

**Coventry City Council**  
**Minutes of the Meeting of Cabinet Member for City Services held at 10.30 am on**  
**Monday, 15 November 2021**

Present:

Members: (Cabinet Member)  
(Shadow Cabinet Member)

Other Members: Councillors N Akhtar, AS Khan and J O'Boyle

Employees (by Directorate):

C Archer, Place Directorate  
R Goodyer  
L Knight, Resources Directorate  
R Parkes, Resources Directorate  
M Salmon, Resources Directorate

Apologies: Councillor L Bigham and M Heaven

### **Public Business**

#### **33. Declarations of Interests**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### **34. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> October, 2021 were agreed as a true record. There were no matters arising.

#### **35. Objections to Proposed Waiting Restrictions (Variation 10) Report 1 (of 3)**

The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Transportation and Highways concerning objections that had been received to a Traffic Regulation Order advertised on 10th June, 2021 relating to proposed new waiting restrictions and amendments to existing waiting restrictions in Wards across the City. The Order consisted of over 100 proposals, some proposals relating to multiple locations.

The report indicated that 123 objections were received, relating to 40 proposals. Two petitions in opposition were also received. In addition, there were 17 responses in support of proposals and five comments. Due to the large number of objections received, and in line with current Government and City Council guidelines in relation to Covid meaning reduced access to meetings, the objections were being considered in three separate reports, each report being heard at a separate meeting.

The objections to be considered at this meeting related to proposals in the Foleshill, Henley, St. Michael's, Upper Stoke and Wyken Wards. A summary of the proposed restrictions, objections and responses were set out in an appendix to the report. All the respondents were invited to the meeting and several attended. In

addition, a number of objectors had submitted additional written comments in response to the report and these were reported and responded to at the meeting.

The Cabinet Member was informed that over 60 of the proposals received no objections, the responses received were either in support or comments about the proposal.

The report highlighted that many of the locations where changes were proposed had been identified from requests for new or changes to existing waiting restrictions. These requests had been received from a number of sources, including the public, for example due to safety concerns relating to parked vehicles and issues due to overnight lorry parking.

Two objectors attended the meeting in respect of the proposals for Bracadale Close/ Coombe Park Road. The main objector highlighted that due to the road lay out, their property had no driveway or off-road parking so they parked in the street. She wanted to be able to park near her property. Reference was made to the fact that residents drove very carefully in the vicinity and there hadn't been any accidents. A written response was reported at the meeting which highlighted that road marking would make no difference to parents dropping and collecting children at the local school, they would just park over the markings. The option of putting markings on both bends by the green was raised. In light of the concerns raised, the Cabinet Member decided to defer consideration of the proposal to allow for a site visit.

Councillor A S Khan, a Foleshill Ward Councillor, attended the meeting and spoke in support of a petition, bearing 21 signatures, objecting to the proposed waiting restrictions at the junction of Beresford Avenue, Durbar Avenue and Churchill Avenue. The petition organiser had been invited to the meeting but was unable to attend. Arising from the petitioners' concerns, the Cabinet Member requested that consideration of the proposal be deferred to allow for a site visit to be carried out.

Councillors N Akhtar and J O'Boyle, St Michael's Ward Councillors attended the meeting in respect of the proposals for Keppel Street/Cambridge Street and Keppel St /Wright Street; and King Edward Street/ Leopold Street, King Edward Street/ Alfred Street and King Edward Street/Alexandra Street. Councillor Akhtar outlined the Ward Councillors concerns, referring to a site visit that had taken place when the options had been discussed. He indicated that there was no support from local residents for the proposals and that you can't protect all junctions across the city, especially as the Council couldn't take action against owners who parked their vehicles on the double yellow lines. He reported that the proposals would just cause more issues in the area. In light of the issues raised, Councillor Hetherton decided to defer consideration of the proposals to allow for a site visit to be undertaken.

Additional written comments were received from an objector to the proposed waiting restrictions for Dartmouth Road which were read out at the meeting. The objector felt that more of the double yellow lines should be left on one side of Dartmouth Road as it was not an easy corner to see around when pulling into the road if vehicles were parked there, it would be even more difficult and potentially dangerous. Also, vehicles that parked on this corner tended to put at least half of their vehicle onto the pavement, as they were concerned that they would get hit by

cars coming around the corner, which ended up blocking the pavement. In addition, it would encourage more long term parking, for days or even weeks, from residents in Torcross Road. Concerns were also expressed about the blocking of the entrance to their property.

A written response had been submitted by an objector to the proposed double yellow lines for Pinnars Croft. He indicated that there was damage due to improper parking at the bell mouth of the road, so to fix this it was proposed to make it illegal to park where previously it was fine to park and there was no damage. Also, it was inconvenient for residents who would have to try to fit too many cars on one side of the road instead.

The officer responded to all the issues raised at the meeting.

After consideration of proposals, the Cabinet Member asked that, following installation of the waiting restrictions at Boston Place/ Durbar Avenue and Pennington Way/ Gosport Road, Pennington Way/ Horndean Close, Pennington Way/ Queen Marys Road and Gosport Road/ Dunnose Close junctions, monitoring be undertaken.

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

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

**(1) The implementation of the restrictions as advertised at Boston Place, Boston Place/ Durbar Avenue junction, Elizabeth Way, Pinnars Croft, Pennington Way/ Gosport Road, Pennington Way/ Horndean Close, Pennington Way/ Queen Marys Road and Gosport Road/ Dunnose Close and Thornhill Road be approved.**

**(2) Approval be given to a reduced extent of double yellow lines being removed on Dartmouth Road, removing 13m, not 18m as originally proposed.**

**(3) That the proposed waiting restrictions at junctions at Bracadale Close/Coombe Park Road; Keppel Street/Cambridge Street and Keppel St /Wright Street; and King Edward Street/ Leopold Street, King Edward Street/ Alfred Street and King Edward Street/Alexandra Street are not installed, the locations be removed from the Order and that site visits be undertaken by the Cabinet Member with further consultation being carried out.**

**(4) Following installation of the waiting restrictions at Boston Place/ Durbar Avenue and Pennington Way/ Gosport Road, Pennington Way/ Horndean Close, Pennington Way/ Queen Marys Road and Gosport Road/ Dunnose Close junctions, monitoring be undertaken.**

**(5) Approval be given that those parts of the proposed Traffic Regulation Order referred to in the report and the recommendations above are made operational.**

36. **Outstanding Issues**

There were no outstanding issues.

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

There were no additional items of public business.

(Meeting closed at 11.45 am)