

Coventry City Council
Minutes of the Meeting of Cabinet Member for City Services held at 2.00 pm on
Monday, 22 November 2021

Present:

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

Other Members: Councillor L Bigham (Chair of Communities and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Board (4)) – Invited
Councillor J Birdi – for the Church Park Close Petition in Minute 44

Employees (by Service):

Law and Governance O Aremu, L Knight, M Salmon

Transportation and Highways C Archer, R Goodyer, P Howarth

Apologies: Councillor M Heaven (Shadow Cabinet Member)

Public Business

43. Declarations of Interests

There were no disclosable pecuniary interests.

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

Further to Minutes 35/21 and 39/21, 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 Bablake, Holbrook, Longford, Lower Stoke, Radford and Sherbourne 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. There were also proposals relating to the Coundon Cycle Scheme and other developments.

An objector attended the meeting in respect of the proposals for Biggin Hall Crescent/Grant Road and highlighted the parking issues at the junction that were being experienced over recent months and was unsure whether the restrictions would solve the issues. Officers confirmed that the installation of waiting restrictions at the junction would enable the Council's Parking Services Enforcement Officers to take action on any reported breaches of the regulations. With the Cabinet Member's agreement, officers undertook to work with residents on the parking issues, including providing the objector with contact details for reporting problems, and to liaise with Enforcement Officers regarding the monitoring of the area, to include Grant Road.

Councillor J Birdi, a Bablake Ward Councillor, attended the meeting and spoke in support of a petition, bearing 15 signatures, objecting to the proposed waiting restrictions at Church Park Close, Tamworth Road and High Street. The Petition Organiser also attended the meeting and spoke on behalf of the residents highlighting that Church Park Close was a very quiet road and without the school traffic, few vehicles parked on the street which left the road clear for emergency and service vehicles. He indicated that access and parking was important to the mainly elderly residents who relied on visits from family and friends and that, having consulted residents, a lot of interest had been shown for a Residents Parking Scheme. Arising from the petitioners' request the Cabinet Member decided that the proposed double yellow lines on Church Park Close, High Street and Tamworth Road be installed as advertised, also that the school time waiting restrictions on Church Park Close were not installed. She requested that officers liaised with residents regarding the possibility of a Residents Parking Scheme in Church Park Close.

An objector attended the meeting in respect of the proposals for Dronfield Road Area and highlighted that those who parked in challenging ways on the road would not necessarily adhere to the installation of double yellow lines, and unless there was enforcement action, the proposals would have little impact on anti-social parking. She indicated that the increase in HMOs in the street had contributed to on-street parking issues. She referred to inadequate consultation on the proposals, in particular because the consultation had relied on the use of technology which many residents did not have access to. She requested that a further, more inclusive, consultation was necessary before any restrictions were implemented. The Cabinet Member was informed by officers that a petition relating

to parking issues in the area was expected. She decided that the proposed waiting restrictions in the Dronfield Road Area not be installed and the locations be removed from the Order, but that further liaison be undertaken with residents.

An objector attended the meeting in respect of the proposals for Ralph Road and highlighted that there had always been issues with compromised access due to parked vehicles, as the street was very narrow. In addition to Ralph Road residents' vehicles, residents of adjoining Lavender Avenue exacerbated the problem by also parking there. It was acknowledged that for safety reasons the junction did require protection. It was further acknowledged that the installation of any restrictions along Ralph Road would result in parking displacement into Lavender Avenue, which already had parking issues. Officers explained that a solution was difficult as the design of the road meant that any parking along either side resulted in compromised access. A Residents Parking Scheme, whilst allowing Ralph Road residents to park, would again create access issues. In light of the comments made by the objector and the officers, the Cabinet Member agreed that double yellow lines be installed at the junction of Ralph Road (10m for junction protection), but the proposed waiting restrictions extending into the road, not be installed. Councillor Lloyd, Deputy Cabinet Member for City Services and a Sherbourne Ward Councillor, indicated that he would work with residents regarding the parking issues.

Three objectors attended the meeting in respect of the proposals at Silverdale/Wildmoor Close and highlighted that there had not been any major issues with parking on the bend in many years and that the double yellow lines were unnecessary as most residents parked sensibly. They referred to an incident concerning an emergency vehicle whose access was compromised during the lockdown of the Pandemic when parking patterns were different with home workers vehicles parked on the street, however, they confirmed that now that had changed and residents had returned to their place of work, on-street parking had reduced again. In addition, a football team that used the nearby park for a period of time and parked their vehicles in the street, had now relocated to new premises. Councillor Bigham, invited to the meeting as Chair of the Communities and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Board (4) and also a Longford Ward Councillor, spoke in support of the objectors and requested that in light of the information provided, the proposals be reviewed. The Cabinet Member decided that as the situation had changed in the area, the proposed waiting restrictions at Silverdale Close/Wildmoor Close not be installed and the location be removed from the Order, and that monitoring be undertaken.

Two objectors attended the meeting in respect of the proposals at Barkers Butts Lane (Radford) that were part of the Coundon Cycle Lane restrictions. One objector spoke about the proposed installation of double yellow lines directly outside their property which would have a detrimental effect on their lives due to health issues that required visits from carers and medical professionals. They also referred to their need to have sight of their vehicle when parked in the street as it had been vandalised in the past. The Cabinet Member received clarification from officers that removal of this part of the Coundon Cycle Lane restrictions would not affect the remainder of the scheme's proposals and agreed that the installation of the proposed Coundon Cycle Lane restrictions as advertised could proceed, except for the double yellow lines on Barkers Butts Lane (each side of the road outside No.s 14-24) and Tomson Avenue, which are to be removed from the Order

to enable discussions with the objectors and for officers to give further consideration to the proposals for the pedestrian refuge island.

An additional written comment was received from a local business in respect of the proposals for Moseley Avenue which were read out at the meeting. The letter referred to the diverse range of businesses in the area that were not reliant on passing trade. The installation of the Cycle Route had already reduced existing parking, with residents using side roads due to restricted parking by their homes on the route. Business neighbours in both Moseley Avenue and Barkers Butts Lane were all encountering customers who could not park and there were a proportion of elderly customers who could not walk far and were unable to visit the business premises. The proposed restrictions, together with the effects of the cycle lane, were not supporting the operation of local businesses. The Cabinet Member requested that officers investigated the use of the compound located at Moseley Avenue as a possible future site for parking.

An additional written comment was received from an objector in respect of the proposals at Norman Place Road/Brownhill Green Road that highlighted the impact the proposals would have on local businesses due to the loss of customer parking.

Councillor Lloyd spoke in support of the proposal that the removal of the double yellow lines on Branksome Road was not undertaken. He referred to an objector's suggestion that a One-way System be considered at this location and the Cabinet Member requested that officers investigated this accordingly.

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

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 the objections to the proposed waiting restrictions, the Cabinet Member for City Services:

- 1) Approves the implementation of the restrictions as advertised at Anderton Road/Ainsdale Close, Moseley Avenue, Newey Road/ Morris Ave, Norman Place Road/Brownhill Green Road, Radford Road, Rupert Road/Treherne Road, Uxbridge Avenue/Crescent Avenue, Warden Road/Tay Road and Wickham Close.**
- 2) Approves the implementation of the restrictions as proposed on Berkett Road, and a reduced extent on Romford Road, reducing by 5m on the western side of junction and 4m on the eastern side of the junction.**
- 3) Approves the installation of a reduced extent of double yellow lines at Biggin Hall Crescent/Grant Road as detailed in Appendix A of the report and following installation, liaise with the Council's Parking Services Enforcement Officers regarding undertaking monitoring.**
- 4) Approves that the proposed removal of double yellow lines on Branksome Road is not undertaken.**

- 5) Approves that the proposed residents' parking scheme is installed on Brays Lane as advertised and once installed, monitor and if necessary, consider the possible provision of shared-use bays (permit parking and limited waiting) between St Agatha's Road and Victoria Park.
- 6) Approves that the proposed double yellow lines on Church Park Close, High Street and Tamworth Road are installed as advertised, that the school time waiting restrictions on Church Park Close are not installed, and that consultation be undertaken with residents about possible alternative restrictions including the possibility of a residents parking scheme.
- 7) Approves the installation of the restrictions as proposed on Clayton Road, and a reduced extent on Donnington Avenue, reducing by 2m on each side of the junction.
- 8) Approves the installation of a reduced extent of double yellow lines on Sandhurst Grove, a reduction of 11m at the cul de sac end (northern end).
- 9) Approves the installation of the proposed Coundon Cycle Lane restrictions as advertised, except for the double yellow lines on Barkers Butts Lane (each side of the road outside No.s 14-24) and Tomson Avenue which are to be removed from the Order to enable discussions with the objectors and for officers to give further consideration to the proposals for the pedestrian refuge island.
- 10) Approves the installation of double yellow lines at the junction of Ralph Road (10m for junction protection) but not install the proposed waiting restrictions extending into the road, and request monitoring be undertaken.
- 11) Approves that monitoring be undertaken at Silverdale Close/ Wildmoor Close.
- 12) Approves that officers be requested to investigate the use of the compound located at Moseley Avenue as a possible future site for parking.
- 13) Approves that the proposed waiting restrictions in the Dronfield Road Area at the following junctions: Holmfield Road/Enfield Road, Dronfield Road/Enfield Road, Holmfield Road/Druid Road, Holmfield Road/Harefield Road; are not installed and the locations be removed from the Order, and that further liaison is undertaken with residents.

15) Approves that the proposed waiting restrictions at Silverdale Close/Wildmoor Close, are not installed and the location be removed from the Order.

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

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

There were no other items of public business.

46. **Outstanding Issues**

There were no outstanding issues.

(Meeting closed at 4.30 pm)