

Cabinet Member for City Services

15th November 2021

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:

Foleshill, Henley, St Michael's, Upper Stoke, Wyken.

Title:

Objections to Proposed Waiting Restrictions (Variation 10) Report 1 (of 3)

Is this a key decision?

No - Although the matters within the report affect several 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 10th June 2021, a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) relating to proposed new waiting restrictions and amendments to existing waiting restrictions was advertised. The TRO consisted of over 100 proposals, some proposals relating to multiple locations.

123 objections were received, which related to 40 proposals. 2 petitions in opposition were also received. In addition, there were 17 responses in support of proposals and 5 comments. 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.

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 are being considered in 3 separate reports, each report to be heard at a separate meeting.

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, Beresford Avenue/Durbar Avenue/Churchill Avenue junction, Boston

Place, Boston Place/Durbar Avenue junction, Elizabeth Way, Pinners Croft, Pennington Way/ Gosport Rd, Pennington Way / Horndean Close, Pennington Way /Queen Marys Road & Gosport Road /Dunnose Close and Thornhill Road

3. Subject to recommendation 1, approve the installation of a reduced extent of double yellow lines at the junction of Bracadale Close/Coombe Park Road, (6m reduction) on the northern side of Coombe Park Road.
4. Subject to recommendation 1, approve a reduced extent of double yellow lines is removed on Dartmouth Road, removing 13m, not 18m as originally proposed.
5. Subject to recommendation 1, approve the installation of a reduced extent of double yellow lines at the junctions of Keppel Street/Cambridge Street and Keppel St /Wright Street as detailed in Appendix A to this report.
6. Subject to recommendation 1, approve the installation of a reduced extent of double yellow lines at the junctions of King Edward Street/ Leopold Street, King Edward Street/ Alfred Street & King Edward Street/Alexandra Street as detailed in Appendix A to this report.
7. Subject to recommendations 1 to 6, and following consideration of objections to Proposed Waiting Restrictions (Variation 10) approve that those parts of the proposed Traffic Regulation Order referred to in this report are made operational.

List of Appendices included:

Appendix A – Summary of proposed restrictions, objections and responses

Background Papers

None

Other useful documents:

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 10) Report 1 (of 3)

1. Context (or background)

- 1.1 On 10th June 2021, a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) relating to proposed new waiting restrictions and amendments to existing waiting restrictions was advertised. The TRO consisted of over 100 proposals, some proposals relating to multiple locations. 123 objections were received, relating to 40 proposals. 2 petitions in opposition (each to a different proposal) were also received. In addition, 17 responses in support of proposals and 5 comments were received. Over 60 of the proposals received no objections, the responses received were either in support or comments about the proposal.
- 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, for example due to safety concerns relating to parked vehicles and issues due to overnight lorry parking. There were also proposals relating to the Coundon Cycle Scheme and other developments.
- 1.4 As part of the statutory procedure, the Traffic Regulation Order was advertised in the local press on 10th June 2021 advising that any formal objections should be made in writing by 1st July 2021. 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

- 2.1 123 objections were received, relating to 40 proposals. 2 petitions in opposition (each to a different proposal) were also received. In addition, 17 responses in support of proposals and 5 comments were 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.
- 2.2 Due to the large number of objections received and in line with current Government and City Council guidelines in relation to Covid meaning reduced public access to meetings, to avoid a potential large gathering the objections are being considered in 3 separate objection reports, each report to be heard at a separate meeting. Paragraph 3.2 indicates in which report the objections will be considered.
- 2.3 The objections to the proposals to be considered in this report, 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.
- 2.4 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.

- 2.5 The recommended proposals in response to each location where objections have been received are summarised in the tables in Appendix A.
- 2.6 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 10th June 2021; 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:

- 123 objections were received (including 2 multi-signature letter)
- 1 petition in opposition to the proposals at Beresford Ave/Durbar Ave /Churchill Ave
- 1 petition in opposition to the proposals at Church park Close.
- 17 responses in support of proposals and 5 comments were also received.

3.2 The number of objections received (and report in which they will be considered) were:

No. of objections	Objections to proposals for (location)	Report
1	Allesley Hall Drive area	2
1	Anderton Road/Ainsdale Close	3
1	Beresford Avenue/Durbar Avenue/Churchill Avenue (see also petitions)	1
2	Berkett Road/Romford Road	3
4	Biggin Hall Crescent/Grant Road	3
1	Boston Place	1
4	Bracadale Close/Coombe Park Road	1
2	Branksome Road	3
1	Brays Lane	3
1	Cecily Road/ Eltham Road	2
6	Church Park Close/Tamworth Rd/High Street (see also petitions)	3
2	Clayton Road/Donnington Ave	3
1	Dartmouth Road	1
4	Dronfield Road Area	3
3	Elizabeth Way	1
1	Goldthorn Close/Farcroft Avenue	2
10	Keppel Street/Cambridge Street & Keppel Street/Wright Street	1
10	King Edward Road junctions	1
4	Ivy Farm Lane/Cannocks Lane	2
1	Lawley Close	2
2	Lilacvale Way	2
3	Moseley Avenue	3
1	Newey Road/Morris Ave	3
3	Norman Place Road/Browns Hill Green Road	3
5	Packwood Green/Wolverton Road	2
6	Pennington Way area	1
2	Pinners Croft	1
1	Radford Road	3
3	Ralph Road	3
1	Rupert Road/Treherne Road	3

No. of objections	Objections to proposals for (location)	Report
1	Sandhurst Grove	3
2	Silverdale Close/Wildmore Close	3
12	Standard Avenue	2
3	Station Avenue	2
1	Thornhill Road	1
6	Unicorn Lane (includes multi-signature letter, 15 signatures)	2
1	Uxbridge Avenue	3
1	Warden Avenue/ Tay Road	3
2	Wickham Close	3
7	relating to Coundon Cycle scheme (includes multi-signature letter, 14 signatures)	3

The petitions in opposition were:

Beresford Ave/Durbar Ave/Churchill Ave – 21 signatures

Church Park Close – 15 signatures

The number of letters of support were:

- 1 to proposal for Abercorn Road /Sir Thomas Whites Road
- 3 to proposal for Allesley Hall Drive area
- 1 to proposal for Birmingham Road
- 1 to proposal for Brays Lane
- 1 to proposal for Bowden Way Hothorpe Close
- 1 to proposal for Burnaby Road/St Marys Priory Road
- 1 to proposal for Chaceley Close/Mapperley Close
- 2 to proposal for Glendower Avenue/ Gorseway
- 1 to proposal for Haytor Rise
- 1 to proposal for King Edward Road junctions
- 1 to proposal for Warden Road
- 1 to proposals for Wickham Close
- 2 to proposal for Wycliffe Grove

The number of comments received were:

- 1 to proposal for Allesley Hall Drive Area
- 1 to proposal for Biggin Hall Crescent/Grant Road
- 1 to proposal for Church Park Close
- 1 to proposal for Coundon Road
- 1 to proposal for Ralph Road/ Lavender Avenue

Appendix A details a summary of the objections for the proposals being considered in Part 1 of the 3 objection reports, 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 (subject to redactions).

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 January 2022.

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:				
Rachel Goodyer	Traffic & Road Safety Manager	Transportation & Highways	01/11/2021	02/11/2021
Liz Knight	Governance Services Officer	Law and Governance	01/11/2021	01/11/2021
Names of approvers: (officers and members)				
Graham Clark	Lead Accountant	Finance	01/11/2021	01/11/2021
Rob Parkes	Team Leader	Law and Governance	01/11/2021	02/11/2021
Councillor P Hetheron	Cabinet Member for City Services		01/11/2021	04/11/2021

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