

Cabinet Member for City Services

21st October 2020

Name of Cabinet Member:

Cabinet Member for City Services – Councillor P Hetherton

Director Approving Submission of the report:

Director of Transportation and Highways

Ward(s) affected:

Bablake, Cheylesmore, Earlsdon, Foleshill, Henley, Holbrook, Longford, Lower Stoke, St Michael's, Sherbourne, Upper Stoke, Whoberley, Woodlands.

Title:

Objections to Proposed Waiting Restrictions (Variation 9)

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:

Waiting restrictions within Coventry are reviewed on a regular basis. On 27th February 2020, a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) relating to proposed new waiting restrictions and amendments to existing waiting restrictions was advertised. 74 objections were received. In addition, 19 responses in support of proposals and 6 comments were also received. In accordance with the City Council's procedure for dealing with objections to TROs, they are reported to the Cabinet Member for City Services for a decision as to how to proceed.

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

Recommendations:

Cabinet Member for City Services is recommended to:

1. Consider the objections to the proposed waiting restrictions;
2. Subject to recommendation 1, approve the implementation of the restrictions as advertised at; Alfall Road/Geoffrey Close, Congleton Close/Lythalls Lane, Cornelius Street, Eastlands Grove, Evenlode Crescent, Harefield Road/Beaconsfield Road, Mellowship Road/Upper Eastern Green Lane, Pelham Bend /Summerhill Lane, Shornccliffe Road/Rosslyn Ave, Silverdale Close/Foxford Crescent, The Monks Croft, The Mount, Wallace Road/ Sadler Road/ Links Road/ Bruce Road.

3. Subject to recommendation 1, approve the restrictions are implemented on Black Price Avenue as advertised, but not implemented on Leaf Lane from its junction with Black Prince Avenue to its junction with the A444.
4. Subject to recommendation 1, approve the installation of the double yellow lines for junction protection at the junctions of Cameron Close with Mackenzie Close and Halifax Close. Approve the Controlled Parking Zone is not installed, that more traffic monitoring at school entry and exit times is undertaken and to consult again with residents about possible parking restrictions if necessary.
5. Subject to recommendation 1, approve the implementation of the restrictions as advertised at Delage Close/Anderton Road and note Anderton Road is already part of a review to determine if additional double yellow lines are to be proposed on the bend.
6. Subject to recommendation 1, approve the implementation of restrictions as advertised at Esher Drive and William Bristow Road and that an extension to the double yellow lines on William Bristow Road (6.5 metres on the northern side and 4.5 metres on the southern side of the junction) is advertised as part of the next waiting restriction review.
7. Subject to recommendation 1, approve the implementation of the restrictions as advertised at Keppel Street and include double yellow lines for junction protection at Keppel Street/Cambridge Street and Keppel Street/Wright Street junctions as part of the next waiting restriction review.
8. Subject to recommendation 1, approve the implementation of the restrictions as advertised at Knoll Drive/Lupton Avenue, monitor following implementation and consult with residents about a possible extension to the waiting restrictions.
9. Subject to recommendation 1, approve the implementation of the restrictions as advertised at Newton Close/Pandora Road and consult with residents about possible additional waiting restrictions.
10. Subject to recommendation 1, approve the implementation of the restriction as advertised at Pangfield Park/Pyt Park and include an extension to the double yellow lines on both sides of Pyt Park (up to the boundary of nos. 4 and 6 Pyt Park) and double yellow lines for junction protection at the Allesley Hall Drive/ Pangfield Park junction as part of the next waiting restriction review.
11. Subject to recommendation 1, approve the implementation of the Residents' Parking Scheme as advertised on Purefoy Road and include a proposal for double yellow lines on the north eastern side of Queen Isabel's Road/ Galeys Road for junction protection as part of the next waiting restriction review.
12. Subject to recommendation 1, approve the installation of a reduced extent of double yellow lines on Morland Road, reducing the extent to 5 metres (not the 10 metres originally proposed) each side of the junction with Romford Road. Install as proposed on Romford Road. Once installed, monitor and if future concerns are raised, consider extending the double yellow lines.

13. Subject to recommendation 1, approve the installation of a residents' parking scheme on St Agatha's Road, St Ann's Road, St Osburg's Road and St Michael's Road and consult with residents of Brays Lane once more to determine if there is sufficient support for a residents' parking scheme. If sufficient support is received, include the proposal for a residents' parking scheme on Brays lane in the next waiting restriction review.
14. Subject to recommendation 1, approve the installation of a reduced extent of double yellow lines on The Jordans, reducing the extent by 6 metres on the north east corner of the junction, outside no. 59. Once installed monitor and if future concerns are raised consider extending the double yellow lines.
15. Subject to recommendations 1 to 14, approve that the proposed Traffic Regulation Order is made operational.

List of Appendices included:

Appendix A – Summary of proposed restrictions, objections and responses

Background Papers

None

Other useful documents:

Cabinet Member for City Services Report: Petition – Request for Residents' Parking Scheme in Benedictine Road to be extended to The Monks Croft (heard 2nd December 2019)

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: Objections to Proposed Waiting Restrictions (Variation 9)

1. Context (or background)

- 1.1 On 27th February 2020, a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) relating to proposed new waiting restrictions and amendments to existing waiting restrictions was advertised. 74 objections were received. In addition, 19 responses in support of proposals and 6 comments were also received.
- 1.2 The majority of Traffic Regulation Orders relating to loading and waiting restrictions in Coventry are consolidated into one Order. New or changes to existing waiting and loading restrictions are undertaken by varying the Consolidation Order.
- 1.3 Many of the locations where changes are 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, due to safety concerns relating to parked vehicles and from petitions requesting residents' parking schemes.
- 1.4 As part of the statutory procedure, the Traffic Regulation Order was advertised in the local press on 27th February 2020 advising that any formal objections should be made in writing by 19th March 2020. Notices were also posted on lamp columns in the area of the proposed restrictions and letters were sent to residents who would be directly affected, due to waiting restrictions being installed on the public highway outside their property.

2. Options considered and recommended proposal

- 2.1 74 objections were received. In addition, 19 responses in support of proposals and 6 comments were also received. Some of these responses were received after the objection closing date. However, these are still included in the report as they were received prior to the report being finalised. The objections to the proposals, responses to the objections, details of support and origin of proposed waiting restrictions are summarised in the tables in Appendix A. Where the objection refers to personal details, these have not been detailed in this report, however the objection has been forwarded in full to the Cabinet Member for City Services.
- 2.2 In considering the objections received, the options are to:
 - i) make the order for the proposal as advertised;
 - ii) make amendments to the proposals, which may require the revised proposal to be advertised;
 - iii) not to make the order relating to the proposal.
- 2.3 The recommended proposals in response to each location where objections have been received are summarised in the tables in Appendix A.
- 2.4 The locations where no objections have been received, but letters of support or comments have been received, will be installed. Any requests for other changes to waiting restrictions as part of the letters of support or comments will be consider as part of future reviews.

3. Results of consultation undertaken

- 3.1 The proposed TRO for the waiting restrictions was advertised in the Coventry Telegraph on 27th February 2020; notices were also placed on street in the vicinity of the proposals. In addition, letters were sent to properties which would be directly affected. Letters were also sent to other various consultees. The responses received were:

- 74 objections were received (1 objection referred to 2 different proposals).
- 19 responses in support of proposals and 6 comments were also received.

3.2 The number of objections received were:

- 2 to proposal for Alfall Rd/Geoffrey Close
- 1 to proposal for Black Prince Ave, Leaf Lane, Haddon End
- 26 to proposal for Cameron Close area (RPZ)
- 1 to proposal for Congleton Close/Lythalls Lane
- 2 to proposal for Cornelius Street
- 1 to proposal for Delage Close /Anderton Road
- 1 to proposal for Eastlands Grove
- 1 to proposal for Esher Drive/William Bristow Road
- 1 to proposal for Evenlode Crescent
- 2 to proposal for Harefield Road/Beaconsfield Road
- 1 to proposal for Keppel Street
- 3 to proposal for Knoll Drive/Lupton Avenue
- 1 to proposal for Mellowship Road/Upper Eastern Green Lane
- 2 to proposal for Newton Close/Pandora Road
- 1 to proposal for Pangfield Park/ Pyt Park & Victoria Court
- 2 to proposal for Pelham Bend /Summerhill Lane
- 1 to proposal for Purefoy Rd*
- 2 to proposal for Romford Road/Morland Road
- 13 to proposal for St Agatha's Rd/St Michael's Rd Area (Residents' Parking Scheme)
- 2 to proposal for Shorncliffe Road/Rosslyn Avenue
- 2 to proposal for Silverdale Close/Foxford Crescent
- 3 to proposal for The Jordans
- 2 to proposal for The Monks Croft & Benedictine Road (part)
- 1 to proposal for The Mount*
- 1 to proposal for Wallace Road/ Sadler Road/ Links Road/ Bruce Road

* objection to The Mount and Purefoy Road is one objection relating to 2 locations.

The number of letters of support were:

- 1 to proposal for Brindle Avenue
- 2 to proposal for Cameron Close Area (RPZ)
- 1 to proposal for Dartmouth Road
- 4 to proposal for Eastlands Grove
- 1 to proposal for Grange Road/Thomas Biddle Lane
- 1 to proposal for Harefield Road/Beaconsfield Road
- 2 to proposal for Knoll Drive/Lupton Avenue
- 1 to proposal for Pangfield Park/ Pyt Park & Victoria Court
- 1 to proposal for St Nicholas Close
- 1 to proposal for Washbrook Lane
- 1 to proposal for Wallace Road/ Sadler Road/ Links Road/ Bruce Road
- 1 to proposals for Westwood Ward
- 1 to proposal for Willenhall Lane
- 1 to proposal for Wilsons Lane

The number of comments received were:

- 1 to proposal for Cornelius Street
- 1 to proposal for Eastland Grove
- 1 to proposal for Gardenia Drive/Birmingham Road
- 1 to proposal for Keppel Street
- 1 to proposal for Newton Close/Pandora Road
- 1 to proposal for Washbrook Lane

Appendix A details a summary of the objections for each proposal, including any letters of support or comments also received, and a response to the issue(s) raised. Copies of the content of the objections can be made available on request.

4. Timetable for implementing this decision

- 4.1 It is proposed to make the TRO and install the restrictions as approved by the end of December 2020.

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

5.1 Financial implications

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

5.2 Legal implications

The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 allows the Council to make a Traffic Regulation Order on various grounds e.g. 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.

In accordance with Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, when considering whether it would be expedient to make a Traffic Order, the Council is under a duty to have regard to and balance various potentially conflicting factors e.g. the convenient and safe movement of traffic (including pedestrians), adequate parking, improving or preserving local amenity, air quality and/or public transport provision.

There is an obligation under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to advertise our intention to make Traffic Orders and to inform various stakeholders, including the Police and the public. The Authority is obliged to consider any representations received. If representations are received, these are considered by the Cabinet Member for City Services. Regulations allow for an advertised Order to be modified (in response to objections or otherwise) before a final version of the Order is made.

The 1984 Act provides that once a Traffic Order has been made, it may only be challenged further via the High Court on a point of law (i.e. that the Order does not comply with the Act for some reason).

6 Other implications

6.1 How will this contribute to the Council Plan

The proposed changes to the waiting restrictions as recommended will contribute to the City Council's aims of ensuring that citizens, especially children and young people, are safe and the objective of working for better pavements, streets and roads.

6.2 How is risk being managed?

None

6.3 What is the impact on the organisation?

None

6.4 Equalities / EIA

The introduction of waiting restrictions will reduce obstruction of the carriageway, therefore increasing safety for all road users.

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

None

6.6 Implications for partner organisations?

None

Report author(s)**Name and job title:**

Caron Archer, Team Leader (Traffic Management)

Directorate:

Place

Tel and email contact:024 75270950, caron.archer@coventry.gov.uk

Enquiries should be directed to the above person.

| Contributor/approver name | Title | Service or Organisation | Date doc sent out | Date response received or approved |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Contributors: | | | | |
| Greg Payne | Head of Traffic & Network Management | Transportation & Highways | 07/10/2020 | |
| Rachel Goodyer | Traffic & Road Safety Manager | Transportation & Highways | 07/10/2020 | 13/10/2020 |
| Liz Knight | Governance Services Officer | Law and Governance | 07/10/2020 | 08/10/2020 |
| Names of approvers: (officers and members) | | | | |
| Graham Clark | Lead Accountant | Finance | 07/10/2020 | 08/10/2020 |
| Rob Parkes | Team Leader | Law and Governance | 07/10/2020 | 09/10/2020 |
| Councillor P Hetherton | Cabinet Member for City Services | | 07/10/2020 | 12/10/2020 |

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