
SUMMARY OF CABINET / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS

WEEK COMMENCING 19 October 2020

**CALL IN FOR THESE DECISION ENDS
9.00 A.M. ON FRIDAY 30 October 2020**

23 October 2020

Public Business

- Denotes items that have been referred to Audit and Procurement Committee.
- # Denotes items that are to be referred to Council. Accordingly Call-in does not apply.
- ◆ Denotes a matter where the associated report has already been considered by the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee or a Scrutiny Board. Where this body has endorsed the recommendations or made recommendations that have been accepted by the Cabinet/Cabinet Member Call-in does not apply.
- * Denotes other items that have been referred to, or considered by, the Scrutiny Co- ordination Committee or a specific Scrutiny Board.
- Split recommendations. Please see note at foot of item for details of the recommendations that are not subject to call-in.

Note: The Limitations on Call-in are set out at the end of this sheet.

Cabinet Member for City Services – Wednesday 21 October 2020

Report 3 Objections to Proposed Waiting Restrictions (Variation 9)

Recommendation(s):

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, 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, **and also consider additional double yellow lines as part of this 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.

The above recommendations were approved along with the following additional recommendations ('Shorncliffe Road/Rossllyn Avenue' having been removed from recommendation 2 and recommendation 10 having been amended as shown in bold):

16. Continued monitoring be undertaken at Evenlode Crescent following the implementation of the restrictions at this location.

17. Following the introduction of the double yellow lines at Pelham Bend/ Summerhill Lane, speed checks be undertaken.
18. The proposed waiting restrictions at Shorncliffe Road/ Rosslyn Avenue are not installed and further investigations be undertaken.

Report 4 Proposed closure of Council operated car parks

Recommendation(s):

- 1) Approve the temporary closure of New Union Street and Cheylesmore car parks, both of which are in a poor condition and in need of significant financial investment.
- 2) Subject to recommendation 1, approve that Salt Lane car park is reclassified as 'long stay' and amend the parking charges in Salt Lane accordingly so that there is no detrimental financial impact to the general public arising from the closure of New Union Street and Cheylesmore car parks.
- 3) Approve the temporary closure of Whitefriars Street and Leicester Row car parks as they are under-utilised and are not in the right location.
- 4) Approve the permanent closure of Moat Street car park in line with plans to redesign and remodel Ring Road junction 7 as part of the Air Quality Action Plan.
- 5) Subject to the approval of recommendations 1, 2, 3, and 4 above, further approve that officers commence the legal process to remove the five car parks from the Off-Street Parking Places Order 2005.

The above recommendations were approved along with the following additional recommendation ('City Arcade' having been removed from recommendation 3 and 'six' car parks in recommendation 5 being amended to five):

- 6) Following the representation received, approval be given for the car park at City Arcade to remain open.

Cabinet Member for Jobs and Regeneration – 21 October 2020

Report 4 Green Homes Grant LAD Scheme Funding

Recommendation(s):

- 1) To approve the acceptance and act as accountable body for the grant funding from BEIS totalling £530,000 to deliver the Green Homes Grant LAD Scheme.
- 2) To delegate authority to the Director of Business, Investment and Culture and the Director of Finance, following consultation with the Director of Law and Governance, to negotiate final terms and approve entry into:
 - a) A Memorandum of Understanding between the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy and Coventry City Council.
- 3) That following completion of the actions set out in Recommendation 2 above, to delegate authority to the Director of Business, Investment & Culture to manage and administer the Grant Funding Agreement with BEIS and the agreements with the Council's delivery partner (Act On Energy).

The above Recommendations were approved

NOTE: In accordance with the Constitution, the Chair of the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee, Councillor N Akhtar attended the meeting for this item of business to agree the need for urgency such that call-in arrangements will not apply. The reason for urgency is that the Green Homes Grant Local Delivery Scheme was made available to Councils with the capacity to deliver between October 2020-March 2021. As a result, the timescales for delivery are already tight and further delay to the acceptance of the funding will reduce the time to deliver further.

Limitations on Call-in

A call-in will normally be regarded as appropriate UNLESS:-

1. It falls within paragraph 18 of the Scrutiny rules (Part 3E of the Constitution) –ie. it relates to:-
 - (i) a matter which is to be determined by the Council.
 - (ii) a decision of the Cabinet/Cabinet Member taken as a matter of urgency and the Chair of the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee (or his/her nominee) had been invited to attend the meeting where the urgent decision had been taken or the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee has previously agreed the need for urgency.
 - (iii) a decision made by an employee exercising delegated authority.
 - (iv) decisions of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee.
 - (v) decisions of the Planning Committee.
 - (vi) decisions of the Appeals and Appointments Panels.
 - (vii) decisions of the Audit and Procurement Committee.
 - (viii) a matter where the associated report has already been considered by the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee or a Scrutiny Board who have endorsed the recommendations or made recommendations that have been accepted by the Cabinet/Cabinet Member.
2. The call-in form is not completed correctly.
3. The call-in form is received after the specified time.
4. The reason for the call-in is unclear or does not relate directly to the decision specified on the call-in form.
5. The reason for the call-in is a question, the answer to which can be found in the report relating to the decision which is being called in.