles. These reports qualified the minimum vehicle capacity for private hire vehicles to 4 and for the space in the rear main seats of the vehicle to be sufficient for 3 people measured by a wooden fixed frame. Given the current propensity of smaller numbers of passengers requiring a vehicle it was justified that the seating capacity of passengers could be lowered. It was also appropriate that electric and electric hybrid vehicles were suitable to be licensed as private hire vehicles, which was currently not the case.

As a consequence, it was proposed that use of the fixed wooden measurement device was abandoned, with licensing and enforcement officers having discretion on the minimum rear seat size. It was also proposed that, instead of a fixed minimum number of passenger seating capacity being provided, this seating capacity would be restricted to the number of seats stipulated in the V5 DVLA logbook (less one seat for the driver), subject to the existing Conditions of Fitness ratified on 11th December, 2012. An appendix to the report detailed the current Conditions of Fitness for Private Hire Vehicles. It was clarified that no objections had been received to these proposals from the trade.

RESOLVED that:

(1) Approval be given that the use of the fixed wooden measurement device is to be abandoned and that licensing and enforcement officers have discretion on the minimum rear seat size.

(2) Instead of a fixed minimum number of passenger seating capacity to be provided, the passenger seating capacity be restricted to the number of seats stipulated in the V5 DVLA logbook (less one seat for the driver), subject to the existing Conditions of Fitness ratified on 11th December 2012.

(3) Approval be given that electric and electric hybrid vehicles off the production line are suitable to be licensed as private hire vehicles.

54. **Outstanding Issues**

The Cabinet Member noted that there were no outstanding issues.

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

There were no additional items of public business.

(Meeting closed at 4.35 pm)

