

**Time and Date**

10.00 am on Wednesday, 17th February, 2021

Place

This meeting will be held remotely. The meeting can be viewed live by pasting this link into your browser: <https://youtu.be/IKx5ObPRnX0>

Public Business

1. **Apologies**
2. **Declarations of Interests**
3. **Minutes** (Pages 3 - 6)
 - (a) To agree the minutes of the meeting held on 27th January 2021
 - (b) Matters Arising
4. **On-Street Residential Charge Point Scheme - Experimental Traffic Regulation Order Objection** (Pages 7 - 16)

Report of the Director of Transportation and Highways
5. **Ultra-Low Emission Vehicles (ULEV) Taxi Infrastructure Scheme - Binley Road Experimental Traffic Regulation Order Objections** (Pages 17 - 26)

Report of the Director of Transportation and Highways
6. **Outstanding Issues**

There are no outstanding issues
7. **Any other items of Public Business**

Any other items of public business which the Cabinet Member decides to take as matters of urgency because of the special circumstances involved

Private Business

Nil

Julie Newman, Director of Law and Governance, Council House Coventry

Tuesday, 9 February 2021

Note: The person to contact about the agenda and documents for this meeting is Liz Knight / Michelle Salmon, Governance Services Officers, Tel: 024 7697 2644 /2643, Email: liz.knight@coventry.gov.uk / michelle.salmon@coventry.gov.uk

Membership: Councillors P Hetherton (Cabinet Member) and G Lloyd (Deputy Cabinet Member)

By invitation: Councillor M Heaven (Shadow Cabinet Member)

If you require a British Sign Language interpreter for this meeting OR if you would like this information in another format or language please contact us.

**Liz Knight / Michelle Salmon, Governance Services Officers,
Tel: 024 7697 2644 /2643, Email: liz.knight@coventry.gov.uk /
michelle.salmon@coventry.gov.uk**

Coventry City Council
Minutes of the Meeting of Cabinet Member for City Services held at 2.30 pm on
Wednesday, 27 January 2021
This meeting was held remotely

Present:

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

Other Members: Councillors R Bailey and L Bigham

Employees:

R Goodyer, Traffic Management.
L Knight, Law and Governance
J Logue, Traffic Management
R Parkes, Law and Governance
M Salmon, Law and Governance
M Wilkinson, Traffic Management

Public Business

28. Declarations of Interests

There were no disclosable pecuniary interests.

29. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 9th December, 2020 were agreed as a true record. There were no matters arising.

30. Objections to Proposed 20 mph Limit and Speed Cushions - Leaf Lane

The Cabinet Member considered a report and received a presentation of the Director of Transportation and Highways concerning objections that had been received to a Traffic Regulation Order and Notice of Intent advertised on 10 December 2020 for a 20mph speed limit on Leaf Lane and traffic calming measures. 9 objections were received along with 3 responses in support of the proposals. A summary of the proposed restrictions, objections and responses were set out in an appendix to the report. As the meeting was being held remotely, in line with the revised government regulations, all the respondents were offered the opportunity to submit any additional comments in writing in response to the report and 2 additional response were received following the publication of the meeting documentation. All the respondents had been provided with additional information on watching the live stream meeting.

Councillor Bailey, a Cheylesmore Ward Councillor, attended the meeting for the consideration of this item.

The report and presentation indicated that safety measures were proposed to be installed on Leaf Lane as part of mitigation measures relating to the Whitley South

development, which had included changes to provide access to the Jaguar Landrover (JLR) premises. It was intended that developer funding from JLR as part of Section 106 financial contributions would be used to mitigate the impact of these changes on residents.

Over the last few years, the Council had received many concerns from local residents about speeding vehicles and a significant increase in traffic volumes since the new grade separated Whitley Junction became operational. Feedback from residents coupled with observations by officers revealed that these problems occurred predominantly in the morning at peak times. Observations undertaken by Council Officers revealed that drivers were using Leaf Lane as a cut-through between Stivichall Interchange and the A444 to avoid queueing traffic during the morning peak.

In August 2020, a Street News consultation was undertaken with 1500 residents being consulted on a possible road safety scheme for Leaf Lane. The proposed road safety measures included:

- Reduce the speed limit to 20mph
- Installing speed cushions
- Installing a one-way system on a section of Leaf Lane between Gregory Hood Road and Fenside Avenue
- Improving cycle facilities throughout the traffic calming measures.

273 responses were received to the consultation. The report detailed that although the majority respondents (74%) supported the proposed road safety measures, many residents did not support the proposed one-way system. Subsequently, the one-way system was removed from the proposals and changes made to the design, with residents being advised of the new proposals.

As part of the statutory procedure, the Traffic Regulation Order for the 20mph speed limit and the Notice of intent to install speed cushions were advertised in the local press and notices were posted on lamp columns in the area on 10th December 2020, and the nine objections and three letters of support were subsequently received. The objections highlighted numerous concerns including the speed limit reduction was 'bad for the environment with emissions increasing due to starting and stopping at the traffic calming measures. Other comments received objecting to the proposals included that drivers may avoid Leaf Lane and use other roads in the area creating traffic migration. The letters in support of the speed limit reduction included comments that the 20mph speed limit and the cushions would work well together. Others offered 'full support' to the proposals.

The introduction of the 20 mph speed limit and the installation of speed cushions was recommended due to the road characteristics and the recorded vehicular speeds and complaints from local residents. Leaf Lane comprised a series of long straights, and this could increase the likelihood of excessive vehicular speeds, as drivers tend to look at where they were going and not what was immediately in front of them, often referred to as 'tunnel vision'. There was a downhill section, bend, a number of junctions, and some houses which fronted the road, although there was limited on-street parking for these properties and was not utilised much. These factors all increased the road safety risk when drivers travelled at inappropriate speeds.

The cost of introducing the Leaf Lane safety scheme was estimated to be approximately one hundred thousand pounds, and if approved, would be funded from the Leaf Lane Works Contribution as part of Section 106 allocations.

Councillor Hetherton, Cabinet Member, sought clarification of the type of speed cushions proposed to be installed and their impact to drivers and their vehicles. Councillor Bailey, local Ward Councillor, expressed support for the scheme and the consultation which had involved 1,500 properties. He requested that consideration be given to the replacement of the current bollards plus additional bollards on the lane and also that consideration be given to replacing the current worn pavements. Officers undertook to raise the issue of the state of the pavements with Highway Maintenance and highlighted that the main purpose of the bollards was to protect bends. Any potential bollard works would be subject to the availability of funding from the Section 106 allocation. In response to a question, the intentions for post scheme monitoring were detailed.

The Cabinet Member thanked officers for all the work undertaken to develop the safety scheme for Leaf Lane.

RESOLVED that, having considered the objections to the 20mph speed limit and traffic calming measures, approval be given to the implementation of the 20 mph speed limit and installation of speed cushions.

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

The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Transportation and Highways 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. When it had been decided to respond to the petition without formal consideration at a Cabinet Member meeting, both the relevant Councillor sponsoring the petition (if any) and/or the petition organiser/spokesperson 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.

32. **Outstanding Issues**

There were no outstanding issues.

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

There were no other items of public business.

(Meeting closed at 3.00 pm)



Public report Cabinet Member Report

Cabinet Member

17th February 2021

Name of Cabinet Members:

Cabinet Member for City Services – Councillor Hetherington

Director Approving Submission of the report:

Director of Transportation and Highways

Ward(s) affected:

City-wide

Title:

Report – Onstreet Residential Chargepoint Scheme (ORCS) - Experimental Traffic Regulation Order Objection

Is this a key decision?

No – Although the matters within the report affect a number of wards in the city, it is not anticipated that the impact will be significant.

Executive Summary:

Coventry is at the cutting edge of the automotive industry and a leader in innovation. Electric vehicles lie at the heart of this development and following a number of successful bids, the city council have installed over 200 residential electric chargepoints city wide. A further 200 chargepoints are currently being installed and will be operational by end of April 2021. This programme is intended to future-proof the city's transport infrastructure for the increase in electric vehicle ownership in line with national Government policy, with the Government having committed to ending sales of new diesel- and petrol-powered vehicles from 2030.

In line with this commitment, the Office for Zero Emission Vehicles (OZEV) has allocated £20m of funding for on-street residential chargepoint projects. The funding available is for 75% of the capital costs of procuring and installing the chargepoint and an associated dedicated parking bay (where applicable). This funding has been made available to Local Authorities in a grant format.

The scheme is intended to meet the needs of residents and therefore the requirement from OZEV is that the chargepoints must be installed in a residential areas where there is limited access to off-road private parking.

Coventry City Council has over the past three years successfully submitted four funding applications to OZEV securing grant funding to the value of £1,446,010. This funding is being used to install a mix of slow and fast chargepoints on residential streets across the city. An Experimental Traffic Regulation Order(ETRO) was advertised on 16th June 2020 for the fast chargepoint locations as listed in Appendix A. One (1) objection has been received .

In accordance with the City Council's procedure for dealing with objections to ETRO's, they are reported to the Cabinet Member for City Services for a decision as to how to proceed. The ETRO is due to expire on 23rd April 2021.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the Cabinet Member for City Services:

1. Consider the objection received to the City of Coventry (Various Locations Phase 8) (Electric Charging Places) (Experimental) Order 2020
2. Subject to recommendation 1, approve the making permanent of the City of Coventry (Various Locations Phase 8) (Electric Charging Places) (Experimental) Order 2020.
3. Note that the issues raised in the objection are general in nature and do not relate directly to the location of the parking bays as detailed in Appendix A and endorse that if the same issues are raised again to other proposed electric charging bays in the future, they are not considered again.

List of Appendices included:

Appendix A –Experimental Traffic Regulation Order – Schedule of restrictions
Appendix B – Details of objection and response

Other useful background papers:

None

Has it been or will it be considered by Scrutiny?

No.

Has it been or will it be considered by any other Council Committee, Advisory Panel or other body?

No

Will this report go to Council?

No

Report title: Onstreet Residential Chargepoint Scheme (ORCS) - Experimental Traffic Regulation Objection

1. Context (or background)

- 1.1. The Chargepoint Scheme is primarily focused on the installation of electric vehicle chargepoints in on-street locations. However, The City Council acknowledges that on street parking is prevalent in streets where off-street parking is not available. Keeping this in mind, no parking restrictions have been proposed for the locations where slow chargepoints have been installed.
- 1.2. However, where fast chargepoints have been installed, there is a parking restriction of Electric Vehicles only for 4 hours, whilst charging, no return within 4 hours, between 6am and 10pm.
- 1.3. The City Council undertook consultation with local residents where these chargepoints were proposed for installation. Where informal objections were received for any proposed location, the chargepoint was relocated or removed from the proposal. An ETRO was used to install the charging point waiting restriction at the fast chargepoint locations to enable monitoring of the situation/any problems that may arise.

2. Options considered and recommended proposal

- 2.1. The proposal has been to install the slow chargers on ends of the identified streets on existing footway where existing street light is present which will supply power to the slow chargers, minimising street clutter.
- 2.2. Where street lights are at the front of the footway, slow chargepoints have been installed directly on to these street lights.
- 2.3. An Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) is introduced for the fast chargepoint locations, and 2 parking spaces are allocated in each area.
- 2.4. The Options considered in response to the objection are:
 - i) make the ETRO permanent
 - ii) remove the parking restrictions
- 2.5. It is recommended to keep the parking bays and the restrictions and make the ETRO permanent.

3. Results of consultation undertaken

- 3.1. In this phase 5 areas were identified for chargepoints with 2 fast chargepoints in each area. 4200 street news were delivered to the residents in these 5 areas.
- 3.2. Venues in each areas were sourced to carryout drop-in sessions, so that residents could come and talk to Council officers directly and raise any queries.
- 3.3. Following the drop-in sessions, a second set of 4200 street news update were delivered informing residents of the outcome of the consultation.
- 3.4. The ETRO for parking for an electric vehicles for 4 hours whilst charging, no return within 4 hours, between 6am to 10pm listed in Appendix A was advertised in the Coventry

Telegraph on 16th of July 2020; notices were also placed on street in the vicinity of the proposal. The ETRO became operational on 24th July 2020. One (1) objection was received. Appendix B details the objection received. . In summary, the objection is not to the specific ETROs that have been proposed but asks that the Council prioritise a range of other measures in advance of making these ETROs.

- 3.5. It should be noted that similar objections have been received from the objector to other ETRO and TRO consultations, and that many of the measures requested by the objector, such as Average Speed Enforcement and the provision of segregated cycle routes, are being promoted and delivered through a range of investment programmes, such as the Local Air Quality Action Plan and Binley Cycle Route schemes.

4. Timetable for implementing this decision

- 4.1. The cost of advertising the making permanent of the ETRO, if approved, will be funded from Highways and Transportation ITB funds (Integrated Transport Budget).

5. Comments from Director of Finance and the Director of Law and Governance

- 5.1. Financial implications

The cost of advertising the ETRO (Experimental Traffic Regulation Order), if approved, will be funded from Highways and Transportation ITB funds (Integrated Transport Budget).

- 5.2. Legal implications

The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 allows the Council to make an ETRO on various grounds for example improving safety, improving traffic flow and preserving or improving the amenities of an area provided it has given due **consideration** to the effect of such an order to monitor and allow members of public to object over a six-month period..

6. Other implications

- 6.1. **How will this contribute to achievement of the Council Plan?**

It is considered that the proposals support the Council Plan objective to create an attractive, greener city by making it easier for people to use electric vehicles within the city, thereby reducing vehicle emissions, improving the environment and tackling climate change, and supporting the delivery of the Local Air Quality Action Plan for Coventry.

- 6.2. **How is risk being managed?**

Risk is being managed through the project governance.

- 6.3. **What is the impact on the organisation?**

None

- 6.4. **Equalities / EIA**

No equality impact assessments have been undertaken. However, it is not expected that implementation of this proposal will have any adverse impact and these chargepoints will be accessible to all residents in the area.

6.5. Implications for (or impact on) the environment

The intention of implementing these chargepoints is that once they are installed and operational, residents will have confidence to purchase or lease electric cars as they will be able to charge near their homes. And once the electric vehicle uptake is accelerated, the (anticipated) reduced levels of CO₂ and NO₂ emissions should result in improvements to local air quality. This would support the Coventry Local Air Quality Plan which was approved by the Council's Cabinet in July 2020.

6.6. Implications for partner organisations?

None.

Report author(s)

Name and job title:

Shamala Evans,
Programme Manager/Senior Project Manager
Transport and Innovation

Service:

Transportation and Highways

Tel and email contact:

024 7683 1048,
Shamala.evans@coventry.gov.uk

Enquiries should be directed to the above person.

Contributor/approver name	Title	Service Area	Date doc sent out	Date response received or approved
Contributors:				
John Seddon	Head of Transport and Innovation		28.01.21	29.01.21
Caron Archer	Principal Officer (Traffic Management)	Traffic & Network Management	28.01.21	29.01.21
Liz Knight	Governance Services Officer	Law and Governance	28.01.21	03.02.21
Names of approvers for submission: (officers and members)				
Colin Knight	Director (Planning, Transport and Highways)		28.01.21	01.02.21
Rachel Goodyer	Traffic and Road Safety Manager,	Traffic & Network Management	28.01.21	01.02.21
Sunny Heer	Lead Accountant	Finance	28.01.21	02.02.21
Rob Parkes		Law and Governance	28.01.21	03.02.21
Councillor Hetherton	Cabinet Member for City Services			09.02.21

Appendix A:

CITY OF COVENTRY
(VARIOUS LOCATIONS PHASE 8)
(ELECTRIC CHARGING PLACES) (EXPERIMENTAL) ORDER 2020

Schedule

Length of Road in the City of Coventry	Restriction	Side of road
<p>Church Lane</p> <p>From a point 20.5 metres south of its junction with Walsgrave Road for a distance of 11 metres in a southerly direction.</p>	<p>Electric Vehicle Charging Place, 6am – 10pm, waiting limited to 4 hours no return within 4 hours</p>	<p>East</p>
<p>Dennis Road</p> <p>From a point 13 metres north of its junction with Alfall Road for a distance of 11 metres in a northerly direction.</p>	<p>Electric Vehicle Charging Place, 6am – 10pm, waiting limited to 4 hours no return within 4 hours</p>	<p>East</p>
<p>Lord Lytton Avenue</p> <p>From a point 10 metres north north east of its junction with Momus Boulevard for a distance of 11 metres in a north northeasterly direction.</p>	<p>Electric Vehicle Charging Place, 6am – 10pm, waiting limited to 4 hours no return within 4 hours</p>	<p>West</p>
<p>The Drive</p> <p>From a point 29 metres east of its junction with Hipswell Highway for a distance of 11 metres in an easterly direction.</p>	<p>Electric Vehicle Charging Place, 6am – 10pm, waiting limited to 4 hours no return within 4 hours</p>	<p>North</p>

Appendix B:

Objection No	Summary of Objection	Response
1	<p>The objector advises they do not have any objections against charge points but object to the council proceeding with any proposals without considering the wider implications in terms of providing a safe highway network for all users. In particular:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are cycle lanes needed on these streets? 2. Are speed limits too high? 3. Is parking being provided at a reasonable and fair rate? <p>In respect of (1) above, the objector feels that the council must make the street safe for all road users before privileging one type of user over another by providing charging facilities. They consider these charging posts remove pavement space from pedestrians, whilst entering into a long-term contract with a private provider to sell electricity in space which belongs to the general public.</p> <p>In respect of (3), the objector advises that it is their understanding that parking remains free and un-metered all year round in all four locations, and that this would remain the case after installation of the charge points. The provision of parking as a service is entirely separate to the provision of electricity.</p> <p>The objector also feels that, before any further charge points are introduced, the council must do the following:</p>	<p>The Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) is explicitly in relation to the restriction proposed for the electric vehicle fast charging bays.</p> <p>It is widely documented that people with electric vehicles will want somewhere at or near their home to charge their vehicle, and this is one of the main reasons why the Office for Zero Emission Vehicles (OZEV) has made funding available for local authorities to provide on-street chargepoints for residents who do not have access to off-street parking. In many parts of Coventry off-street parking is not available, especially where residents live in apartments.</p> <p>This scheme is being proposed to future proof Coventry City's streets and give residents an element of confidence to take that step towards buying/leasing an electric vehicle. Especially, as the sales of electric vehicles are increasing exponentially, and they will increasingly become the norm, with the Government set to ban sales of petrol and diesel cars by 2030.</p> <p>The proposed chargepoints are in form of a bollards with the same dimensions as a standard cast iron bollards that are installed around the city to manage parking issues. These bollards do not take up any additional space than a street lighting column. A minimum width of 1.8m is achieved on all the footways where these charging bollards have been installed.</p>

	1. Roll out 20 mph as the default speed limit city wide, as agreed in 2014.	1. This request has been passed on to Traffic and Network Management and does not relate to the Order that has been advertised.
	2. Produce a map of each and every street in the city, to determine whether or not cycle routes are likely to be needed on each street. This map must be put out to consultation and it must be in the public domain.	2. The design of where cycling routes should be are progressed by the Transportation division and will be consulted on as and when they are ready for consultation.
	3. In respect of the above, a street can be determined as **not** needing cycle routes if it has been (or will be) made safe through the removal or substantial reduction of through traffic, through the implementation of 20 mph as a top speed, and through the installation of suitable traffic calming measures, if they are still needed.	3. See Response to item 2.
	4. If a street requires cycle lanes to be installed at a future date, then the council must consider whether charge points can still be safely installed – for example by placing the cycle lane behind a parking lane (ie between the parking lane and the footway), or by permitting parking on one side of the street only.	4. The dimensions of majority of the residential streets are not wide enough to facilitate measures such as placing the cycle lane behind a parking lane (ie between the parking lane and the footway), or by permitting parking on one side of the street only. However, waiting restrictions can be reviewed in relation to any future highway changes
	5. For the avoidance of doubt, no charging points must be installed before consideration of both the need for safe cycling and for suitably socially distanced walking space.	5. Each proposed bay location is reviewed in terms of road safety. In addition by installing charging bollards on the footway has no impact on cyclists and they are positioned to maintain a minimum footway width of 1.8m.
	6. Undertake never to install any more charge points on bus routes, and to remove all street parking on these routes, including all parking associated with erroneously installed charge points (for example on Hearsall Lane).	6. Residents of Coventry regularly park their vehicles on street where off-street parking facilities are not available often on bus routes. Regular meeting are held with the bus service providers where they can raise any issues in regard to problem parking
	7. Undertake to charge market rates for all parking, including the parking of electric vehicles but with the exception of blue badge parking, in order to end the current unfair subsidies the council gives to motorists.	7. Parking charges will be considered by Parking Services and does not form part of this order

	8. Install average speed cameras on all major through roads in the city.	8. This points is related to speed of traffic and has no bearing on the parking restriction order.
	9. Produce a report detailing the measures the council is taking in order to fulfil its obligations to provide safe street space for everyone, in terms of the Equality Act 2010.	<p>9. The parking restriction order does not have any bearings on Equality Act 2010.</p> <p>All the points raised by the objector are being addressed through the relevant service areas by investigating and developing concept and designs relating to the wider cycling and parking projects.</p> <p>As the objector does not have objections to the restrictions at the charge point locations, which are directly related to the ETRO, it is recommendation that the ETRO be made permanent.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank



Public report Cabinet Member Report

Cabinet Member

17th February 2021

Name of Cabinet Members:

Cabinet Member for City Services – Councillor Hetherington

Director Approving Submission of the report:

Director of Transportation and Highways

Ward(s) affected:

City-wide

Title:

Ultra-Low Emission Vehicles (ULEV) Taxi Infrastructure Scheme – Binley Road, Experimental Traffic Regulation Order Objections

.

Is this a key decision?

No – Although the matters within the report affect a number of wards in the city, it is not anticipated that the impact will be significant.

Executive Summary:

Coventry is at the cutting edge of the automotive industry and a leader in innovation. Electric vehicles lie at the heart of this development and following a successful bid, there is the opportunity to promote a move towards electric taxis.

The Office for Zero Emission Vehicles (OZEV) made £500m available to grow the market for ultra-low emission vehicles (ULEVs) from 2015-20 and offered grants to support the wider use of electric and hybrid vehicles. Coventry City Council submitted a bid to OLEV in December 2016 and were successful in securing £1.2m funding in March 2017 to install 39 rapid charging point for taxis and private hire cars in the city.

The priority of the project has been to encourage existing taxi drivers to purchase an electric taxi by establishing an accessible network of charging infrastructure within the City for use by electric taxis.

The City Council has installed 39 rapid chargepoints city wide. Two rapid chargepoints have been installed on Binley Road and to ensure a turnover of use, parking is restricted to 1-hour maximum stay. An Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) was introduced to restrict the parking. This was advertised on 19th March 2020 and came into operation on 27th March. Two (2) objections have been received to the ETRO. The objections are detailed in Appendix B.

In accordance with the City Council's procedure for dealing with objections to ETRO's, they are reported to the Cabinet Member for City Services for a decision as to how to proceed.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the Cabinet Member for City Services:

1. Considers the objections received to the City of Coventry (Binley Road) (Electric Charging Places) (Experimental) Order 2020
2. Subject to recommendation 1, approve the making permanent of the City of Coventry (Binley Road) (Electric Charging Places) Order 2020.
3. Note - the issues raised in objection two (2) are general in nature and relates to outside of the parking bays and the advertised restrictions and endorse that if they are raised in the future, they are not considered again.

List of Appendices included:

Appendix A –Experimental Traffic Regulation Order – Schedule of restrictions

Appendix B – List of objection and recommendation

Other useful background papers:

None

Has it been or will it be considered by Scrutiny?

No.

Has it been or will it be considered by any other Council Committee, Advisory Panel or other body?

No

Will this report go to Council?

No

Report title: Ultra-Low Emission Vehicles (ULEV) Taxi Infrastructure Scheme – Binley Road
Experimental Traffic Regulation Order Objections

1. Context (or background)

- 1.1. The Office for Low Emission Vehicles (OLEV) is a cross Government, industry endorsed team to promote the uptake of ultra-low emission vehicles (ULEV). In 2013 the Government made £500m available to support ULEV in the 2015-2020 period.
- 1.2. Coventry is a dynamic and rapidly growing city and a rapidly emerging centre for cutting edge automotive development and innovation. Coventry City Council submitted a bid to OLEV for funding to help prepare the City with the infrastructure required for the Government's ultra-low emission strategy published in 2013. This bid was successful resulting in the award of £1.2m grant funding for the installation of 39 rapid charging points for taxis and private hire cars in the city.
- 1.3. The whole of Coventry was declared an Air Quality Management Area in 2009 because of high levels of Nitrogen Oxide (NO₂) and more recently the Government's 'UK Plan for Tackling Roadside Nitrogen Oxide Concentrations' document issued in July 2017 identified Coventry as a city where NO₂ exceedance is expected to continue beyond 2020. The City Council Cabinet approved the local air quality action plan in July 2020 to address this.
- 1.4. Diesel vehicles, especially the older diesel vehicles which characterise Coventry's taxi fleet, are a major source of NO₂ so the adoption of ULEV taxi and private hire vehicles would represent a clear public health benefit for those who live or work in the city. This project should be seen as part of a wider strategy to promote electric vehicles.
- 1.5. While the charging points installed are specifically for taxis, the Council has aspired for the charging points to also be available for use by private electric cars. This works on the basis that taxi charging gets priority and a booking system is now in place to facilitate this.
- 1.6. Thirty-nine (39) chargepoints have been installed city wide. The locations where these rapid chargepoints have been installed, have a parking restriction only permitting electric vehicles, whilst charging, to stay for 1 hour with no return within 2 hours. They have been installed using ETROs to enable monitoring of the situation/any problems that may arise.
- 1.7. Where the chargepoints have been in the vicinity of residential, retail, or commercial properties, localised consultation has been carried out and where necessary, consent has been sought from adjacent properties.

2. Options considered and recommended proposal

- 2.1. In response to the objections received the options considered are:
 - i) make the ETRO permanent
 - ii) remove the restrictions and parking bays
- 2.2. The recommended proposal is to keep the parking bays and the restriction and make the ETRO permanent

3. Results of consultation undertaken

- 3.1. The locations were identified by Taxi drivers during the bid process. There are no adjoining properties in the immediate vicinity of the installed rapid chargepoints.
- 3.2. The Experimental TRO was advertised in the Coventry Telegraph on 19th March 2020, and notices were also placed on street. The ETRO became operational on 27th March 2020 which commenced a six months objection period. Two objections were received.

4. Timetable for implementing this decision

- 4.1. Subject to approval, it is proposed to make the Binley Road ETRO permanent in April 2021.

5. Comments from Director of Finance and the Director of Law and Governance

5.1. Financial implications

The cost of advertising the making permanent of the ETRO, if approved, will be funded from Highways and Transportation ITB funds (Integrated Transport Budget).

5.2. Legal implications

The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 allows the Council to make an ETRO on various grounds for example improving safety, improving traffic flow and preserving or improving the amenities of an area provided it has given due **consideration** to the effect of such an order to monitor and allow members of public to object over a six-month period..

6. Other implications

6.1. How will this contribute to achievement of the Council Plan?

It is considered that the proposals support the Council Plan objective to create an attractive, greener city by making it easier for people to use electric vehicles within the city, thereby reducing vehicle emissions, improving the environment and tackling climate change, and supporting the delivery of the Local Air Quality Action Plan for Coventry.

6.2. How is risk being managed?

Risk is being managed through the project governance.

6.3. What is the impact on the organisation?

None

6.4. Equalities / EIA

No equality impact assessments have been undertaken. However, it is not expected that implementation of this proposal will have any adverse impact and these chargepoints will be accessible to Electric hackney carriages and other electric vehicles.

6.5. Implications for (or impact on) Climate Change and the Environment

The intention of implementing these chargepoints is that once they are installed and operational, residents will have confidence to purchase or lease electric cars as they will be able to charge near their homes. And once the electric vehicle uptake is accelerated, the (anticipated) reduced levels of CO₂ and NO₂ emissions should result in improvements to local air quality. This would support the Coventry Local Air Quality Plan which was approved by the Council's Cabinet in July 2020.

6.6. Implications for partner organisations?

None.

Report author(s)

Name and job title:

Shamala Evans,
Programme Manager/Senior Project Manager
Transport and Innovation

Service:

Transportation and Highways

Tel and email contact:

024 7683 1048,
Shamala.evans@coventry.gov.uk

Enquiries should be directed to the above person.

Contributor/approver name	Title	Service Area	Date doc sent out	Date response received or approved
Contributors:				
John Seddon	Head of Transport and Innovation		29.01.21	29.01.21
Caron Archer	Principal Officer (Traffic Management)	Traffic & Network Management	29.01.21	29.01.21
Liz Knight	Governance Services Officer	Law and Governance	29.01.21	01.02.21
Names of approvers for submission: (officers and members)				
Colin Knight	Director (Planning, Transport and Highways)		29.01.21	01.02.21
Rachel Goodyer	Traffic and Road Safety Manager,	Traffic & Network Management	29.01.21	01.02.21
Sunny Heer	Lead Accountant	Finance	29.01.21	02.02.21
Rob Parkes		Law and Governance	29.01.21	03.02.21
Councillor Hetheron	Cabinet Member for City Services			09.02.21

This report is published on the council's website: moderngov.coventry.gov.uk

Appendix A

Schedule

Length of Road in the City of Coventry	Restriction	Side of road
Binley Road From a point 100 metres west of the western projected kerb line of Brays Lane for a distance of 13 metres in a westerly direction.	Electric vehicle charging place, waiting limited to 1 hour no return within 2 hours	North

Appendix B Summary of Objections and Responses

Objection No	Summary of Objection	Comments
1	<p>The objector advises that they believed the conservation area around Binley Road was a VERY protected area and as such should not have been allocated as a charge point. The objector believes that it is inappropriate and possibly illegal to install the rapid chargers at this location, but also recognizes the need for such infra-structure, however does not feel that this is the right place.</p> <p>1) The use of the word experimental seems very tongue in cheek ... the infra-structure required to support the charging point neither makes it experimental nor temporary (as the word experimental suggests)</p> <p>2) The fixture is a blot on the Conservation area landscape, when not in use and more so as a real eyesore when the parking bay in use. Since when has change to the conservation area been allowed without full planning.</p> <p>3) There are enough hazards for cyclists along this section of the road with out the potential of electric car drivers opening doors into the path of cyclists. Avoiding such a manoeuvre is likely to cause passing cyclists to move dangerously into the flow of traffic.</p> <p>4) The fixture is at some distance from the shops or other warmer places to wait during charging.</p>	<p>Advice has been sought from the Planning and Enforcement Officer of the City Council who has confirmed that planning permission is not required to install the rapid chargepoints on the Binley Road footway under the following act:</p> <p>The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) indicates at Schedule 2 Part 12 Class A 'Development by Local Authorities' that the following works are considered as 'permitted development' (planning permission is not required) subject to compliance with the limitations:</p> <p>A. The erection or construction and the maintenance, improvement or other alteration by a local authority or by an urban development corporation of—</p> <p>(a) any small ancillary building, works or equipment on land belonging to or maintained by them required for the purposes of any function exercised by them on that land otherwise than as statutory undertakers;</p> <p>(b) lamp standards, information kiosks, passenger shelters, public shelters and seats, telephone boxes, fire alarms, public drinking fountains, horse troughs, refuse bins or baskets, barriers for the control of people waiting to enter public service vehicles, electric vehicle charging points and any associated infrastructure, and similar structures or works required in connection with the operation of any public service administered by them.</p>

	<p>The objector wishes for the Conservation Area to be returned to its previous state</p>	<p>Interpretation of Class A A.2 The reference in Class A to any small ancillary building, works or equipment is a reference to any ancillary building, works or equipment not exceeding 4 metres in height or 200 cubic metres in capacity.</p> <p>And as the electric vehicle charging points do not exceed 4m in height or 200 cubic metres in capacity the works comply with the above legislation and therefore planning permission is not required. These permitted development rights are unaffected by the Conservation Area location of the site.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) The 'Experimental' in the TRO is in relation to the restrictions of '1 hour no return within 2 hours' and not the chargepoints.2) As the electric vehicle charging points do not exceed 4m in height or 200 cubic metres in capacity, the works complies with 'The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) indicates at Schedule 2 Part 12 Class A 'Development by Local Authorities' that the following works are considered as 'permitted development' (planning permission is not required) subject to compliance with the limitations, and therefore planning permission is not required. These permitted development rights are unaffected by the Conservation Area location of the site.3) The new cycle lane proposed on Binley Road is due to be installed behind the parking bays.4) Again, the new cycle lane proposals on Binley Road have plans to reconfigure the area around the retail shops as mentioned by the objector on Binley Road.
--	---	---

2	<p>The objector advises that they object to the creation of more car parking spaces, together with the false assumption that electric cars will significantly reduce carbon output. Whilst they may reduce local air pollution, they still require significant levels of raw materials for both manufacture and for their use, particularly in terms of the batteries themselves</p>	<p>The 'false assumption that electric cars will significantly reduce carbon out put' statement is the objectors' opinion. It is evidenced that electric cars will reduce carbon out-puts and the City Council needs to address the local air pollution, hence the move towards promoting electric cars. The following articles sheds further clarity on this point: https://futurism.com/the-byte/electric-cars-dont-hurt-environmnet or https://www.forbes.com/sites/mikescott/2020/03/30/yes-electric-cars-are-cleaner-even-when-the-power-comes-from-coal/#36dedab62320The</p>
	<p>The objector feels concerned that the city is continuing to install charge points on pavements, and in locations where cycle paths are necessary advising 'This is a very clear breach of the council's duties under the Equality Act 2010 - something that the council continues to ignore, despite knowing full well that it is breaking the law in doing so'. Meanwhile, as the council is fully aware, walking and cycling are genuinely zero emissions modes of transport, whilst bus travel is also far greener than car travel, on account of many more people travelling on each bus.</p>	<p>The parking restriction order does not have any bearings on Equality Act 2010. A minimum unobstructed width of 1.8m or more is achieved on all the footways where these rapid chargepoints have been installed and specifically on Binley Road footway charging bollards have been installed. There is space on the footway for wheelchair uses and parents with prams. As Cyclists are not a protected group under the Equality Act 2010, it is not clear to which of the nine protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 the objector is referring to and therefore how the City Council is breaching and breaking the law. The City Council shares the objectors' ambition to create a network of safe walking and cycling routes. However, promoting more walking/cycling and encouraging motorists to switch to electric vehicles are not mutually exclusive. The City Council has secured funding to develop a cycle route along the Binley Road. Detailed design of the cycle route includes the section in the vicinity of the charging points</p>
	<p>The station area itself is already a toxic traffic sewer - something which will only get worse when the new car park opens - yet scant consideration has been given in respect of pedestrian safety, and the council is knowingly breaching DfT guidelines by installing yet another dangerous and inappropriate "shared" junction.</p>	<p>Objectors comments around the station area has been to the Project Manager for this project.</p>

	<p>Given the current concerns over Corona Virus, the city also needs to ensure that it is resilient for not just a low carbon future, but for one where individual movements may need to be restricted for long periods.</p>	<p>The City Council is working hard to deliver vital & critical services to community and citizens in these trying times.</p>
	<p>The only way to ensure this is to provide a safe network for walking and cycling on every road in the city - something that this council has spectacularly failed to do in recent years Now is not the time to be installing more charge points</p>	<p>Again, the City Council shares the objectors' ambition to create a network of safe walking and cycling routes. However, promoting more walking/cycling and encouraging motorists to switch to electric vehicles are not mutually exclusive.</p> <p>Experimental Traffic regulation Order (ETRO) is explicitly in relation to the restriction proposed for the two parking bays associated with the electric vehicle rapid charging bays on Binley Road. All the points raised by the objector are being addressed through the relevant service areas by investigating and developing concept and designs relating to the wider cycling and parking projects.</p>