



Earlsdon Liveable Neighbourhood proposals

**Phase two consultation report
November 2023**

Contents

Page	Content
3	Executive summary
4	Background
5	Methodology
	Feedback - Let's Talk survey:
6	Which street do you live on
7	20mph zone
21	Extending one way loops and no entries
34	Spencer Road bus gate
53	Newcombe Road one way
68	Pedestrian crossings
83	Albany Road toucan crossings
93	Beechwood Avenue measures
125	Zebra crossings by Co-op
138	Widen paths by bus stops
148	Market gates on Earlsdon Street
159	Cycle parking
170	Taxi rank
180	Area by Earlsdon primary School and library
191	Benches
202	Anything else you want to tell us
228	Respondee demographics
	Other feedback
230	Drop-in sessions and online meetings
233	Focus Groups
234	Community meetings
248	Emails

Executive Summary

Earlsdon was chosen as the pilot scheme for Liveable Neighbourhoods in Coventry. Liveable Neighbourhoods aim to encourage more people to walk, wheel and cycle. Liveable Neighbourhoods also improve road safety, help to tackle climate change, improve air quality, and improve physical and mental health.

This report considers the second phase of consultation, which took place between 6 September and 29 October 2023. This phase focussed on gathering feedback from people who live, work, and learn in Earlsdon on a package of measures to help make Earlsdon a liveable neighbourhood.

The measures were developed using feedback from local people during the first round of consultation and tested using traffic modelling.

People gave us their views via an online survey, online meetings, drop-ins, emails and focus groups. We received feedback from every street in the Earlsdon Liveable Neighbourhood area and beyond.

In total approximately 6000 individual comments were received on the Let's Talk survey by 439 respondents and feedback was received from all streets in the Earlsdon Liveable Neighbourhood zone.

1. Background

Earlier this year we asked local people what could be done to make Earlsdon a more liveable neighbourhood. We received almost 1,500 comments relating to traffic, parking, trees and greenery, cycling infrastructure, access and seating, and ideas for Earlsdon Street.

We reviewed all the comments we received and developed a package of measures to address the issues raised. These included:

- Introducing a 20mph zone
- Extending the existing one-way loop around Providence Street, Berkeley Road South and Moor Street so that Berkeley Road South becomes fully one-way. Berkeley Road North will become no entry from Earlsdon Avenue South but will remain two-way.
- Installing a bus gate on Spencer Road at the junction with Dalton Road, near to King Henry VIII school.
- Making Spencer Avenue/Newcombe Road a one-way system which would make Newcombe Road one way from Albany Road to Earlsdon Avenue North and Spencer Avenue one way from Albany Road to Mayfield Road.
- Adding new pedestrian crossings on Albany Road, Earlsdon Street (between the Co-op and the City Arms) and Beechwood Avenue, as well as making improvements to the existing zebra crossing outside the library. Also changes to the Spencer Road/Dalton Road junction to make it easier to cross the road.
- Toucan crossing at the entrance to Spencer Road on Albany Road, improving the Sustrans National Cycle Route, allowing both pedestrians and cyclists to cross the road.
- A range of measures to reduce traffic on Beechwood Avenue.
- Enabling a new zebra crossing by the Co-op, by rearranging parking.
- Widen the path at the number 11 bus stops outside Earlsdon Primary School and opposite the Methodist Church.
- Market gates on Earlsdon Street, so that a road closure could be implemented for trader led markets or community events.
- Cycle parking on Shaftesbury Avenue, Arden Street, Warwick Street, Earlsdon Avenue South, Berkeley Road North and South.
- Single vehicle 24-hour taxi rank near to the Co-op. A daytime (7am to 7pm) feeder rank on Moor Street (replacing the double yellow lines), outside these times anyone can park there.
- Improving the area by the library and Earlsdon Primary School with planting and seating, creating a shared community space.
- Benches on Earlsdon Street and around the roundabout.

This report considers the second phase of consultation which took place between 6 September and 29 October 2023. This phase focussed on gathering feedback from people who live, work and learn in Earlsdon about their thoughts on the proposals and what should be included in an Earlsdon Liveable Neighbourhood.

2. Methodology

The key outcome of this phase of consultation was to find out what people thought about the package of measures proposed. To achieve this we spent time being available for people to talk to us at a number of events/activities. These were advertised on a Street News newsletters delivered directly to all properties in and around the Earlsdon Liveable Neighbourhood (ELN) zone.

Target Audience	Event/activity	Date	Approximate number of attendees
Open to all	Let's Talk online survey	6 September to 29 October 2023	Aware – 2.7k Informed 1.1k Engaged - 439
All residents and businesses in and around the ELN zone	Drop-in sessions (Earlsdon Methodist Church, Library, St. Barbara's Church, Beechwood Golf Club)	18, 2, 25, 28 September and 2 and 3 October 2023	282
Businesses on and around Earlsdon Street	Drop-in session	21 September 2023	4
Residents and businesses within the ELN zone	Online meetings	27 September and 2 October	18
NENA residents association	Focus group	3 October	10
Children (Earlsdon Primary School)	Focus group	10 October 2023	19

In addition to these events and activities, an online Let's Talk page with survey and mapping tools, comments cards in the local library, and a phone number and email address were available throughout the consultation period for people to provide feedback.

3. Feedback

**All feedback is recorded exactly as it was received.
XXXXX's indicate redactions to protect identities.**

3a. Let's Talk survey


Let's Talk is the Council's online engagement webpage. Information about the Earlsdon Liveable Neighbourhood was included on the platform between Wednesday 6 September and Sunday 29 October 2023. Approximately 2,100 people accessed the page, of those around 1,100 looked at other detail on the page - such as images or documents - and 439 took part in the survey.

Question 1

Which street do you live on?

The plan below shows the number of respondents from each street. The Liveable Neighbourhood zone is outlined in blue.

Number of respondents by street



Question 2

What do you think about this proposal:

Introducing a 20mph zone – this will cover the whole liveable neighbourhood area (shown on the plan) as well as Bates Road, Beechwood Avenue, Dorney Close, Innis Road, Nightingale Lane, Raven Cragg Road, Rochester Road, The Riddings and Woodfield Road and Morningside, Davenport Road and The Firs.

Comments received regarding a 20mph zone
Positive but how will you enforce it
Agree with it. Too much traffic to pursue a greater speed.
I agree with this. There's a lot of speeding on Arden street too.
Besides beechwood avenue I see no need for this but will only add to traffic
Excellent plan
Stoneleigh needs to be included!
Good idea
Great idea too many people and fast cars on small roads at moment
Agree
Totally in favour but useless unless speed cameras are put in
It's a good idea
Fully agree, 20 is more than enough for these residential streets
Very good idea
Good
Great idea, there isn't really space to go much faster anyway, and it would make it safer for pedestrians.
Excellent idea
Great
Very good idea. Lots of speeding around earlsdon in residential family areas so a 20 limit would help.
I agree to speed limits close to the high street/ school/ library etc but as far as the firs will only cause road rage and be ignored by most people anyway.
I think this is needed and although I suspect many drivers will ignore the limit it will slow more people down. The benefits of safety and reducing pollution are welcome.
I don't think it's necessary on such a large area.
Happy with that
Fine with me
Happy with that
Yes this is a fantastic idea. Yes please!!! I am pedestrian and a car driver.
No issue with this proposal
Agree
good idea
Ok, if you put (a) 'End of 20 MPH zone and start of XX (30, 40) MPH zone' signs facing the street lanes exiting the zone and (b) 20 MPH repeaters on any longish stretch of road and when the name of the road changes within the zone. Here is a link to the type of signs I'm referring to: https://www.marktek.co.uk/technical-signs/prohibition-signs/traffic-sign-15
I suggest this for two reasons: 1. Safety. It can be dangerous if someone fails to speed up on a road with a higher speed when exiting the zone or if they speed up within the zone because they don't see repeaters and then assume that the speed limit is 30mph because of the rule of thumb that streets with streetlights are 30 MPH.

Comments received regarding a 20mph zone
<p>2. Acceptance of Zone. Drivers, especially those who don't live in the zone, will be annoyed by the zone. If the traffic signs are inconsistent or unclear they will cite it as evidence that the council and programme's leader incompetence and will tell others that the zone is intended to get speeding fines rather than make a more liveable neighbourhood.</p> <p>Streets that would need 'End of 20 MPH zone and start of XX (30? 40?) MPH zone' are:</p> <p>Beechwood Avenue (both ends, toward Kenilworth Road and Sainsbury's) Earlsdon Avenue South (both ends, toward Kenilworth Road and Abbey Fields) Davenport Road (toward Kenilworth Road) Spencer Road (toward Kenilworth Road) Albany Road (toward city centre) The Riddings (toward the west) Stoneleigh Avenue (toward Kenilworth Road)</p> <p>20 MPH repeater signs (repeaters are the smaller diameter speed limit signs) might be needed on: Beechwood Avenue Earlsdon Avenue South Warwick and Stonleigh Avenues Earlsdon Street and Rochester Road Spencer Road Bates Road The Riddings</p>
Yes sounds great
Sounds a good idea but not able to visualise the in practice
I'm happy with the speed restrictions
I completely agree with the proposal and I hope it can be extended to all of earlsdon including Broomfield road which currently has very high traffic and no speed control measures
I would support this
Good idea
Happy with this proposal. It will not work unless it is enforced, cars at night already break the 30mph limit knowing they will not be caught
Fully supportive
Good idea. We need it. Far too many people speeding.
In favour
Good
Good idea
Excellent
Good idea.
A good idea.
Those who choose to keep to this will, those who rat run will not, speed bumps would be more effective.
Generally, I think it's good and would make Earlsdon a better and safer place to live by reducing the rat runs across the area.
More streets should be included in the liveable.neighbourhood, why is it the wider roads are reduced to 20mph but other narrow roads are not included, because they are not in the right area!
Yes
I support this
Can't or won't be enforced so a waste of time and money.
i think yes a good thing maybe beechwood at 30mph more appropriate
Support this - particularly on the Beechwood Ave section.
Exactly what we need, thank you this will feel much safer and help drivers be aware to take care on our roads.

Comments received regarding a 20mph zone
Good
Yes. Do it to make the area safer.
An excellent idea but I am concerned about how this will be enforced.
Support
Good
Yes please
Not necessary
Good idea. Support this but extend to Spencer Avenue as we have a speeding problem. Used as a short cut
In agreement
In favour
20mph on the whole of Beechwood is ridiculous. I can see the relevance for the dangerous part with the bends, but to enforce it along the whole road is too much.
Great idea - fully behind it to increase road safety and traffic flow, and reduce pollution. Needs to be backed up with effective monitoring and enforcement though.
Been needed for a while
Agree with proposal.
Fine
Bad idea , no need , just make Earlsdon St 20 MPH
Don't agree. No need.
Fully support
It would make it safer for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers.
This should extend to include parts of Kenilworth Road from Pedestrian crossing at Coat of Arms Bridge Road towards town.
Agree, perhaps include parts of Kenilworth Road eg between Earlsdon Ave South to Coat of Arms Bridge Rd
Agree, speeding cars are problematic. Stoneleigh Avenue often has issues as comuters use this road as a cut through to Kenilworth Rd.
Strongly agree
unnecessary.
No problem with it as that's a safe speed anyway given the number of parked cars
Good idea.
Good idea
Fine
In principal this would be great - but it would have to be enforced. At the moment, Newcombe Road (where I live) is a 2 way road and, because of this, cars go really slowly as they have to pull in to avoid other cars. I worry that if it is made a 1-way street, cars will speed up as they won't expect another car to come down, making it less safe for pedestrians and also very dangerous for cyclists who will be allowed to come down the road the 'wrong' way. Some enforcement will be needed to make sure that cars don't break the 20mph limit here or on any of the other roads.
That's fine, but in practice how will you stop boy racers that particularly ride up and down Earlsdon Ave and associated side roads at night?
In favour.
Excellent: fully in favour of the 20mph speed limit
20 mph limit is fine but closing some roads / closing from one end will be a nightmare, reduce available parking, be detrimental to emergency services and give us planters that will no doubt not be maintained once the piggy bank runs dry. A taxi rank in Moor St is also a bad idea, who wants taxis sitting idling outside your house at night.
Good. Good for safety of pedestrians
20 is Safer. Makes coming out in traffic safer. Its already busy so anyone doing over 20 has to stop suddenly or alter speeds.
Happy with 20mph limit.
I fully support introducing the 20mph zone. I very happy to see it. I hope that there are suitable traffic calming at

Comments received regarding a 20mph zone
the start of the Zone. We get speeding and extreme speeding on Albany Road so I'm hoping this can be reduced.
Don't think it will be kept to
I am not convinced that this will have the intended impact and I suspect will have no impact whatsoever in the evenings. Why do you believe a 20mph limit would be adhered to when the 30mph one is ignored? The majority of traffic speeding along Beechwood Avenue in particular occurs after 8pm.
I think a 20 mph speed limit would be more beneficial on Albany Road due to the high volume of speeding traffic.
Great idea, but to ensure cars actually stick to 20 mph will probably require traffic calming measures naturally slowing down traffic to ensure that drivers feel like 20 mph is the right speed to drive at.
Agree
Wholeheartedly agree
Yes but must include electric bikes and scooters
Agree
Brilliant good idea
I like the idea of this a lot.
Fantastic idea, but I think that you will need to introduce more traffic calming, particularly on the larger roads such as Beechwood, Earlsdon Ave and Albany Road, such as speed bumps or road narrowing
Yes in principle but are less effective when not accompanied by other measures
Agree. This should also apply to Newcombe Road
I think this is OK but I do wonder how well this can be enforced. However some of the measures I can see would help enforce it. So on the whole it's fine.
Brilliant idea
Excellent idea,
I am in favour of 20mph speed limits in built up areas. Little/no impact on journey time, big increase in safety, noise and health benefits. A child, adult hit by 20mph likely to survive, at 30mph, more likely to lose life or have serious injury.
1. It needs to include Earlsden High St. 2. The 30 mph limit is currently ignored by the numerous boy racers and vans at the moment, so why do you think a 20mph limit will make any difference. The real problem has always been a lack of traffic calming and a lack of enforcement of existing laws.
Aweful idea and totally pointless and unnecessary
Good
I support the 20mph
Not needed
I think this is a good idea.
Excellent idea, this should be rolled out as soon as possible and extended to other coventry neighbourhoods, such as Stoke.
Think it's brilliant! And really needed!
Good idea but would need to be reinforced
What about Arden Road... The cars speed along both ways at stupid speeds. All sorts of cars all ages totally ignorant and unconcerned about the people that live in this road.
If you propose to reduce speed throughout to 20 mph, why the need for additional traffic calming measures? Poorly conceived.
I disagree there is not a great speed issue in Earlsdon yes slow the traffic on Beechwood but we are just making it impossible for people to get to their homes and work if we block roads off.
Agree with 20mph but one way roads only encourage idiots to go much faster
Mixed - don't think it's particularly needed but no particular objection.
Brilliant.
Okay
An extremely bad idea. 20 mph limits in higher risk areas (around schools) would be a more acceptable alternative.

Comments received regarding a 20mph zone
Agree
I agree that traffic travels too fast in and 30 mph is a good idea.
A sensible measure
Totally against. The problem isn't with people doing 30mph, it's with people doing 50! I imagine the amount of road deaths caused by people doing between 20 & 30mph is vanishingly small! All this will do is penalise ordinary people and increase pollution by vehicles having to use lower gears to travel around. It will also increase dangerous overtakes when some folk decide to crawl around at 15mph (indicated, not actual speed), causing even more frustration to those behind them.
seems ok
neutral
Agree
great
Worth trying.
Agree for most roads. For some roads that enter the Earlsdon area it would be sensible to start the limit outside, eg start 20mph limit at Hearsall Common traffic lights as this is a bendy road where drivers should go slowly.
No objection
Im not sure it is needed.
It should be 20 in Broadway and Belvedere and Spencer rd too
Ok
Traffic slowing / speed restrictions are the only realistic idea of the whole proposal.
That's fine
20 mph is great, but as long as it is policed.....including electric delivery bicycles.
This proposal punishes law abiding motorists who will take longer to complete their journey. Unaware drivers will be fined and receive penalty points. It does nothing to deter the boy racers.
I think it's a very good idea!
I support thid
Not the answer - only the more main roads such as Beechwood Avenue should be restricted
I am very supportive. I recently experienced 20mph zones in urban areas whilst on holiday in the Scottish Borders, it felt much safer when I was cycling or walking around the towns we visited.
The liveable neighbourhood area is in blue whilst some of the proposals affect much of Earlsdon including the area I live in. While I have no objection to the introduction of a 20mph zone covering what looks like the whole of Earlsdon since I think it may improve traffic flow and probably not increase journey times noticeably, and will certainly make the roads safer for other users, I do object to not having had the same consultation process as the folk in the original liveable area.
Excellent idea. All for it. Should be extended to cover Styvechale Ave.
Speeding drivers ignore 30 mph so will ignore 20 mph limit.
Spot on.
Great
Agree
Not necessary
I disagree.
I fully support the proposal for a 20 mph speed limit but, if it is not monitored effectively, it will be ignored. Speed cameras are needed to secure compliance, particularly on Beechwood Avenue, Earlsdon St., Earlsdon Ave., and Albany Road.
It won't make much difference to me as I don't drive.
A good idea and I support it. The question is how will you enforce the limit? At the moment in earldom drivers are tearing up 30mph limit roads at 40+mph. If people are happy to break the rules anyway, then how will changing the limit actually make any difference to the speed certain people drive? Install cameras or it simply isn't worth applying a new limit.

Comments received regarding a 20mph zone
I agree with this proposal
I would prefer a few speed bumps/ sleeping policemen. Drivers just ignore speed limits. Twice I have almost been hit by speeding cars when I was actually on the zebra crossing on the High Street near Cafe Bravo.
Supportive, but it will need enforcement and measures (e.g. traffic calming) to ensure adherence.
All for 20mph zone
20mph zone is fine - how will it be implemented though? Cars regularly travel at 40/50mph up and down Broadway...
I welcome this
Good idea
I support the proposal
I think this will be a good thing
Agree
Sounds a sensible idea
Good idea in principle but as it is not going to be enforced by cameras and is reliant on car drivers obeying the signs, in reality some drivers will speed still.
Disagree. A 20 mph zone may be needed in some of those areas but introducing a blanket is lazy, ill-informed and unnecessary.
Strongly in favour.
Quite positive
good idea
I think the speed limit is appropriate but I'm unsure of how you'll enforce it? If you can give any more information on this, that would be great.
This is a positive step for road safety in a busy area
Absolutely unnecessary
Good idea but how will this be enforced?
My main concern is that the traffic will increase on the main road Earlsdon Avenue South .it wakes me through the night evenalready I have noticed an increase in the main traffic ..it starts at around 7 am ..really noisy especially when lorries go hurtling through the night ..it literally shakes the building when a a big lorry goes speeding by ...and the traffic to the local schools increases in the term times it's awful that this is being overlooked for years now ..I have always thought there should be hump's implemented to reduce this ..that's the best solution . 2.why facilitate for taxis instead of local people needing to park the amenities in the high street such as the chemist and food shops ..the taxi drivers should be called on Uber as everywhere else does ..this move to facilitate will only encourage more drinkers to come to the area ...the amount of sirens we have to put up with people drunk and shouting is awful too especially at weekends from both Millsys and Wetherspoons .
Fully support.
I do not support this proposal, it is unnecessary. Most side roads speed is restricted by layout and traffic, other roads it will slow journeys and cause more pollution. The issue with speeding cars will not change - those that ignore the 30mph already will still ignore the 20mph. Current limit needs enforcing, not changing for all.
Good idea
Not a problem but eho monitors it. There is currently 30mph but you still get cars speeding in the area
Welcome speed restriction
I welcome the 20mph zone in this area but it needs to be enforced on the blind bend on Beechwood Avenue with a average speed camera
Seems sensible given the number of accidents on Beechwood Ave
In favour. I believe 20mph zones should be self-enforcing due to the design of the road, otherwise the cars driving dangerously fast will continue to do so.
agree
Think will be good
Excellent idea. I fully support this. I would also be interested about how this limit would be enforced on Earlsdon Avenue South.

Comments received regarding a 20mph zone
Fine and sensible.
Unsure of benefit
Good. Is it enforceable?
Good
Agree
Completely back the reduction
Not supportive
Fair but maybe not necessary
Fine
Unclear how this links to recent changes announced by rishi sunak
Agree - much better for safety and air quality
Ok with the speed limit
OK but if not enforced then will anyone pay attention?
It is not necessary
I have no issues with 20mph Zones
Brilliant! I wholeheartedly support a 20mph zone here.
Good idea
Ok
Good. Will need to be enforced
Not needed in Morningside as it's not a through route
No problem with 20th zones, rather they were applied consistently rather than stop start of anything
Great idea, I wholeheartedly support it.
Happy with this proposal
In favour of 20mph zone
Yes, that's fine
Good idea for safety of small children and less mobile residents.
Not keen on the proposal. I feel 20mph is too low.
Strongly in favour of all proposals affecting Beechwood Avenue as detailed in Fact Sheet 1
Agree wholeheartedly
Yes please. And I'd like to see it enforced too please.
I have no issues with this proposal
Very strongly support. I am driver and feel it is unsafe on the majority of these roads to be travelling faster than 20 mph, but regularly witness this occurring.
Agree that some speed limits are necessary. However a 20mph zone is different from a 20mph limit. A 20mph limits is an areas where the speed limit has been reduced to 20mph but there are no physical measures to reduce vehicle speeds within the area.
By implication the proposals are for a 20mph zone which require any point to be within 50m of a "traffic calming device" which used to be defined quite strictly as a physical calming device. I would be wholly against the idea of a 20mph zone especially introducing one onto Beechwood Avenue and likely to cause greater congestion.
There should be a 20mph limit in all urban neighbourhoods
* Against a blanket restriction of a 20mph Zone across the whole area, this is not needed. Any 20mph limit should be targeted and for a specific reason eg, near school crossing.
* Creating a 20mph Zone across such a wide area because it would increase costs by 'having to illuminate other signs' or not to include Bates Road and Rochester Road would create 'unnecessary street clutter', are not valid reasons (see sheet 2)
* Against the use of more surveillance cameras for a 20 mph limit to be enforced. Cameras already installed on

Comments received regarding a 20mph zone
the Kenilworth Road monitoring traffic in and out of the City. If cameras are not financed in these proposals, this will be the next step.
* 20mph limits increase journey times and increase congestion
I feel this would be more suitable on some of the busier, narrow roads in Earlsdon.
Not sure needed for all roads but probably a good idea
Fine if enforced
I think this is an excellent idea - and I speak as a driver. This will benefit everyone in the area both through improved road safety, reduced emissions and easier movement around the area.
Agree, a very necessary first step.
This is great, however, I was told during the online meeting that this will not be mandatory and will only be self-enforced. It makes more sense to put some enforcement in place otherwise people will ignore the speed limit. (e.g. speed bump on narrow street/roads, electric signs to show if they are going over the limit)
I would be happy to give the 20mph zone a trial period. However, as I state below, the plan is too complex and ambitious. There are many elements. It is taken for granted that all the elements must be done at the same time. It would be more sensible to introduce one at a time, and learn from experience which elements may or may not fit together and may or may not generate excess costs for residents as well as visitors.
I understand that the plan as a whole is backed by modelling, but models are only as good as the ideas and data that go into them. And people have a habit of confounding them.
It would be better to introduce the 20mph zone, and enforce it properly. Proper enforcement can be funded using the resources freed by postponing other elements. Then, observe the effects on traffic around the neighbourhood. It will become evident which further measures would best complement the 20mph zone, or whether the community should stop there, or go back.
Good idea - I do not feel safe as a local pedestrian and road safety should be improved to encourage walking and running.
Stupid!
Very happy about this
It is a good idea but how will it be enforced?
Fully approve
Good
Agree.
Good
20 mph hour is a good idea
Very supportive, excellent.
I agree with it being changed to a 20mph zone
It's unnecessary. It's quite hard to exceed 20mph anyway, and those who do, would probably do so anyway, given there are no police in the area. To have signage and CCTV enforcing this speed limit (if that is planned) would be completely inappropriate. This feels like a fashionable imposition and is quite unnecessary.
Excellent. Absolutely no reason why cars need to go faster on residential roads.
Approve
good if it is properly enforced
Agree
I would agree to this although travelling at just under 25 mph along Beechwood Avenue (the existing layout) when no traffic or pedestrians (most of the time) seems satisfactory and preferable. Under the proposals Beechwood Avenue will become the "M25 of queuing".
Agree in principle with 20mph limit in residential areas. However, the current issue is drivers speeding over the current 30mph limit on a couple of roads (Beechwood Ave and Albany Road in particular) so how will this be monitored/enforced?
Fully support - how is it going to be enforced?
Good

Comments received regarding a 20mph zone
Very welcome If you can get this implemented. Majority of Traffic on affected streets travels at 20mph. Particularly welcome around Earlsdon Primary and on the high street.
Yes Please How would it be policed/monitored
Is this necessary. Most streets in Earlsdon are congested and to get to a speed of more than 20mph other than on main roads is difficult at any time. The main road speeds can be controlled in ways that stops traffic speeding if the 30mph speed limit was implemented have we got a problem? Outside schools and specific areas like Earlsdon Street where there are people then it may be desirable.
I am fully in favour of all the proposals
Excellent proposal, giving more time to cross the roads safely. I do hope this will be implemented A.S.A.P
20 mph is a good idea
20mph zone is good, however, people won't stick to it because there is no plan for speed bumps to ensure they stick to it.
OK
Supportive of this
I like this idea. Will help with speeding traffic.
Fine
Seems unnecessary expense. Not aware of any significant RTAs in the area.
As a parent of 2 small children, the risk from the speed people already drive seems low. I see no need for a reduction in speed limit.
Don't think this will be effective. You'd be better off putting cameras or speed police for the key times people speed ie Fri and Sat evening. And keeping it at 30mph.
Approve
I support the change of permitted speed to 20 mph. This on its own, if enforced, would make this area a much nicer place to live
Fantastic! It is hard to go faster than 20mph most of the time anyway, but making this the norm will certainly make Earlsdon safer for pedestrians and road-users.
Brilliant.
If this is undertaken and drivers are 'encouraged' to keep to it, it could result in drivers with no real reason for passing through the area, and we are told, creating traffic issues, then avoiding the area.
I am happy with this proposal provided it is effectively enforced. I think this could have a significant impact on routing through Earlsdon and should be introduced and monitored for effect on routing before any other traffic flow measures, such as no entries, are even considered.
not needed
I think this is a good idea
Strongly support 20mph zone throughout Earlsdon
Support this
I'm in favour
No problem with this
There are winners and losers but thank you for the ideas and consulting us. I like the 20 speed limit, more pedestrian crossings, some new systems especially Newcombe road plus traffic calming. I'm concerned that the bus gate will send a lot more traffic along Dalton, Belvedere and then Earlsdon Avenue South (which is busy already) with the difficulty of turning right out of Belvedere as it will be more congested. I wonder if a system such a number plate recognition could be used to allow local residents to exit Dalton by turning right into Spencer road . I wonder how parents will drop their children at the back gate of King Henry's and then continue their busy lives without causing mayhem by doing 360 degree turns in the road with their often very large cars.
I am very strongly in favour, only wish it went further. My main concern would be enforcement, as there are often cars going along Earlsdon Avenue late at night at speeds well in excess of the current speed limit, like it was a race track, which they do with impunity because there are no cameras and no road police.
This should cover all the roads in this newly extended area. Plus the Kenilworth road should be 30mph

Comments received regarding a 20mph zone
We need to slow traffic. It's so unsafe for residents. It's unsafe crossing and for the elderly who need time and patience to cross or those with young children.
I think this is a good idea, but is it going to actually be enforced? I often see people driving well in excess of the current speed limit in Earlsdon, so what difference is it going to make to them if it's dropped to 20? In my opinion speed bumps in residential streets are a better solution.
No! this is only necessary on certain roads where people do exceed the speed limit....in spite of the 30 mph limit they do sowhy can't the Council take measures to ensure people keep to 30 mph Speed bumps preferred eg on roads like Beechwood Avenue where I am told cars speed at night Definitely not keen on a rule of 20 mph everywhere although this would earn money for the Council....is this the idea?
I agree with it wholeheartedly
Very much needed
I'm happy to drive at or below 20mph but I do not notice many driving fast, I've lived here for 25 years. The money spent installing 20 mph signs could be better spent on other maintenance e.g. repairing pavements.
A good idea
This is brilliant! The streets are pretty much one way anyway with cars parked both sides and as a cyclist I often come nose to nose with a car travelling too fast down a road and I have nowhere to go with so little time to react.
Good idea
Only necessary near school and Earlsdon st. The Beechwood racers will ignore.
Agree
Support it
Yes. I support this, and if enforced it makes most of the other proposals redundant.
I agree with the 20m per hour zone
This is a great idea! Very happy about this.
Sounds reasonable.
Strongly in favour
Start enforcing 30 mph. There's no point in introducing more restrictions if you can't enforce existing ones
Happy with this
Totally unnecessary
I am not happy about this change! The changes only reflect traffic laws which will inevitably lead to policing through cameras as the council has set out. There are a few hotspots which need changing e.g. pedestrian crossing at the end of Earlsdon, straightening of Beechwood Ave by the golf club. Most of the changes reflected, particularly the change in priorities at Rochester Rd and Beechwood Ave and unnecessary and reflect the views of only the older inhabitants of Earlsdon. This money could be better invested in actually making Earlsdon High St more attractive (and liveable) opposed to changing traffic priorities.
Happy with speed reduction especially in the Canley Gardens area as traffic on Bates Road has become quite a problem due to speed. Difficult to turn out of Innis Road and Nightingale lane as one had to creep out to see around the corner. Speeding cars coming up the hill can't see you
Not greatly fussed. I doubt it will make much difference to the speed people drive.
I think this is a good idea
It isn't enforceable. What seems to slow most people down are digital speedometers which tell drivers what speed they're driving even if it doesn't enforce it. You often see cars brake where these are located on Beechwood, so clearly has some impact, if not limited. I don't think 20mph on Earlsdon Ave south is necessarily a good idea. Low speeds can increase emissions in an area so can become problematic where high volumes occur. Additionally there's no stopping cyclists going above 20mph - because let's be honest this is all benefit to cyclists throughout. What can be done about speeding cyclists?
I like the 20mph, I think this should be extended more widely and it should be 30 on Kenilworth road.
Good, cars speed along Earlsdon Avenue which has bends which make crossing dangerous for pedestrians and for people driving out of parking spaces where the bends restrict seeing oncoming traffic.
I don't live in this area but sometimes drive through it, I support 20 mph in residential areas like this.
Agree
Mainly in favour

Comments received regarding a 20mph zone
Yes - it's a residential area and this would prevent noise and traffic pollution and restore the area to a more peaceful place.
I only think of Beechwood as a problem area the rest of the roads should stay as they are
This is one of the few aspects which is helpful and frankly this proposal if enforced, would solve most of the issues without the res of the over engineered programme
This will make driving around the area worse than it currently is. I stopped going to the shops as it's impossible to drive or park
In favour
Agree
Good idea
I don't mind the speed limit reduction.
I think it is an excellent idea. For far too long, traffic and excessive speed has made the roads increasingly dangerous and unpleasant to use by pedestrians and cyclists.
OK
Would prefer this to be targeted to where needed
Excellent
This will cause people delays in travel on the main roads.
Why only these roads.
Excellent idea and very necessary
This seems a very good idea.
People who already stick within speed limits also usually drive appropriately on narrower residential streets. People who already drive inappropriately will continue to do so. Enforcement of existing speed limits is needed particularly on Albany,road, Spencer avenue and beechwood avenue where people drive like idiots.
All our families are in favour of this.
This is a good idea, but requires enforcement.
I drive, walk, run & cycle in Earlsdon & strongly welcome this proposal. A large number of vehicles drive well above the current 30mph speed limit & walking/running & particularly cycling is not a pleasant or always safe experience.
think this is a good idea
People who take no notice of a 30 mile an hour limit are hardly likely to take any notice of a 20 mile an hour restriction.
In my own road (Moor St and Clarendon St.) and most other side roads it is already rarely possible to drive at more than 20 mph. On the major routes, those that choose to exceed the speed limit will continue to do so unless speed cameras and fines are introduced. This would be a waste of time and money if it were not policed. It should be introduced in the immediate vicinity of the three schools.
absolutely agree. I would ask that this applies to electric bikes too which are harder to police.
No thank you - 30 is fine.
Yes. Makes for steady traffic flow and reduces the need for any further actions.
20mph zone is a good idea
Excellent idea but it needs to be enforced. Signage only will not work. Average Speed cameras on main roads needed as bare minimum.
Fantastic! Drivers around Earlsdon (and particularly around Beechwood Ave.) are putting others, families and children in danger. No one thinks a 20 mph zone will limit speed to 20 mph, but there is overwhelming evidence that the number and severity of casualties is reduced by such measures
I DO NOT SUPPORT
I do not think it necessary to put into place a total 20mph zone, outside the school would seem sensible and in line with other neighborhoods.
Good idea. This is the de facto top speed anyway and with so many schools and pedestrians in the area this makes sense.

Comments received regarding a 20mph zone
Perfect but my concern would be without enforcement it will be ignored
in favour as long as it can be policed. The people who race along Beechwood Avenue and other roads will still race, whatever the limit, so traffic calming is needed too
Good idea for pedestrian safety
Wholeheartedly support all this
I don't think this will work unless it was to be a city wide initiative and i am interested to see what happens in wales -Cardiff , in particular. I am told by friends in Wales that 20mph is worse for air quality than 30mph as you can't get out of 2nd gear. saving lives is paramaount, but i think this should be made clear if it is the truth.
Not sure how much benefit this would have in isolation, but if the traffic volumes are lowered then I wouldn't be opposed to this.
Agree
I wholeheartedly support this. Something definitely needs to be done about the speed of vehicles along Spencer Road and Spencer Avenue.
Agree
Good. It's is needed. Too many people speeding. It will benefit air quality and reduce risk.
The road speed should not be reduced, where it is safe to travel at 30mph people should be able to do this.
Agree with this proposal
I do not agree with the proposal as it is not necessary
Fully supportive
Unnecessary - except for Beechwood Avenue
Its a positive step but would plead for its enlargement to cover Canley and Sir henry Parkes Roads too
I think 20mph on residential streets is a good idea. But I doubt it will be monitored and historically taxis, delivery vehicles and those dealing drugs are never stopped.
I think the 20 mph limit in these roads plus the area between Earlsdon Avenue South and Spencer Rd/Ave as well as the streets between Albany Road and Belveder would be a very good idea.
okay but how will it be policed
Good Idea
Ok for side streets but not the main roads
This could potentially affect the businesses. Elderly patients will find it difficult to access the disabled car spaces provided by the business.
I support 20mph zone
This will only work if it can be enforced - people already drive at 40 down Beechwood Avenue which is currently a 30 mile an hour zone, so with only a bit of traffic calming they will drive at 30 in a 20 mile an hour zone
I'm not sure that it is necessary. It would be more effective to enforce the existing 30mph speed limit to affect the behaviour of drivers.
Seems reasonable
Not sure about the extend of the zone.. Beechwood avenue being a busy through road. Perhaps it will be better limited to the smaller and school / shopping roads
This is fine. It would need to be enforced so would be interested in how this might be done.
In theory, it sounds good, but the current speed limits are not adhered to by many and aren't policed, so it's hard to see how the 20 mph limit will work in reality.
A 20-mph zone is a fantastic idea which will benefit the whole area. Many roads are too narrow for faster speeds in any case. Experience elsewhere shows that even with limited enforcement the average speed drops with a simultaneous reduction in KSI. Some enforcement, particularly on the main through roads Earlsdon Avenue North, Earlsdon Avenue South and Beechwood Avenue would be very welcome and will increase compliance. The effectivity of the 20mph scheme would be further improved, if the segment of Earlsdon Avenue South between the Firs and Kenilworth Road, which is currently 40 mph limit, were reduced to a more appropriate 30 mph limit.
Agree
Agree this would be a good idea - 20mph should be extended to all the narrower roads in Earlsdon
Agree strongly

Comments received regarding a 20mph zone
I think it should be extended to earlsdon avenue north too.
Good idea. Primary issue is speeding cars. However, introducing a 20mph limit may not be enough, traffic calming, such as speed humps or double chicanes (priority narrowing chicanes do not work) to slow traffic. This is particularly a problem on Beechwood Avenue in the evenings with high powered cars driving at excessive speed around the corners by the golf and tennis clubs and also further along by the junction of the Rochester Road
I like that idea but there needs to be a way to enforce it. The problem isn't with the people who drive at 30 but those that drive recklessly and will just ignore any limit
We are fine with plans to slow traffic for safety purposes. We can see the benefit in this.
But we reject plans to change routing and flow.
I think this would be beneficial for the safety of the area
I agree. It is a good proposal.
I approve of this proposal which I have used when visiting relatives in London so I know that it is effective.
A reasonable idea - if it can be enforced.
I do not support this proposal as written. I am in favour of reducing the speed limit on Beechwood Avenue, especially the section from the golf club to Rochester road. I also am in favour of a reduction on the Earlsdon High Street, and outside the Earlsdon School and Library. I personally believe that the current speed limits in place just require enforcement to stop the mindless idiots who do speeds way in excess of the limit. Average speed cameras with enforcement would go a long way to achieve the traffic slow down that is desirable. The Welsh speed limit reduction to 20mph has led to a number of unforeseen consequences. Emergency services hindered by the slower traffic, journey times considerably increased versus the predicted effect, and more environmental effects than the predicted benefit for pollution reduction.
I support this proposal
I understand the logic of this for certain parts of Earlsdon, particularly the residential streets, but I don't think that the case has been made for its universal application. A 20mph limit on the main arterial and wider roads, such as Earlsdon Avenue, is excessive and unnecessary.
20mph is too slow for the whole of the proposed zone. But "yes" for Beechwood Avenue, which is the main 'danger zone'.
Enforce 30 mph for speed limits, and spend money on enforcement, catching those who speed.
Not bothered
Good!
No point unless it's enforced. Earlsdon Avenue South is already a racetrack at certain times of day, and just because there hasn't been injuries, there has been vehicle damage due to speeding. If no-one police's this speed limit it will be ignored, much as the current parking restrictions are.
20mph seems the right limit for all residential streets, but the major through routes (beechwood avenue, earlsdon avenue) can allow a higher limit (30mph) so long as it is actually enforced.
Unnecessary. It may work for some roads, but not for all. In any event, useless unless enforced.
Yes. This in itself would deter through traffic and improve road safety. No need for other measures
This proposal in good in principal but unrealistic. Many of these roads already have speed limits of 30mph which is ignored (especially Beechwood Avenue), so a further reacting will likely still be ignored.
Not necessary
very good
No problem with speed control where necessary eg outside schools etc...
Absolutely not! There is no evidence that this will solve the problems. Put speed cameras in and catch the males responsible.
A 20mph zone is an excellent idea and long overdue. But it is also important that there should be measures to enforce it. NB Slowing the traffic might also make the other suggestions unnecessary.
Agree
Excellent proposal
Definitely a sensible proposal.
I think this is a good thing

Comments received regarding a 20mph zone
Good Idea
I am happy with this proposal. However, a limit of 25mph would be appropriate on Beechwood Avenue.
I like it
yes
Great - as both a driver, cyclist and pedestrian I see this being a good thing!
I support investment in traffic calming on Beechwood Avenue, but believe there are better ways of achieving this than introducing a 20 mph zone. Without effective enforcement a 20mph zone will not have the desired impact. The current 30mph limit is not adhered to and therefore I do not believe changing the signs will give rise to the change in behaviour that is needed, if anything it may lead to even more dangerous overtaking. I would support the introduction of speed bumps and cameras to enforce the current 30mph limit and the introduction of a chicane as suggested in Q8
I strongly support this proposal. It will make the area safer for my family, which will encourage us to cycle and walk more. The reduction in speed will not make much difference to car journey times.
I am in favour of the 20mph zone
Yes
I am for reducing the speed limits
Fine but it needs to be enforced with absolute and average speed cameras otherwise a waste of time and it will cause annoyance and frustration to law abiding people who will keep to the limit. Failing cameras, speed bumps and or traffic calming measures need to be put along Beechwood avenue, not only both sides of the golf/tennis club but also at the approach to the railway bridge where motorists speed up to beat the lights.
Good idea
Ok
You have misrepresented a "low traffic neighbourhood" as a "liveable neighbourhood". There is absolutely no need for it.
Generally supportive - especially if the main proposals to restrict through travel in Earlsdon to the principal arteries of Beechwood Ave / Earlsdon Ave North & South / Albany Road & Earlsdon High Street - important to protect our amenity as residents on Beechwood Ave as more affected by deleterious aspects of traffic management
I strongly support the introduction of a 20MPH speed limit throughout the area enclosed by the red dotted line on the map provided (not just the area listed above!). I would strongly recommend that enforcement measures are also put in place to ensure this is complied with.
25 mph perfectly adequate around the school site but unnecessary in other areas mentioned
Absolutely crazy. I can't give my support to this. 30mph is ok for residential neighborhoods. I could agree to 20mph outside of schools.
Agree
Generally positive
I very strongly favour a 20 m.p.h limit throughout the entire area. However, I would much prefer it to be enforced through the installation of speed cameras, since the current speed limit is widely flouted.
Strongly agree
Not needed. The clear problem of speeding on the Beechwood Ave "racetrack" is being addressed through various proposals. Through traffic will be dramatically reduced by the proposed road blockages. So most of the remaining traffic in Earlsdon will be by local residents or those who work or come her for a specific purpose, and who therefore are part OF the community. As the Council officer argued to me at a drop-in session, the Earlsdon community has a stake in its own safety, it is only the 'through' traffic which is the problem, so, on balance, a speed limit is not beneficial to the community.

Question 3


What do you think about this proposal:

Extending the existing one-way loop around Providence Street, Berkeley Road South and Moor Street so that Berkeley Road South becomes fully one-way. Berkeley Road North will become no entry from Earlsdon Avenue South but will remain two-way. Cycles will be able to pass through the no entry and use the road as two-way.

Comments received regarding extending no entries and one-ways
Agree with this proposal. With it being split one and two way it makes it very confusing for anyone not local.
Agree
Excellent plan
Good plan
Great idea
Not in favour, all you do is increase traffic as it has to travel further to get to where it needs to go.
Good idea
Good
Sounds fine.
I imagine that some residents of Berkeley Road South will be unhappy about having no access from Earlsdon Avenue South, plus this might have the undesirable side-effect of diverting more traffic along Earlsdon Street to enter BR South from Providence Street. A one-way loop along Mayfield Road from Earlsdon Avenue South to Broadway and back along Berkeley Road North where, (because of parking on both sides) it's usually impossible for two cars to pass, might be considered to ease congestion on both roads.
Great
Supportive of this. Will be good for traffic control.
Makes sense and is something I considered 20 years ago when we moved here. Other places like StAgnes in Cornwall have large one way systems. As a driver you appreciate the ease of parking while as a pedestrian you know where cars are coming from. I would say signage and lines RE cyclists allowed to go past the No entry needs to be very clear to all, otherwise there will be conflict. There is sense in allowing cyclists through though - a good move.
Really really dislike. Making Berkeley road north only accessible from one side will be a logistical nightmare for us.
Happy with that
Fine with me
This will encourage more traffic turning onto Mayfield to get to Berkeley Road North. I don't want this!
Yes, I agree. Especially with the extra allowance to cyclists.
Agree
fine
Good idea. Currently, there is a risk of vehicles driving south on Berkley Road South T-boning vehicles driving on Providence Street; making Berkeley Road South one-way should reduce this risk. You could also reduce this risk by adding speed humps on Providence Street. Many Audis and BMWs like to speed on that stretch of road after exiting Earlsdon Street. They wrongly assume, I think, that the street is closed on both sides when, in fact, there is an exit from Regency Court. Speed bumps could reduce that risk. Alternatively, you could add a warning sign before the Regency Court exit or extend the no parking lines to the left and right of the Regency Court exit.
As above
I think it's ok if the residence on that street approve
Agree

Comments received regarding extending no entries and one-ways
I need further information about this
Fully supportive
Good idea.If they do it can Moor street no entry sign be more prominent(criterion side) many cars daily are coming up the wrong way and sometimes speeding. It's an accident waiting to happen..
In favour
No comment
Sensible
Don't think this is necessary
Good idea.
This could be a little awkward for us.
Sensible.
I'm not concerned with these changes
Ridiculous
No
Seems like a good addition, however I rarely use these roads.
Cycling against the flow on a one way street is dangerous.
no sure really. cannot really work out the benefit? bit more detail?
the one way system would work better in arden st - turn onto warwick st and right onto moor st and exit onto earlsdon st
relook at the one way system - quite long way round for people to reach earlsdon st who live where we live creating more traffic on these roads.
what will the parking situation be on Warwick st? adding more parking here could help maybe if it went one way?
don't like any no entries roads especially arden st - creates more issues elsewhere and less flexibility. exits are already extremely busy so forces people just one way sounds madness.
need to think about larger vehicles access such as bin lorries, delivery vans etc. how will people turn around if needed? often issues so needs lots of thought for turning circles etc
I don't really understand the rationale for this proposal.
Good idea. I would feel much happier and safer using this route on my bike.
Good
No opinion.
A good idea and will hopefully pave the way for the permanent closure of Earlsdon Street to traffic. However it is not clear what the benefit is of closing access to Berkeley Road North from Earlsdon Avenue South.
Seems sensible but further consultation required for High street businesses
No chaos
Not necessary
I strongly disagree. A one way system would make it very annoying for Berkeley Road North.
Not in favour - this will make getting home more difficult
No objections
In favour
I cannot see that this would cause any issues
Disagree with proposal. Makes challenge for parking in congested area increasingly difficult for Broadway residents who seem to barely be an afterthought who rely upon Berkeley North when parking not available on Broadway.
Will creating a one way system enable speeding? Knowing traffic is not coming the way...
Silly idea

Comments received regarding extending no entries and one-ways
Makes it difficult for people living on these streets constantly having to drive a longer way around when leaving and returning to their homes.
Berkeley Road North should be fully closed at the junction with Earlsdon Ave except to cyclists. There would be minimal negative impact to residents driving, but it would remove all through traffic and make it safer for pedestrians walking along Earlsdon Ave. It would also create space for seating/trees/planters - there is no other space for this on Berkeley Road North
Giving cyclists two ways to travel would be safer and more convenient.
Disagree - I don't think it is necessary
Disagree as I think this is unnecessary
Good, this may support traffic flow.
Neither agree or disagree
Good idea as more parking will be available.
Extending of one way loop so that Berkeley Road South becomes fully one way - good idea. Berkeley Road North becoming no entry from Earlsdon Avenue South - disagree as risk it will push traffic on to Mayfield Road instead.
Not sure
Fine
I don't live round this bit or regularly drive here so I have no comment on this. I support whatever the residents of these roads say as they will have to live with the restrictions.
I don't think this is a good idea as it would trap people who live in Berkeley Road South and who have garages there. It does need to have restrictions on the road to stop large lorries as the roads are too narrow to support them. What will be the access route for shop deliveries? Currently there are too many large delivery vans who are driving up and down the narrow streets and the current one way system which is inappropriate for their size, specifically Berkeley Road South to Moor St. The house vibrates as they drive up the road. The new proposals would just push them the other way. Berkeley Road South between Earlsdon Ave and Moor Street needs resurfacing and the extreme camber on the road needs addressing as this makes it difficult to manoeuvre cars in inclement weather. Finally parking needs addressing- local residents are blighted by people parking in front of garages and drives. I cannot park in front of my house in Earlsdon Ave South as it has double yellow lines in front of it and I can't park in Berkeley Road South because it gets parked up early in the morning by workers in the area. there needs to be parking for local residents. This is further exacerbated by people parking regularly in front of my garages blocking me in. So residents parking needs extending and or white lines painted in front of garages to allow resident access.
In favour of extending the existing one-way loop around Providence Street. However closing Berkeley rd north will just move short-cutting traffic onto Mayfield.
I can appreciate the problem here but the proposal may create difficulties on days when there are road closures on Earlsdon High Street e.g. Market Days. Accessibility to the Criterion Theatre (e.g. delivery vans) will be made difficult.
Terrible idea, this is Earlsdon not Amsterdam, there are not that many cyclists. The roads work just fine as they are.
Not necessary
Fully support. As long as signage is good including 'safe' for cycling signs at entry of one way street.
Ok
I Support this proposal. will there be signage saying except cycles?
The parking at the bottom of moor st makes getting out of this junction difficult at the best of times
I think this would result in more traffic going to Earlsdon high street and am not sure that is a good thing given the

Comments received regarding extending no entries and one-ways
issues with that road already. The measures would reduce traffic on surrounding roads however.
Unnecessary
I'm not 100% sure on the reasoning for extending the one-way loop to cover the entirety of Berkeley Road South, since I imagine through-traffic should be sufficiently reduced by the no entry point at Styvechale Avenue. What's the imagined route for cars attempting to get to the popular Criterion Theatre car park? If the goal is the narrow the road, then I would still agree with doing that, even if it's nominally kept as a two-way road (due to double-parking it's generally a one-way-at-a-time road already). The rest of this proposal looks good to me. It's vital that the various no-entry and one-way roads are fully viable in both directions for cyclists to use. Will this proposal include making two-way cycle usage on the currently existing one-way roads? I think it should.
Agree
Agree
Cycles must be the same as other vehicles, otherwise more accidents and confusion
Agree
Good idea.
I have limited information on the effects of this, but it won't really affect me.
I support this proposal, as well as the proposal to make Warwick St one way. I think the proposal would make more sense of Clarendon St was als one way (opposite direction to Warwick St)
It would make it safer on Berkeley road south as often near misses with junction of Moor Street. See absolutely no value or need to make Berkeley Road North no entry from EAS, having previously lived on Huntingdon road this would just be inconvenient and unnecessary.
This seems sensible.

I support this initiative. Many are out of cycling (benefits to health, noise/pollution) by thought of riding on busy road. Opportunities to make short journeys by bike are to be encouraged in all initiatives.
It will make things more dangerous, because speeding electric bikes used by Deliveroo, Just Eat couriers etc will have more opportunities to kill people with their terrible, inconsistent and unregulated cycling.
Unnecessary
Good
Not sure it's needed
Would Block residents in too much
I think this is a good idea.
Excellent idea, this should be rolled out as soon as possible and extended to other coventry neighbourhoods, such as Stoke.
Brilliant idea
Not sure if this would be a positive step
This question is for residents living in that area, I don't.
This will benefit no one.
And this achieves what ? More traffic going up Broadway
Rediculous Cyclists do want they want anyway and less than 5% of road users = do they pay annual fee?
Absolutely awful, although it will not really impact me personally. We used to live on Moor St and this would have been terrible for getting to our house!
Yes, this seems a very good idea.
Do not like no entry to Berkeley Rd North from Earlsdon Avenue South. I think unnecessary.
A terrible idea clogging up traffic and trapping residents of these streets
Disagree. Real problem for Criterion Theatre access and does not aid problem of speeding
As I love on Berkeley Road South I am very concerned by this extension of the one way system. I have Off road parking and usually have to reverse off my drive. If cars are parked on both sides of the road it is

Comments received regarding extending no entries and one-ways
impossible for me to reverse out towards Earlsdon Avenue direction, so how will I be able to get out if it is one way ! Also it makes access to the Criterion Theatre difficult. It is only a small stretch of road and this change will make it difficult for the few residents and will also increase traffic on the proposed one way system. I thought we were trying to decrease traffic pollution.
No comment
No strong feelings other than the fact that I think having cycles travelling against the flow of the traffic is a bad idea... (I am a regular cyclist)
Not clear how Berkeley Road North vehicular access will be from one way only yet the road will remain two way? How would this work?
neutral
I do not think that this is necessary
no opinion
Disagree. Making Berkeley Road South fully one-way, agree would force more cars coming from Earlsdon Avenue to go up Earlsdon St and along Providence St to reach Moor Street car park, etc. Disagree blocking Berkeley Road North entry. This would force more cars onto Mayfield Road. In any case, how could it be 2 way if blocked one end? There is not enough space to do dangerous U-turns, especially for large delivery lorries, etc.
Not sure about this: if cars can only turn right into Mayfield but not Berkeley it might cause building up a queue on Earlsdon Ave getting into Mayfield. Also, if it is a dangerous right turn, why allow bicycles to use it?
I do not support this proposal
Fine
Bad
There is no benefit to this particular component of the proposal. You can drive this route currently
Terrible idea
That's fine. Clear signage is required.
Why are you proposing this? The clear intention is to make things more difficult for drivers and easier for woke people on bicycles.
I think it's a very good idea
I'm not sure how this benefits the neighbourhood
No - I cycle and agree it should be promoted but you cannot imagine people are just going to give up on vehicle use overnight. I see so many people already driving up roads that are already one-way now!! (Providence St section / Moor St section)
Supportive.
Extending the one way system so Berkeley Road South I think will have minimal impact but have no great feelings about it. However, I've long felt that the introduction of a one way system with Stanway and Huntington going one way and Mickleton and Broadway going the other way, and then Mayfield and Berkeley being one way on opposite directions, would help with traffic flow in quite narrow roads that become clogged as soon as a Chelsea tractor decides to travel along them (never mind the delivery vans or council vehicles). I cannot see what advantage closing the exit at the avenue end of Berkeley Road North offers and will certainly be irksome for these residents. To elaborate on the idea, I think at very little cost the entrance to these roads could be narrowed whilst allowing sufficient width for refuse collection or removal vans etc., and that there might be plantings of small trees or bushes, or planters with a variety of herbs available for any to harvest.
Fair enough. Understandable.
Don't see the problem with the existing layout. What is the benefit of the proposal?
No opinion really.
Fine
I'm not sure why you need to extend the loop to take in the rest of Berkeley Road South. It seems to work well as it is.
Ok
I disagree.
I believe this is taking a sledge hammer to crack a nut. It will increase the car journey distances for residents to reach local facilities thus increasing pollution rather than reducing it. Cyclists must follow the same rules as other

Comments received regarding extending no entries and one-ways
road users otherwise you cause unnecessary confrontation.
All good except for the residents who who this impacts, making it more difficult for them to get to their properties.
Supportive, but enforcement at the Earlsdon St junction with Moor St (south) will be required. Too many vehicles driving the wrong way down Moor St already .
Looks okay
I don't have an opinion on this
That will divert more traffic into Earlsdon street via roundabout increasing the logjam there
No opinion
I support the proposal
no comment
Difficult
Ok with that
I feel this is unnecessary and will only add to the increase in traffic along Mayfied Rd which will already be impacted by other proposals. When I asked at the drop in session the reason behind this proposal, I was told it was so the children walking from the school would not have to look four ways to cross.
Disagree. Change of change sake just because money is available is no basis on which to make decisions. This is another unnecessary change
In favour
That's fine
We don't mind either way.
Will have limited positive impact on traffic volumes, rather this will be an inconvenience for residents and local travellers
Absolutely unnecessary
Good idea.
No ...I object as There would be a horrendous build up of traffic streets surrounding these streets..it will have a domino effect on the area . The solution is speed bumps and cameras I believe in all these side and main streets .
Fully support.
What is the benefit of this? More traffic pushed up Earlsdon street
you are turning right into one way systems which holds up traffic
Cycles both ways on a one way vehicle road can be dangerous
This does not make any sense of creating 1 way routes through residential streets when it has not caused any issues to date? Instead of traffic calming it will cause traffic to increase on Rochester road to Radcliffe road and into Earlsdon Street. I lived in East London and seen the noise and environment damage these one way residential routes can cause.
Can you please provide any reasoning why this proposal needs to be done as it seems to be a waste of tax payers money which can be used elsewhere in this project
Do not see any benefit and see no point in reducing access
Partly in favour but against making Berkeley Road South one way as this will add extra traffic to the north end of Styvechale Avenue. Getting in and out of this part of Styvechale Avenue is tricky at times already.
agree
I fully support this proposal.
I can't see the benefit of this. Traffic is currently quite light in Earlsdon out of peak hours. This could funnel traffic onto other roads causing congestion.
No opinion
Fine
Don't think it's necessary
The signing of the two way system for bikes needs to be clear for all users
Fine with this

Comments received regarding extending no entries and one-ways
No need
Fine
X
Agree - makes sense, though there is a risk that traffic increases on Mayfield Road
Don't think BNN is a sensible idea, given that dalton rd might be gated!!!!
Agree with extending the one way loop around Berkeley Road South. Don't see any advantage to Berkeley Road North proposal
I don't see how this will be of help
This would cause a big inconvenience for the residents in these roads
I think that sounds good. I'm particularly pleased that as a person who commutes on my bicycle, I'll feel safer.
Good idea
Disagree
Unnecessary, who asked for this? What problem is it seeking to address???
I don't have any opinion either way.
Yes happy with this
No opinion
That's fine
Fail to see any advantage in that proposal.
In favour.
Agree
I have no issues with this proposal
I support this
Would make some sense to make Berkeley Road South a way one.
Quote Sheet 18 "It also prevents Berkeley Road North being used as a cut-through between Earlsdon Avenue South and Albany Road, which may increase as a result of other changes being proposed." Where is the evidence for this and what is to stop traffic finding alternative cut-throughs onto Albany Road.
* Against. These measures are being proposed to mitigate the increase in traffic cutting through side streets as a result of other changes being proposed.
I don't understand the reasoning behind this at all and do not want it. It seems needlessly confusing for no benefit and more inconvenience.
A one-way system on these roads may also encourage cars to speed as they would no longer need to be concerned about cars travelling in the opposite direction and the need to slow down.
Of the one way schemes this has most mileage. Berkeley road south being one way for whole length seems ok. Not sure about cutting off entry to North part will help anyone.
Has any modelling been done of the likely effect on traffic volumes on Earlsdon Avenue South ?
A sensible extension to the existing one-way routes.
No opinion
This includes Warwick Street on the map. I do not mind one-way loop on our street, however am concerned that this may allow more people to park on Warwick Street, where residents are already struggling to park due to visitor parking on the street. Off-the-road parking should be considered and introduced to make the area better to the residents.
Stupid
I Don't agree with no entry into Berkeley rd North from Earlsdon street. If Berkeley rd south becomes fully one then there shouldn't be any entry into it off Earlsdon AVE south
Fully approve
Good
Agree
No objections

Comments received regarding extending no entries and one-ways
I think this will cause problems
Very supportive, excellent.
I agree with everything but the cyclists being able to pass through the one way road the opposite way. If cyclists are on the road then they just follow the road laws. This is just inviting an accident to happen.
I don't see the point of this; I think it is unnecessary. The scheme is tinkering with traffic movement yet I can't see what it intends to achieve. When town planners start to, as they stated at the meeting, "ask people to think about their routes and methods of transport" the end result will be congestion somewhere else. The system as it is now, works well - Earlsdon is a popular and loved neighbourhood. Please stop interfering.
Approve
ambivalent
Agree
DISAGREE The extensive amount of proposed one-way streets will cause traffic to queue up. If the entrance to Berkley Road South is made no entry but residents or someone parking can still have 2-way direction surely you are causing more agro. Cars will spend added 'getting to work' time engaging in 3-points turns. Residents will have to drive around on the one-way route trying to find a parking space. When the BIN LORRIES come everyone will be stuck for ages = work time wasted and getting children to school (as not all children go to the state school in walking distance) AND how can Fire or Ambulance services get through????
Unsure what problem this is trying to solve.
Seems a trivial change
Don't think this will be helpful - more traffic will end up going down Styvechale & Osborne Road or the High St
I personally think this offers a route to the kind of high street most people in Earlsdon would prefer, and am personally in favour but i can foresee some resistance and complaints about traffic being shunted onto side streets and accessibility when combined with other proposed changes to traffic flow. It would be helpful in this regard if the council were to grant permission for the regular monthly market (and necessary closure of the high street) in order to gauge efficacy and get people used to the idea and possibly see the benefit of a traffic free high street! Of all proposals this and the 20mph limit are likely to be both the most beneficial and contentious in terms of immediate change to those less in favour. I do wish you luck.
Acceptable
In favour
Excellent proposal. It will feel safer and encourage more cycling .
This makes it difficult for people on that road to access Earlsdon Avenue south.
Bad idea allowing cyclists to use a one-way street both ways. Cars one-way but cyclists both ways seems an invitation for accidents.
Supportive of this
This will make Berkeley Road South more dangerous and add little, if anything, to the overall project.
Sounds ok
No thoughts
Good idea.
No comment
Fantastic (again): the roads are often not able to take 2 cars anyway beause of double-parking.
A messy solution that just creates other hot spots/issues and a new plan will be required.
I do not support proposals for additional 'no entry' measures.
not needed
I don't think there are any advantages to this idea. I don't believe closing Berkeley Rd North is a good idea at all. Making the last section of B. Rd South means having to take a longer route through the High st.

Comments received regarding extending no entries and one-ways
Using more fuel and making more pollution.!
Support this
I'm strongly opposed to a one way system on moor street and Warwick st. Access and parking is difficult enough now adding a taxi rank will mean driving around in circles looking for parking/ loading for residents . There are two bars on the corner which have frequent deliveries.
No issue with this
No great opinion
Again, I strongly agree with this and hope it would reduce excessive through traffic. I wish the proposals would also include camera- or warden-enforced parking/waiting restrictions on all the side streets off Earlsdon Street, where the permit-only parking on Earlsdon Avenue has led to increased pressure for parking spaces since it came into force some years ago. For example, vehicles frequently park blocking my garage entrance on Berkeley Road South despite the dropped kerb and a polite 'no parking' sign, and sometimes also blocking my driveway gates despite the dropped kerb and double yellow lines. There is a persistent daily problem of waiting cars/vans engine idling in Berkeley Road South for substantial periods of time, generating worse emissions and worse local air quality than if they were moving through (the statute against engine idling, which has been in force since 1988, has apparently never been enforced in Earlsdon, and when I respectfully request that people outside my house turn off their engines until they are ready to leave very few accept that what they are doing is in fact illegal and potentially fineable if only the Council wanted to collect the money).
One way directions around these street may help traffic flow
I think this is a good idea
Again, I agree
This should work well and help with some of the rat runs
No comment
Poor idea It will restrict traffic too much and push traffic on other roads which will be more crowded due to other proposals in this scheme
Brilliant! The less people can use the neighbourhood as a cut through, the better. There is no need for people to cut through when there are good arterial roads.
Good 👍
Unnecessary and will cause more traffic on residential roads
No comment
Fully support
No. I am against making the lower end of Berkeley Road South one way. People accessing the Criterion and properties at the lower end of Berkeley Rd South will add to the traffic on Earlsdon Street, Providence Street and the top end of Berkeley Road South – all already congested and often completely blocked by workers/deliveries. Confusing for cyclist as to which No entry signs they can ignore, and for pedestrians who may be caught unaware by cyclists.
Agree
Good idea
Sounds like it will just cause short term confusion and frustration and create unintended problems in the surrounding areas.
I think this serves no purpose
Why?
Ok
The change to one way systems will increase traffic in the area. Rat runs have been created by Coventry Council and continual roadworks in the area. Now major works are completed at Butts Colledge, this will be better. Please dont ruin our area by making these changes!!!
No sure that's a good idea as it will lead to more traffic down Earlsdon street for the Criterion and Berkeley road North.
Not fussed. One way streets are confusing to people not from the area.
Promoting cycle over motor traffic is an excellent idea in principle (I cycled from home to Warwick University regularly for 20 years or so - even before the current cycle-way was established) but I have some reservations about how such proposals will work. The e-bikes that are commonly used for deliveries and the e-scooters that

Comments received regarding extending no entries and one-ways
are favoured as a speedy way of getting around, sometimes without respecting the protocols motorists and pedestrians follow, in my view present some of the worst current traffic hazards. The fact that such devices enjoy privileges where otherwise one-way and no-entry restrictions are in force could easily amplify these hazards. As of now, I feel that we are a long way from the vision that cycle use would supplant car use in the enlightened way for instance that has long been the case in the Netherlands. In my experience of walking around the Earlsdon neighbourhood (my preferred way of accessing Earlsdon and Coventry City Centre), there is very limited use of bikes - I doubt whether the cost of making provision for bikes that prove to be virtually non-existent has been justified.
Majority of traffic is being forced down the high street (earlsdon street for non locals) which is more problematic than increasing amount of one-way routes around it.
Seems fine to me.
Berkeley Road South seems to me to be safe with the present system. Parked cars make it hazardous turning from Berkeley Road North into Earlsdon Avenue South.
Agree
Unsure
No issues. Would enjoy as a cyclist.
Good Idea
I don't think this will have any positive impact
Not in favour of this. Too many one way streets cause confusion and annoyance gif the residents and outs off people from coming into Earlsdon, thus having a knock on effect for tradespeople
Agree
No opinion
It will make it a lot harder to move around Earlsdon and access different roads. My daughters friend lives in Earlsdon and it will make it even harder for her to see her friend.
I think it is an excellent idea. Prioritising non-motorised traffic is one of the keys to making this work.
OK
Disagree with it. Existing one way signage is missed with cars turning into moor street or coming the wrong way down Providence street
Agree
Ok
Do not agree
No comment
No view. Seems reasonable
no opinion
All our families are in favour of this. Suggestions: "Paint signs on the road to show cycles can go both ways to avoid drivers getting angry". "move the give way lines back to show pedestrians have right of way across junctions"
No opinion, I rarely use these roads.
This seems sensible to achieve the hoped for improved traffic flows.
I really do not see the point in making Berkeley Road North no entry from Earlsdon Avenue South or making the bottom end of Berkeley Road South fully one way.
I don't think that many people turn into Berkeley Rd South other than the residents but it would make reaching their properties more difficult. I cannot see that making Berkeley Rd North one way would do anything other than make it more inconvenient for residents of this road to access their properties.
Traffic flow in Providence Street and Berkely road is currently very light. This would achieve almost nothing except inconvenience for the residents of these streets. I acknowledge that the junction of Moor Street and Earlsdon street is sometimes congested but this always the result of illegal parking. A better solution would be clearer marking of the no parking areas and enforcement with cameras and fines.
I agree with the one way loop but do not understand how BRN can be no entry from EAS. Will you create a road barrier such as a planter? This implies only bikes can use BRN as 2 way but cars will want to use in both directions too. Is this planned?

Comments received regarding extending no entries and one-ways
No thank you. Unclear why Berkeley needs to become no entry.
No. Excessive interference.
I don't agree with the one way system, as it will just push the traffic into other streets and cause more congestion in Earlsdon
Great, but please enforce it! The contraflow cycle lane in the city-centre (near the university) always had confused drivers beeping at cyclists... until they simply removed the cycle lane instead of educating or punishing drivers!
I DO NOT SUPPORT
I do not think that this is a very sensible idea at all particularly making Berkley Road North no entry from Earlsdon Avenue South - i can not see any benefit other than creating entry and departure stress for residents of Berkeley Road North and increasing traffic on Mayfield Road and surrounding roads. Equally I can not see any benefit in extending the current one way on Berkeley Road South other than to add further congestion at the roundabout onto Earlsdon Street. In addition are there safety concerns with cycles being permitted both directions on a one way road for vehicles.
Great. Impossible for two cars to pass each other anyway.
Ok but not sure why Berkeley road North becomes no entry as wont this just throw ALL traffic up mayfield and then even residents of top section will need to go up mayfield to get round to there own properties ? Not sure what this achieves really ? BRN is hardly a big thoroughfare ?
No specific comments
Not sure this is necessary or beneficial
I agree with this
No real opinion on this.
I don't believe the problems are that bad to warrant this much change
I support this.
Agree
I think that if it eases traffic flow then yes, id be for it. It will need simulations to prove this out though.
Making Earlsdon in to an array of one way streets will not work as traffic has only one way in and out of the area and traffic will quickly become congested if, for example, someone is taking a delivery. Imagine if someone breaks down in the road, no-one will be able to travel in their cars.
This may be good for Berkeley Road North, but will increase traffic on Mayfield Road and the lower part of Broadway.
This is not necessary and is too restrictive. It will force traffic onto other roads which will become over congested
Agree in principle; traffic monitoring should be put in place to ensure that EAS -> Mayfield -> Broadway -> Albany does not become a common shortcut when the roundabout at the top of Albany Road becomes congested.
What problem is this trying to solve?
OK
I am not sure this will work it will give more traffic on Earlsdon Ave
Yes
Mixing two way cycle traffic with one way car traffic could be confusing and cause usage conflicts
This could have detrimental affect on business owners in the surroundinv areas.
It's a good proposal
This might work - but I can't see how this would provide more kerbside parking as suggested given that both sides of the road are already parked on.
I don't see what difference making Berkeley Road South fully one way will make. Currently only a short section of Berkeley Road South is two way and any traffic taking this route can only turn right down Moor Street. I disagree with making Berkeley Road North no entry from Earlsdon Avenue South.
This will cause major problems on other roads. This is disjointed thinking.
Good idea to save on blocked traffic
I was unsure about why this would be needed. Having spoken to someone from the planning department I see that this is linked to the road closures if there is a market. My concern would be that it could drive more traffic along earlsdon Street as cars would only be able to do a long loop. At present many cars come up Berkeley Road

Comments received regarding extending no entries and one-ways
South and then down Moor Street and round. All cars would then need to drive up to Providence Street and down Berkeley Road South.
I think it will be a muddle for drivers.
I am not fully convinced by this part of the proposal, due to its impact on cyclists. As a cyclist, I currently use Berkeley Road South (BRS) and Moor Street to avoid the busy roundabout at the library. By making BRS a one-way route, I would be travelling contraflow. And while this would be legal, according to the proposal, I fear that the limited width of the road will worsen conflicts with motorists who will not expect cyclists to travel contraflow. Increasing parking would further remove space for cars and bicycles traveling in opposite directions to avoid each other. A more robust closure at EAS would avoid this. I strongly oppose using the freed-up space for parking - parklets, street trees, planters and cycle parking (particularly close to Earlsdon street) would be a much better solution. For the Berkeley Road North (BRN) intersection with Earlsdon Avenue South (EAS) I would prefer a full traffic filter - it's easier to enforce compliance with a planter in the road and would make BRN more attractive to cycle on. A no-entry point is a useful first step. To improve visibility for vehicles (motorised or not) emerging from BRN or Mayfield Road onto EAS, buildouts may be helpful.
Disagree
Not a good idea as vehicles are just pushed down other roads making them busier. Keep access to Berkeley Road North from Earlsdon Avenue South.
Disagree strongly
No comment
Will this put more pressure on the round-about and with the proposed crossing and other surrounding changes, will we see more car queuing and thus more pollution?
No. Will cause more problems. One way at the moment works well.
We reject this idea. Can see no benefit.
Agree with this proposal
I agree. It is a good proposal.
I approve
Pointless, works fine as it is, will make life more difficult for residents.
This proposal is not required. The roads should be left as they are. This proposal will make the area more difficult for business owners to run their business, and for customers who want to use the businesses. Existing Yellow lines for parking restrictions are abused by a minority and they need enforcement, not additional one way systems. This idea will make Earlsdon undesirable for visitors to the high street shops and businesses. Creating the death of the high street even quicker. Existing one way loop causes confusion for some. This proposal could result in adverse unintended consequences for pedestrian and road safety. Will also increase journey times and create more pollution from vehicles as a result.
No opinion as to the changes but any one way routes (existing or new) need to be better marked on the road so that it's clearer for people going the wrong way.
Making Berkeley Road South fully one-way will INCREASE the traffic on other residential roads, such as Osborne Road and Styvechale Avenue, for example by visitors to the Criterion Theatre. The case has not been made for why this is necessary. If this is only linked to markets in the High Street, this is a disproportionate measure considering how rare those events are likely to be. As I cyclist, I do NOT welcome the idea of two-way cycle traffic on a one-way street; this feels very dangerous to me.
Disagree with the proposal. Not needed.
Not sure of the point of this?
I'll be honest with you, I don't understand what you're doing. How is it two way but no entry? Like... No entry for who? Who can go down there? This really needs clarifying because I was speaking to people and some people on that road genuinely don't know if they'll be able to park outside their house. It makes *no* sense to quite a lot of people.
Cannot see advantage
Traffic around this route is relatively low, so unclear what this would achieve.
That could work.
No. Puts more traffic on to Earlsdon Street

Comments received regarding extending no entries and one-ways
Good idea if increased parking
good
Ill thought out proposal.
No I do not want more one way streets.
Ridiculous proposal which will simply move traffic onto Mayfield Road.
Indifferent to this
I am against this proposal. I don't believe that the perceived negative implications of the current traffic layout are significant. I walk, cycle and drive through the roads on a regular basis, and am currently comfortable doing so.
Over complicated
Seems to no advantage & a pointless exercise.
I do not support this proposal. As someone who regularly walks along these streets I do not perceive there is a problem with traffic currently. The impact of this proposal will be to increase traffic (and congestion) on Kenilworth Road, Earlsdon Avenue South and lengthen journeys (with the consequent impact on air pollution and carbon emissions as people who live in Earlsdon try to continue with their normal daily activities.
I support this proposal. I would like to see the extra kerbside space be used for planting to make the area more pleasant
I am probably OK with this but there is already an issue with people going the wrong way down Moor and Providence Street then I suspect the junctions will need to be realigned to make it clear which way to enter the roads. There is also a risk that this will put more traffic onto the High Street when in fact it would be good to have less traffic on the High Street
Yes
I disagree. It is unfair and unnecessary to prevent residents on Berkley Road from accessing their road from Earlsdon Avenue. This is not a busy thoroughfare and is not needed.
Ok. How will it affect cyclists going against the car flow? I suspect motorists won't give way so either clear cycle contraflow lanes are needed or cyclist passing places / refuges.
Ok
Are you seriously proposing to have a one way street fir cars but make it 2-wsy for cycles? Can you not see that this would be dangerous? There is absolutely no need to extend the one way system.
No firm view
I am opposed to the closure of access to Berkley Road North from Earlsdon Avenue South as this is likely to increase traffic over the length of Broadway. If, as it claimed, this closure will reduce through-traffic using Berkley Road North to access Albany Road from Earlsdon Avenue South then surely this traffic will instead use Mayfield Road/Broadway (or even Belvedere Road/Broadway) for the same purpose. Clearly the effect of this would be to increase traffic on a greater length of Broadway.
Berkeley road south should remain 2 way from providence street to Earlsdon ave south it is never that busy . Closing Berkeley road north wii push traffic onto mayfield road, these tend to be avoided anyway as cars are parked either side so the main roads are the preferred option.
Another crazy idea. This will force more traffic onto Earlsdon avenue south and the high street. I can not support this idea
I am not in favour of the proposal to close access to Berkeley Road North from Earlsdon Avenue South as it is likely to displace traffic onto Broadway. If vehicles which currently use Berkeley Road North as a cut-through from Earlsdon Avenue South to Albany Road can no longer do so, they are likely instead to turn down either Mayfield Road and then Broadway, or Belvedere Road and Broadway. Traffic levels in Broadway are therefore very likely to be increased by this proposal.
Agree
No benefit in extending the loop to BRS under normal circumstances. The argument that it will help "familiarize" everyone to the occasional closure for market gates seems very weak. No comment on the BRN block off.

Question 4

What do you think about this proposal:

Installing a bus gate on Spencer Road at the junction with Dalton Road, near to King Henry VIII school. This means that only permitted vehicles such as buses, cycles and taxis would be able to travel between Dalton Road and the entrance to Parkview flats. All other parts of the street remain fully accessible. No frontage loses any vehicular access to their front door or parking places.

Comments regarding Spencer Road bus gate
Disagree
When road works have been in place by central six this has been an alternative route
Excellent plan
This will stop Dalton / Belvedere being used as a short cut
Too many parents of king Henry's drop off come down dalton and use dalton / morningside junction as a turning circle. This is on a bike path and I've seen so many children and adults nearly be hot because the drivers are on auto pilot. I think residents of dalton road should also have access to the automatic gate
Again, this increases traffic flows elsewhere
This or something else is much needed. In the mornings and afternoons Morningside and Dalton Road becomes busy with parents of Henry's turning around. Most of the time they are looking down roadway to see if they can do it without stopping whilst turning and is very dangerous. Other options could be a camera for this U turn behaviour or bollards in the middle of the road
Make this stretch between dalton road and the kenilworth road one way. Local traffic will be forced on to other streets to get out of Earlsdon if this becomes blocked off. Making it one way would stop it being used as a cut through. This is already an issue as it is difficult to turn out of beechwood ave on to Kenilworth road
I can't quite understand where this would be. We regularly drive to KHVIII school to use the swimming pool, so would be a big detour for us if we couldn't drive on Spencer Avenue OR access Warwick Road or Stivichall Ave from Beechwood.
This will involve substantial detours for anyone wanting to head out of Earlsdon to the station (& returning) it'll also increase traffic along Dalton Road & Belvedere for those forced to divert back to Earlsdon Avenue only to return along Kenilworth Road & Warwick Road, more traffic, more congestion, more pollution. A poor idea. It also sounds like another money-spinner if there is a camera similar to the one on Stoney Road at the back of Coventry station!!
Great
Again good idea to reduce traffic flow in an area where children are often walking.
One of the few proposals I really dislike. It will just concentrate traffic onto already busy routes/junctions and will feed the 'bus gates are only about generating revenue' rhetoric.
Doesn't affect me
Don't see that working
I need to know more on this, can I still drive down Spencer Road from city centre/central six and turn left into Dalton Road. If not this will make my journey to Mayfield Road longer and more harmful to the environment?
Yes great
Do not see how this creates a benefit
Unsure
better for the school
This could be explained better. Linking the proposal document to the question so that it opens in a new tab, or including the images from the proposal in this survey, would help.
not sure - this would make it more challenging to access Huntingdon Road from the ring road.
Will make Spencer Rd less if a rar run

Comments regarding Spencer Road bus gate
I'm not happy with this
Agree
I do not agree with this
I am not supportive.
Not sure
Not sure this would be adhered to. How will it be enforced
If this was introduced without the other Spencer Avenue measures it was cause increased traffic down a very busy road. If other measures introduced as suggested it would be fine.
Don't think this is necessary
Good idea.
Where will the traffic that uses this be pushed too?
I'm concerned that many of the changes will funnel traffic in to Earlsdon ave South. The traffic lights on Kenilworth road would need to be re-planned as they will not take the additional traffic.
For residents living in the streets not in the right area! Will have restricted access
No
I can see this causing traffic issues for school drop offs. Backing up on warwick Road and Spencer avenue.
Dont like it! PLEASE DONT DO THIS! creates less flexibility
Again I'm not 100% clear on this proposal, where will traffic coming down Spencer Rd go, if Spencer Ave is closed in that direction and Dalton Rd is closed to cars? Dalton Rd, then Belvedere are much wider than the top part of Spencer and then it would have to be Mayfield if you were driving to Earlsdon, which is equally narrow.
Great idea. It will also stop speeding through traffic and this will be much safer for families crossing to Spencer Park playground with small children and bikes.
No views
No opinion.
Good idea
This feels unnecessary
No chaos
Not necessary
Good idea
Not in agreement.
Not in favour
I am very much against this. This would limit access to King Henry's school and it is used by the wider community for swimming lessons etc.
Not entirely clear on how this would work but I see a risk of traffic spilling through Belvedere Road, which already is used as a rat run. Rather than restrict traffic between Dalton Road and Warwick Road (only populated on one side and fairly sparsely), a better solution to me would be to direct traffic via existing arteries - Earlsdon Ave North and Albany Road. I may have misunderstood the proposal though - the fact sheet is not clear.
Should this go ahead, I would favour a 24 hour bus gate with a concession for Zone EA (not CA per the info sheet) parking permits.
Again, this will need effective monitoring and enforcement.
Like this
This would not cause issues for me as, although they are longer, there are alternative routes. I have a friend who lives in Spencer Road for whom it would increase their work commute by a considerable amount if the one way system was introduced.
Disagree with proposal as again limits options out of Broadway.
Fine
No need
Don't agree. This is a major route to the city centre and train station and Central Six.

Comments regarding Spencer Road bus gate
Fully support - will remove through traffic from all streets in the area. The bus gate should be 24/7, and should exclude taxis as well. Enforcement needed (cameras?)
A segregated lane would help to promote bus/active travel as it would reduce congestion but it helps that no frontage loses any vehicular access to their front door or parking places.
Strongly disagree - this currently is an alternative route into town and reduces traffic on the Kenilworth Road
Strongly disagree-restricting the traffic from Spencer Ave into town will create congestion elsewhere
No issues.
Agree
Unsure why this is required.
Could residents of Spencer Avenue be allowed through the gate? The problematic traffic is caused by rat running and it feels like residents are being penalised with reduced access and longer journey times. Also, will Ubers be allowed through the gate? If so, the reduction in traffic may not be large enough to be worth it.
I am unclear how the bus gate would work. From the description I think it would mean personal vehicles would not be able to travel between Dalton Road, or Spencer Road (near Spencer Park) towards King Henry's School and vice versa. If that understanding is correct, I am in favour of reducing through-traffic on these roads, but living on Albany Road I would advocate for access for Albany Road residents in addition to Zone CA residents if the bus gate is implemented. Without this access, if this measure is implemented alongside the other measures suggested, the only access to Albany Road from the Kenilworth Road /Warwick Road side of the area would be along Earlsdon Avenue South, thus disadvantaging a sizeable group of residents.
Good idea
How do you get to Spencer Park?
This will be a big inconvenience to the majority of people living on the East (Spencer Road) side of Earlsdon Avenue(s) as this is the best way to drive into town/railway station/A45. Closing off this bit to cars will mean we all have to use Earlsdon Avenue South to reach Kenilworth Road. This is already a very busy road and will increase the pollution on this stretch which will affect residents. I'm not quite sure what this proposal is trying to achieve. Not many bus routes use that junction and, when I've been on the bus, there has never been any delay there so there seems no need to close it to cars. I wonder as well if closing this bit near the school will mean parents will drop children off in less safe/more inconvenient areas on the main road instead of Spencer Road which is generally safe for children to be picked up/dropped off. One other thing which concerns me is personal safety. As a lone woman, when walking back from the railway station to my house in Newcombe Road, I actively avoid walking through Spencer Park when it is dusk or dark for my own safety and instead walk up Spencer Road. As there are regularly cars which drive past, I do have the confidence to walk on this road and assume that the fact there is regular traffic would deter anyone from approaching me. If there was no traffic on a large part of the road and only a very occasional taxi or bus, I would be more concerned for my safety and it would vastly affect whether I chose to travel by train or not, especially in the evenings or in the winter. I am also concerned that this will stop people coming to use Spencer Park. Many families drive to Spencer Road to play on the recreation ground, children's play area, tennis courts or use the café on a weekend. It's wonderful to see so many families enjoying the area and also spending money in the pavilion which I hope will lead to it being able to stay open, or even hopefully increase its provision. If the access to this road was restricted with people having to go the route of Earlsdon Avenue South/Albany Road/Broadway/Spencer Road rather than just turning into the road directly, many wouldn't use the parks and would find somewhere much easier to access (e.g. Memorial Park).
Generally in favour. Could there be an exemption for residents for more direct access to homes?
I can understand the problem of congestion caused by parents dropping off / collecting pupils but stricter enforcement of permissible dropping off zones could be applied without making the road a no through route for drivers trying to get onto Warwick Road. I can foresee problems with motorists blocking the road by having to make 3 point turns !
No, you are just going to push all of the traffic either onto EAS or Albany Rd which is already bad enough.
Don't understand this. Does mean you can't go from Spencer Ave to Spencer road? Surely it will increase traffic along Dalton road and belvedere back onto earlsdon Ave to return down Kenilworth. Seems stupid to me.

Comments regarding Spencer Road bus gate
Makes sense.
I think this is a great idea that will stop a lot of through traffic.
This limits access again to and from Earlsdon for anyone living that side of the area. Makes for more traffic funnelled down Albany Rd which can get congested at peak times anyway. Would annoy me to have to drive further to get to places such as central 6
The main issue with Spencer Road is parked cars and the volume of traffic using this road. Clearly these measures would improve that, however I am not sure where it is anticipated the current traffic would go instead?
It would force access into Mayfield Road which is very narrow. As a resident of Spencer Avenue I feel it important to be able to drive up the road. The residents should still be permitted access.
This sounds like an excellent way to prevent through-traffic on the otherwise pleasant Spencer Avenue, without losing any key access to the park and various electric car charging points there.
Agree
Agree
No opinion
Agree
Don't like this proposal at all.
I like the idea of this a lot.
I support this proposal. It will stop people using Spender Ave as a rat run. Uber drivers should not be classed as taxis for this proposal
This would create massive inaccessibility issues for those on Spencer Road and neighbouring streets and push more traffic onto the already congested Earlsdon Avenue South, it's difficult enough now to get out onto EAS.
I am concerned that as someone who lives at the furthest reach of the area under consideration this combined with other changes are reducing again viable routes into the city. You are forcing me to either go down Beechwood Avenue to try and force my way onto the congested Kenilworth road or down Earlsdon Street which will back up if a zebra crossing is installed by the City Arms and is already a festival of poor parking, then either Earlsdon Avenue South where you acknowledge there is already a queue for the lights or down Albany to queue at the lights to turn into Spon end. This forces me to spend more time in my car with more pollution which is what happened with the removal of right turn lights at the junction of the Kenpas Highway and the Kenilworth Road. (The person who signed that off should be made to drive that route on a frequent basis). The market gates on the high street could lead to further closures of that route. My concern is as soon as one of the two viable routes left are blocked the whole area becomes gridlocked. I'd also like you to understand that from my house it's a 45 min walk to where I work at XXXXXX. A 5 mile round trip. I walk once or twice a week but alas at nearly 50 my knees won't take 25 miles a week. Cycling is hopeless because Coventry is in a basin. So it's all downhill in the morning and entirely uphill on the way home (and a death trap - I've tried it). I'd buy an ebike but those just get nicked. There are two buses an hour on the corner of Rochester and Beechwood. One at 53 mins past the hour the other at 6 minutes past which is rubbish planning (!) So a 47 minute wait if you miss it. If you are going to do this then you are shutting my current route to work, so perhaps all those in the 20mph zone should get a bus gate exemption pass as local residents.
👍
I am not sure what this gains and would be a big block on vehicles passing along Spencer Road. A sensible alternative would be "slow, buses entering roadway" signage.
It will make things more dangerous, because speeding electric bikes used by Deliveroo, Just Eat couriers etc will have more opportunities to kill people with their terrible, inconsistent and unregulated cycling.
Totally against this idea. As a car driver I have been using Spencer Road for over 35 years of driving. I pay my Road tax and should not be restricted in this way. Bus gates are awful. I would have to find a different longer route
Bad
No opinion
I don't understand exactly what this would mean. Would access still be allowed from dalton road into Spencer road to access central six and the station?
Excellent idea, this should be rolled out as soon as possible and extended to other coventry neighbourhoods, such as Stoke.
Brilliant idea!

Comments regarding Spencer Road bus gate
What value would this add ?
That sounds reasonable to me.
So we just push more traffic to the dangerous junction by the memorial park / kenilworth road and London road and every one come into Earlsdon down Earlsdon Ave south !
Ridiculous traffic needs to flow not clog up
By far the worst part of the proposal - this is one of the main routes to our house, turning into Belvedere Rd. It was suggested the bus gate could allow cars in the resident permit scheme through which would ease our concerns, but I still think it will force too much traffic further round Kenilworth Rd and cause major issues at the traffic lights by the Memorial Park. Have you done a traffic survey to understand how many cars currently turn from Warwick Rd onto Spencer Rd? You have to assume that most of them would then need to turn at the Earlsdon Avenue junction instead - it will be gridlock!
I think this might be a good idea, but would it mean an increase in traffic flow down toward Albany Road. It's really difficult to drive down Spencer Road already...
I think this will cause traffic to divert to Earlsdon Avenue South. Which already has a high flow of traffic and pollution levels.
Terrible idea. Through traffic to Earlsdon Avenue South is not huge at any time of day but pushing this onto an already highly congested Kenilworth Road will cause chaos
Why do we need a bus gate. How will people living in Morningside get out of their road. This seems a major change to achieve very little and cause great inconvenience.
Against this proposal if its stops cars from driving between Broadway and Kenilworth Road along Spencer Road in either direction.
Despite the fact that this will make my most common car journey more difficult, (out of Coventry, down Leamington Road), something really has to be done to stop this being used as a rat run at rush hour. Parked cars are regularly damaged and there are regular accidents at the junction of Spencer / Albany / Newcombe roads, as cars try to cut across Albany and meet speeding cars coming up Albany under the railway bridge. Something really needs to be done to calm the traffic travelling up and down Albany at this point.
Assuming that this would prevent Earlsdon residents from using the vehicular route from Warwick Road down Spencer Road through Dalton Road to Broadway and Belvedere Road therefore adding traffic to routes via Spencer Avenue, Albany Road and Kenilworth Road. Sort of see that the aim of this is to prevent no residents using the route, however feel that this is detrimental to those living in the area who frequently use the existing vehicular route to access their homes. Proposed one way up Spencer Road to Mayfield and Berkeley Road North - decreases options for routes to access homes and roads are not built to take what will be increased volume from residents alone. Pushing more traffic onto side roads, eg Mayfield, Berkeley Road North -which are less able to take more traffic than Spencer Road and Dalton Road.
this will block my access to the swimming pool at Henrys. A lot of Earlsdon families swim there Friday evenings and Saturday and Sunday. It shouldn't be 24/7
I do not think that this is necessary
no opinion
Bus gate could be, say, 8-10am and 3-5pm. Extra road space should be for car parking
Would only work if residents of streets affected, eg Spencer Avenue, Broadway, Morningside, Dalton Road, etc could go through bus gate. If not they would have longer journeys and increase traffic on Earlsdon Avenue South.
Definitely disagree, unless residents with parking permits are still allowed to go through.
I do not support this proposal
Not sure
Bad
This is a terrible idea as it will hugely impact the King Henry school drop off, parking for spencer Park and regular visitors to central 6 and the train station as you will force this traffic onto the already busy kenilworth road.
Bad idea
As a resident of Earlsdon (who is a cyclist and a motorist) this would be a mistake. I agree with slowing the traffic down on Spencer Avenue and adjusting the central crossing point. But as my main route to the city and back this not good. Smaller narrower roads would suffer from bottlenecks..... e.g.Broadway / Mickleton, etc. Spencer Road is wider, straighter and you can see the traffic coming..
Lots of drivers get caught out by bus gates and end up paying fines for driving on a clear piece of tar mac. Look

Comments regarding Spencer Road bus gate
waht happended when a bus gate was intorduced near the railway station.
I think it's a very good idea
This is likely to increase traffic and parking on smaller streets during school pickup/ drop-off times
Ridiculous - all you will do is force all traffic down the same routes causing additional congestion. So much for clean-air zones!
Neither supportive nor unsupportive. I know that there can be inappropriately fast traffic along Spencer Avenue and Spencer Road and some mitigation is necessary to reduce traffic speeds, but closing off the proposed section of Spencer Road will probably shift a lot of traffic onto already busy Albany road and Warwick Road and caused knock on affects for Parents driving children to King Henry's. I hope the potential impact has been carefully modelled.
And this illustrates my frustration with the whole of this consultation. The original area did not include these streets and these proposals should not have been put forward until everyone had had an opportunity to consider the impact. A bus gate at this point will be a nuisance and I cannot see the justification.
Good idea. Very congested area.
The Spencer avenue traffic will move elsewhere. Why is the proposal needed.
I am Concerned that it will affect my route to work Also concerned re access to properties for community workers NHS/ Social care/ Care agencies
This would lead to many more people using the Kenilworth Rd which is already really busy! We use this route to avoid the traffic on the Kenilworth rd
I don't understand this at all. Traffic on Spencer Road/Avenue is fairly light,. surprisingly so sometimes. Motorists already know that the street can become congested with parking on both sides and many avoid it.. The effect will be to throw more traffic at the Earlsdon Avenue South junction with the Kenilworth road, a junction that already backs up at the slightest pretext. As a resident of Earlsdon Avenue South I'd like to see much more traffic-calming on the road to contain the speed at which some drivers use it. I'm astonished the accident record is not worse than it is. Why no speed cameras on the road? They would pick up the worst driving instantly.
Dreadful. Spencer road is a busy traffic road. Where else are the cars meant to go
I disagree
I think this is a poor idea as you will then push traffic onto Belvedere Road to access the City Centre. Belvedere is already a much more residential road than Spencer Avenue so why do you want to create more traffic on this road. I can't see any benefit in this proposal.
I'm fine with the bus gate as long as local permit holders can still pass through. This bus gate will improve the road as a whole by preventing through traffic, but it has a profound and frankly unfair impact on people who live on Spencer ave. This can be fixed with exemptions to the bus gate for residents.
I agree but think those with parking permits in the area should be exempt
Looks okay
As long as it doesn't affect entrance of cars to the top of Broadway I am fine with this.
I don't have a strong opinion on this. I sometimes use this route to get to the railway station and this will be a minor inconvenience.
I support the proposal
I use Spencer Road to get into and out of my road in a car and on a bike. I am concerned that I will not be able to get to Morningside by this proposal.
Poor
Ok with that
This proposal makes no sense, it is going to make the journey to the station and central 6 from Earlsdon and back again very longwinded, forcing more cars down Belvedere and Earlsdon Ave South. If you lived in Spencer you would have to go right on to Belvedere, left onto Earlsdon Ave South, Right onto Kenilworth Rd. I think this proposal will also create havoc near King Henry with all the school traffic and force even more traffic to use Davenport. Having Spencer ave from Albany one way may be enough to calm traffic on spencer rd without the need for the busgate. Will the bus gate be camera enforced?
Disagree. I have lived in the area for nearly 30 years and used the roads in this area. It gets busy at school times. That is life and not an issue to be resolved. Spend the money elsewhere and not on creating barriers in areas where the problem is minimal

Comments regarding Spencer Road bus gate
This is hard to understand. The idea behind 4 and 5 seems to be to reduce traffic on Spencer Ave. The unintended consequence is highly likely to be more traffic on Broadway - already busy, tight and dangerous.
As a cyclist this will be helpful
As this would most likely mean an increase of traffic on Earlsdon Av south we are not in favour of this solution.
This will force traffic onto even more busy roads (Kenilworth Road, Earlsdon Avenue) and create even more congestion on Davenport Road at school pick up time - this is already very busy.
Absolutely unnecessary
Not sure about the wisdom of this one. Why?
Can you imagine the build up of traffic backing up into the Kenilworth road!???.
Fully support.
Silly
Where are Parkview Flats?
On busy times this may cause traffic?
This would make life difficult for me and my family and I would oppose this
Totally against. This road is used by local people as well as through traffic. Losing this access will overload Earlsdon Avenue South and result in more traffic running through to Beechwood to avoid the lights.
Davenport Rd will take more traffic
Concerned as to what provision has been made for parents dropping children off at school if they cannot enter Spencer rd. they will not park further away and will be dropping off in Dalton rd and doing three point turns in rd (as they already do) also a two minute journey to town/station for us will turn into a ten minute or more journey leading to more pollution and fuel usage.
I support this proposal. I would prefer that there was an exemption for holders of the parking permits that cover Spencer road/avenue and the surrounding areas.
This could make getting onto the Kenilworth Road from north Earlsdon quite problematic. Traffic may be concentrated on Belvedere Road and Earlsdon Avenue South.
No opinion
Disruptive to a range of residents and largely pointless. It will create longer journeys and more pollution. I really question your view that most traffic is through traffic as most residents do move in and out of the road every day and that includes Broadway, Dalton Road, Morningside and Belvedere Road. Giving residents and visitors with parking permits exemption could help and still restrict unnecessary traffic
Don't think it's necessary
Agree 100% - the volume of traffic using Spencer Ave as a cut through is dangerous. How will the bus gates work in terms of stopping cars passing through, will there be cameras present?. Does this also mean there will be no access to Warwick Rd from Spencer Ave travelling from Albany Rd?
Not supportive
Terrible idea. This will make transport to Henry's poor for residents of Earlsdon. It will make traffic on Kenilworth road worst which will make commuting to work for residents awful, and add more distress and waiting times, and people doing daft things as they lose patience. Traffic will become worse, not better
Totally unnecessary and will cause more congestion on Kenilworth Road.
X
Agree - traffic build-up, speeding and noise has long been a problem on Spencer Avenue
Do you think the bus gate should be 24 hours a day? Yes - speeding, excess traffic and noise all happen at different times of the day. A 24 hour bus gate (with residents concession) would eliminate this.
Would you like a concession for existing holders of the Zone CA parking permit? Yes, most definitely - this would make most sense for residents and visitors, rather than penalising them (with potential fines / extended journeys).
Think this is impractical. We use the park a lot. Traffic will be chocca through Spencer Avenue. Which is already a nightmare to navigate.
Mildly disagree with this proposal as it restricts access towards the city centre pushing traffic onto already congested roads at busy times. Any bus gate and monitoring system should be lawfully installed (unlike the camera system to the rear of the train station)!

Comments regarding Spencer Road bus gate
This is not a good idea
I am opposed to this idea. where is the research to show this is needed? It would cause massive inconvenience to residents and just push the traffic onto other surrounding roads making travelling in and out of Earlsdon difficult.
I think that sounds good. I'm particularly pleased that as a person who commutes on my bicycle, I'll feel safer
Good idea
Disagree
I am opposed to this as I use this road frequently both to turn right and left out of Spencer Road
Not acceptable. It would vastly restrict Morningside resident's ability to access different ways into the surrounding road networks.
Completely unnecessary, who asked for this? What problem is it seeking to address???
It will inconvenience me to a certain extent, however I can see the reasoning behind it and therefore support it.
No concerns
Not in favour. That part of Spencer Road is a key entrance / exit to Earlsdon.
I don't agree
Why? It just forces traffic on to another road
No opinion
Agree
This is one of the ones that causes me personal inconvenience (nursery drop-off at Davenport Lodge) but I still think it should go ahead as a trial.
I don't agree with this proposal and can't understand the logic behind it. There is only one bus route using this stretch of road and cycles should be encouraged to use NCN route 52. A bus gate is not the right solution if the aim is to reduce traffic on this section of road.
Very strongly support this. I understand it's very desirable to prevent through traffic on Spencer Avenue, and this proposal should prevent it being traffic being displaced onto Broadway which would be a disaster. (a temporary closure of Spencer earlier this year led to Broadway being completely blocked by cars.) I would also support the lower part of Broadway becoming one way.
My one concern about a bus gate is that it would require enforcement to work effectively, so I hope this is the intention.
Against the change..... Reference Sheet 15 "Less traffic on Spencer Avenue also means less conflict with other traffic at school drop-off and pick-up times at King Henry's School. The bus gate may also help spread out students getting dropped off or picked up across a wider area, and the reduction in traffic may make some people feel more comfortable in dropping off further away and letting students walk further." This change will not prevent parents using Davenport Road as a another cut-through which will increase the traffic flow and throughput on the main Kenilworth Road as car access will be limited on Spencer Road due to the proposals. Where is the evidence that bus gates actually work ?
I am concerned that if a bus gate is installed up by Henry 8th we will have no car access to the Kenilworth Road from Broadway other than by going via very circuitous routes which would add to air pollution. To get to Central Six and the the rail station would involve driving along Earlsdon Avenue South and joining all the traffic going north or driving down Albany Road to Spon End and adding to the traffic there and on the ring road. At present I usually walk but my husband and I are in our late seventies so can see a time when this may not be possible. At present we take our granddaughter to the Cheylesmore Community Centre which involves going down the Leamington Rd from Spencer, but with the bus gate there it would be a very convoluted journey. Having the bus gate would stop all cars from Spencer and Broadway going directly to the Kenilworth Rd. increasing the burden on other roads and adding to environmental pollution.
* Against. A Bus Gate proposal will increase the traffic using Davenport Road and Dalton Road.
* Extending the amount of parking in Spencer Avenue by 34.8m +10.8m and Dalton Road by 18m will encourage

Comments regarding Spencer Road bus gate
MORE traffic looking for parking either for the station or Central 6. The pinch-point created by the Bus Gate means traffic will then have to travel down Dalton Road or Spencer Avenue to exit rather than out onto Warwick Road as now.
* The Bus Gate will increase traffic on Davenport Road, particularly from parents dropping off and collecting children from King Henry VIII. Putting in place other measures to mitigate this is not the answer!
* Taxis and private hire vehicles should NOT be considered public transport and allowed access through. This will soon become a rat run for taxis and Uber drivers heading for the station.
I wouldn't be in favour of this.
Bus gate is madness. Where are parents going to King Henry's going to go? The school gave money to put in the narrowing of road near to Warwick road a few years ago and made Spencer Road safer. The parents need somewhere to drop off that is not on Warwick Road which would cause more problems. They will not use Centre Six. They will just cause even more problems to local residents.
Don't understand what this is trying to achieve
Disagree. Will lead to much more traffic on Dalton road etc at peak times, and make the (already difficult) turn from Belvedere Road to Earlsdon Avenue much busier at peak times.
I am concerned that if a bus gate is installed up by Henry 8th we will have no car access to the Kenilworth Road from Broadway other than by going via very circuitous routes which would add to air pollution. To get to Central Six and the the rail station would involve driving along Earlsdon Avenue South and joining all the traffic going north or driving down Albany Road to Spon End and adding to the traffic there and on the ring road. At present I usually walk but my husband and I are in our late seventies so can see a time when this may not be possible. At present we take our granddaughter to the Cheylesmore Community Centre which involves going down the Leamington Rd from Spencer, but with the bus gate there it would be a very convoluted journey. Having the bus gate would stop all cars from Spencer and Broadway going directly to the Kenilworth Rd. increasing the burden on other roads and adding to environmental pollution.
I understand the intent of this proposal and agree to an extent, in particular to the effort to cut traffic which comes in from Warwick Road. However, the bus gate on both ways will cause more issues for residences as well, and therefore believe the bus gate should only be enforced one way from Warwick Road, and allow traffic coming from Spencer Ave and Dalton Road into Spencer Road. The current proposal will also prevent parents from dropping off their children at King Henry's (on Spencer Road) and cause the large amount of traffic going into Davenport Road, where there's a nursery, which will become dangerous for nursery children.
I understand that only 20% of traffic on Spencer Road and Avenue is residents' traffic, but the 20% are the people who live here and are supposed to benefit from this scheme. The proposal would affect us adversely by cutting off our most direct car access to Central 6, the railway station, and the City Centre. We (my family) favour a CA residents' pass and/or time limitation of the bus gate to the morning and evening rush hours.
Ridiculous
Sounds good
This is a good idea, but only if those people living on Spencer Road or nearby can have an exemption so that they can pass through the bus gate
No comment
Agree
Very supportive, excellent.
I think this will create a much larger build up of traffic in that area.
Absolutely terrible idea! For me, and for every parent who drops off/ picks up their child in the bays of Dalton Road and Spencer Road, the idea of blocking free movement outside King Henry VIII School is outrageous. Many pupils are not local and so require lifts by parents who are usually en route to their own workplaces - they could not walk or cycle as they live far away, perhaps on the other side of Coventry or beyond. I personally drive up Spencer and drop off my child, before driving on and turning right at the traffic lights (Warwick Road) to head towards Kenilworth XXXXXXXX. A bus gate would not encourage pupils to use those buses either; it would merely create a massive inconvenience for parents who would be forced to find alternative and inconvenient routes, most likely increasing the length of their journeys and shifting congestion to other locations, such as Davenport Road (which is already congested at certain times of day. The turn right at the bottom of Davenport onto Kenilworth Road is difficult enough at the best of times and can be quite dangerous. As a payer of tax and

Comments regarding Spencer Road bus gate
council tax, I find the idea that bus users, Uber users and cyclists can use a route from which I might be barred, quite ludicrous and disgraceful.
Oppose, unless Earlsdon Area parking permit vehicles are exempted, in which case I would approve. The reason is the nuisance and extra vehicle emissions caused by the necessary diversions to avoid the bus gate.
good idea but residents in the parking scheme area should be able to use this route
Agree
I don't understand what this means - I have googled 'bus gates' and there are different models. Would this mean no traffic could get from dalton road/Spencer road to Warwick Road?
At the very least this needs to be bus gate for EA permit holders. There is also a concern that people visiting Morningside may get a fine? I m not convinced this bus gate is a good idea at all. I would rather this did not happen.
Cannot see the logic of restricting access - may well lead to longer journeys within Earlsdon.
Don't like this personally
Unsure of the benefit, will increase traffic on Earlsdon Ave south to Central 6, esp as Aldi now closest Supermarket.
Not acceptable. Alternatives: 1) Why not make Spencer Rd a cul de sac stopping at Dalton Rd. Access for all both ways to houses and park from Albany Rd. The #11 bus can still go its normal route. 2) Make Spencer Rd. a one way road from Albany Rd. to Kenilworth Rd. this will reduce the congestion on Spencer Rd. The #11 bus would use Kenilworth Rd. and Earlsdon Ave South as its new route.
In favour
Yes Our family are fully supportive of this proposal. Again it will make area feel safer to walk, and use buses or cycle, and less worry about crossing to dodge cars.
I see no point in this.
I cannot see how this will work for the flow of other traffic and what is the reason for it.
This is ridiculous, with the no entry to Warwick Avenue and Styvechale avenue, all traffic is just going to be directed down earlsdon avenue south. This is already the most congested part of the zone, and it'll lead to more congestion on Kenilworth road because cars will be unable to turn off any earlier than the junction with earlsdon avenue south.
High risk of diverting a lot of traffic to Earlsdon Avenue
Absolutely not. This will increase traffic on Broadway
This would be very frustrating as would channel lots more traffic down to the ring road at the Butts which is already an overloaded junction. Or push more traffic along Belvedere Rd.
Strongly object. This would make it extremely convoluted for about 70% of my journeys and I anticipate would make the earlsdon avenue south junction on Kenilworth Road extremely busy.
Please, please don't do this. Kenilworth Rd and the station are already at a standstill at key times. Cuts roads like Broadway etc off from the station. Puts all access to the station onto a single point of failure ie Kenilworth Rd. I don't think any Earlsdon resident except some of those living on Spencer want this.
No opinion
I DO NOT support this change. The stated objective of this change is to reduce the incidence of speeding on Spencer Road/Avenue. Surely this will be achieved by enforcing a 20 mph speed limit in the area? The impact assessment does not consider the curtailment of residents access into and out of our area. It will have a significant detrimental impact on access to and from Broadway for residents. For example we will only be able to leave the area via the Butts or the Kenilworth Road/Earlsdon avenue junction. Both are already traffic hotspots without the additional traffic displacement you call out as a result of the other changes in the proposals. Specifically this change will make access to and from the station, Central Six, the the town centre as well as journeys needing the A45 difficult in terms of duration and distance. Whilst I would not want to assume a negative impact on house prices, one of the key benefits of the Earlsdon area is its location in the heart of the City and access to facilities Coventry has to offer.

Comments regarding Spencer Road bus gate
The benefits listed appear to be directed at removing traffic all together rather than addressing the objective and stated concerns of residents, which related to speeding. Taking your points in order:
1. Pedestrian safety crossing between the two halves of Spencer Park, would be improved by an enforced 20mph speed limit. Failing that a proper pedestrian crossing rather than the current refuge would surely work?
2. The reference to the National Cycle Route 52 is disingenous at best and is I suspect driven more by the funding opportunity than true benefit. I would be interested to know how this change would actually improve access to and use of the route?
3. I fail to see how reduced traffic flow will enable more carriageway space for use by local residents as there is already parking on either side of Spencer Road up to the point of the proposed bus gate, and doubt very much that residents would use additional parking further along the road, if they were unable to access it because of the bus gate. I note you have asked for feedback on this point and that it is not something residents have specifically asked for.
4. Traffic conflict with Henrys at school drop off, is in my daily experience largely restricted to the Warwick Road end of Spencer Road/Avenue, as well as Warwick Road itself, at the Henrys main entrance and by definition limited to specific times of the day and term time only. The school should surely take some accountability for this itself, if it is indeed an issue. For example they have a large car park and playing fields which could be re-configured to enable a safer drop off area. I would be interested to know if there has been any consultation with the school?
Enabling access through the bus-gate for residents (mentioned in the section 'How can I influence...' would be a mitigation, but does not get over the points I make earlier , that this change does not in itself deliver tangible benefits. I would also be concerned at the councils ability to manage this effectively based on my experience of the Mi-Permit/Taranto parking permit fiasco.
Makes sense. This is a nasty turning and this will make things safer especially for children travelling to school.
Very good idea. I will be happy to drive a little out of my way to make the area safer. I walk and cycle and drive around these streets and this will make it safer, especially for children trying to get to Spencer Parks.
Crazy plan, the only problem with this area at the top of Spencer Rd has only ever been the Henry VIII parents dropping off/picking up pupils and large coaches doing the same. Traffic is busy at going to work/returning home times, but it flows. the new plan would just create other issues in other places where the traffic is increased.
I do not support this as it will create a major inconvenience for Earlsdon residents that far outweighs any routing benefits. Together with the proposals for Spencer Road the bus gate will create further traffic flow problems in Broadway.
not needed
I think this is a dreadful idea. It would cause Spencer AVE and Rd. residents to effectively be trapped.
Not sure as I don't often travel this way.
I am.against this proposal. This means that BroadwY residents will lose the bikity to drive to kr from the A429/Warwick Road via Spencer Road. If coming form certai directions it will mean a detour thus increasing pollution and traffic on those other streets.
See my comments in 2 . Probable increased local traffic Dalton, Belvedere and difficulty turning right out of Earlsdon Avenue South due to congestion.. possible exemption for locals
I think this would be a good idea to make it safer for children walking to Spencer Park and to King Henry VIII school.
Not a good idea at all it will reduce the number of roads you can use to travel into the city centre. Thus resulting in long queues at the remaining routes that are open ie. Beechwood Avenue, Earlsdon Avenue, Davenport Road
Yes please!
Absolute madness, although it would stop inconsiderate parents from parking illegally when dropping off their kids at Henry's. This is one of the main routes into town and Retail 6, and making people drive the long way through wary round will simply cause more traffic elsewhere. I am totally against this proposal.
No! NO! I am totally absolutely opposed to this Bus Gate and cannot emphasise this enough! I frequently use this road (avoiding school times) but at other times I go to Town (support the City Centre shops)

Comments regarding Spencer Road bus gate
and also Central Six, collect and drop people at the station etc etc This is a public road and should remain open for All
Please do it
Agree
No comment
Not needed at all traffic flows freely here perhaps if the current laws regulations and rules were carried out re poor parking etc especially as children leave and come to Henry 8th school you would not need to bring in unwanted and harsh restrictions
Brilliant! This is part of cycle route 52 and having a safer space to cycle where cars and buses aren't trying to get through and get stuck will be great. Queues often tail back up Spencer and also down Broadway due to the bottle neck that exists here. Could you please consider cycle markings/a cycle lane when you do this.
Good
Will cause more traffic issues as those wanting to access Central Six/Station will all be forced onto one route
Strongly Disagree.Spencer Rd is a main exit point from Earlsdon and it's removal will add pressure to other main arterial roads.At peak times the drive from Dalton Rd to Warwick road,via an already congested Earlsdon Avenue and Kenilworth Rd will be unacceptable.The lack of through traffic at night will make Spencer Rd a dangerous route for people to walk into Earlsdon from the station.There seem to be no positive aspects to this proposal
Fully support
No. I am strongly against this. There are useful Health businesses on Spencer Road which will be cut off from Earlsdon. Depriving us of these facilities, perhaps resulting in their closure, makes Earlsdon less liveable. Making Earlsdon Avenue the only safe exit onto the Kenilworth Road will create congestion. Cutting Earlsdon off from the rest of the world does not make it more liveable.
I think this will be dangerous for pedestrians/school children as parents dropping children for the school will be doing U turns to exit. As a resident of Morningside this will make driving routes longer and more congested and I do not support this idea. Could local residents be allowed to pass through the bus gate if it is to go ahead please.
Not sure
No strong feelings either way
Sounds like it will just cause short term confusion and frustration and create unintended problems in the surrounding areas.
Strongly in favour. However I think it should be a one way affair with cars able to travel east up Spencer rd,.
Can't see why
Stopping traffic through Spencer road would be a disaster
Completely against it! This will move traffic somewhere else. The new traffic system at the train station should be torn up and improved. The problem is the mess of a traffic system installed
I don't think this is a good idea
Not fussed
I am not happy about this proposal. Living close to the Broadway end of Belvedere Road, I regularly follow the 11 bus route down Dalton Road and Spencer Road in order to get convenient access to the A45 East to London / Leicester via the Leamington Road and to the ring road east via the station. When the ring road junction at Coventry station was remodelled years ago, access to the ring road E became most inconvenient since it had to be via the junction near the Butts / Odeon: my choice was between going via Albany Road down Broadway or down Kenilworth Road. I do not consider Broadway to be a good route for traffic any more than Spencer Avenue and avoid it when possible: if I were unable to access Kenilworth Road via the 11 bus route, I would feel obliged to travel' in the wrong direction' via Earlsdon Avenue and negotiate 3 sets of lights: to access Kenilworth Road / at the junction with Leamington Road / at the end of Spencer Road. I think a bus gate is overkill as far as eliminating through traffic on Spencer is concerned (as long as Proposal 5 is implemented) and the implications for Broadway would be dire as it would become the most sane route to the ring road E / city centre / station area for many. A concession for the Zone EA (not CA??) permit holders would help but make it hard for visitors.
Don't agree with the bus gate. It would be better to narrow the road and slow down the rat runs. Whilst the scheme reduces people cutting through earlsdon, there are elements which are penalising those who live in the area, this is one of them.
Seems ok. Can't see how this would work in reality, has it been modelled with real stats?
This is an awkward junction. I don't know where Park view flats are but I often go along Dalton Road and turn right

Comments regarding Spencer Road bus gate
past the fields of Henry VIII school. I suppose this is to redirect traffic to get to town by using the Warwick Road?
I do not support this proposal, or if it is implemented it needs to be modified. It will just push traffic coming out of the city centre further up Kenilworth Road and cause longer tailbacks at the traffic lights with a Leamington Road and Earlsdon Avenue South - the latter already gets long queues at times. I live in xxxxxxxx and coming down Spencer Road is my usual route coming off the ring road e.g from University Hospital, or from the east A45 via Leamington Road, these journeys will be longer if I have to go up to Earlsdon Avenue South, particularly if there are longer queues at the lights. I don't see any benefit to the closure other than less traffic on the lower half of Spencer Road, and that traffic has to go somewhere. I am a resident (EA Zone) and I feel it will restrict my access to my home unnecessarily. I believe it will also cause (more) traffic chaos at school pick up/drop off as King Henry parents will try to drop off on Kenilworth Road (despite teachers efforts) or on Davenport Road. I would prefer the bus gate proposal to be scrapped, but as a minimum the proposal to be modified to allow all the residents of Earlsdon Parking Zones access through the bus gate.
Agree largely in principle. As we are directly affected by changes to Spencer Ave which are significant, I think the first communication was poor, there was insufficient information on the context / why of the proposals, road names impacted were confused e.g. Newcombe / Spencer Ave. The supporting detail on the website has more context which I appreciated. Maybe these should also of been distributed through letterboxes to directly impacted households, particularly the demographic I suspect will complain more will not always have access to this material as I think this would of headed off some of the resistance with accurate information. At this point, it is unclear however how we will access our households and I would greatly support the bus gate being extended to allow the area permit holders.
Against it unless there is provision for local residents e.g with parking permits to be exempt
I do like this and as a resident on Spencer avenue this would cause disruption, as an old person who uses my car regularly for certain activities as well as other families on the road this would be a negative for me.
Could the bus gate include residents?
As a resident of Spence Avenue I am strongly opposed to this proposal it will significantly cause me daily nuisance value and inconvenience. this along with the one way system at the bottom of Aspence avenue is very likely yo increase traffic at the top end of Broadway - already a congested street.
Again, this will not have a positive impact and might not be the right solution
Absolutely NIT in favour. Thus will cause immense hardship for parents teachers children at Henry VIII school. Where will they park to collect/ drop off children? It will make an already busy main road outside Henry's even busier with far more schoolchildren around .
Agree
Will cause chaos on other routes which are already busy and congested at peak times
I think this was poorly thought out and no consideration was used in the pupils who attend King Henry VIII school. My daughter attends the school and I am very concerned and upset about her coming out of school especially during the winter months in the dark. It is unsafe and I would not allow my daughter to walk down Spencer road or any where else, especially as there is a house for the homeless in spencer road near the school. There could be anyone around walking around the roads. And she would have to walk further in order to get picked up after school. My 81 year old father picks my daughter up when I am working and he will have to walk further just to pick her up and he has problems with his back when walking. The street lighting is poor and I would not feel safe walking down the road. And when we drop her off at school we make a point of making sure is safely in school. The school have only just included this in their newsletter and we have missed all the meetings.
This would make it more difficult to drop/collect visitors from the railway station but with planning and familiarity I don't see why this should be a problem in the future.
wont affect me
Disagree with it. Pushes traffic to existing congested routes or to narrow residential streets (Broadway)
I agree with this but how will it be enforced? Unless there is a camera some motorists will ignore any advisory signs
This is very bad and dangerous idea which will cause lots of problems. Increased traffic on Earlston avenue south and the Firs. Congestion, delays, pollution, noise will all be worse on these roads.
Do not agree. All cars should be able to access kenilworth road from Spencer road
Not sure how this will help. We visit friends in the flats weekly. Could we still drive and park there?
I don't understand these plans. I think they need some clarification. Does it mean that Spencer Road will be

Comments regarding Spencer Road bus gate
closed to normal traffic so all Spencer Avenue traffic would need to enter via Mayfield or Albany Road? Not sure how that improves traffic particularly for residents of Mayfield road or Broadway
Not sure but something needs to be done to stop the rat runners who regularly block Spencer avenue because they are are unable to drive appropriately and cannot pass cars coming in the opposite direction
All our families are in favour of this. Comments from our families: "The gate will stop THOUSANDS of through-traffic journeys, just imagine the difference that will make to our air quality, noise pollution and road safety – every day of every week!" "This is the absolute Best thing in the whole scheme". "This is a marvellous idea". "Will be loads safer to walk to Spencer park". "can't happen soon enough". "I don't mind to drive a few minutes further if it makes the whole area safer". "Will Ubers be allowed through too?"
Not sure. I understand how through traffic could be persuaded onto more sensible routes but wonder how much this bus gate benefits the school in comparison to nearby residents.
As the area surrounding King Henry school is busy at both ends of the school day this seems only likely to be chaotic. Once entering Spencer Road from Albany Road to collect children and with the proposal to make Spencer Avenue one way the only way to exit Spencer Road will be via Broadway or Belvedere Road increasing the traffic on both roads and having a detrimental impact on the current cycle routes. Nothing has been mentioned with regard to access to and from Davenport Road.
This is an appalling proposal benefiting nobody and causing nothing but increased vehicle emissions and inconvenience and expense for all residents between Kenilworth Road and Albany Road. This would also serve to force more cars onto the proposed cycle route of Dalton Road and Belvedere Road! See (2) above, I would support a 20 mph speed limit on this stretch of road. (ie outside the school)
No mention is made in this proposal to Davenport Road. How do residents access and exit?
Would like people in the Earlsdon Parking Scheme to be able to go through this bus gate. Parents dropping off children at Henry's School will require parking. Where is this to be as there is the danger of double parking if they cannot use more of Spencer Road and so increase danger to cyclists/pedestrians who at peak time are meant to find it easier to cross?
Absolutely not. Bus gates are a money-making trap for unsuspecting visitors and are a general annoyance when trying to get around.
No. Not thought through as to consequences.
I don't agree with closing off Spencer Road for just buses at the junction with Dalton Road, as this will cause cars to use smaller roads and will create a build up of traffic in road that are not suitable for it.
Disagree with this proposal for several reasons. Firstly the traffic on the Warwick Road is already significantly congested and closing this entrance will make matters worse. I see no point in taking the traffic out of Earlsdon and making the surrounding area heavily congested. Secondly, if vehicles cannot turn on to Albany Road from Spencer Road vehicles are likely to turn down Dalton Road or on to Mayfield and head down Broadway to get access to Albany Road. Thirdly, where are King Henry pupils parents supposed to park. If reliance is on parents dropping their children off further away then roads such as Broadway are likely to become congested. Fourthly, will King Henry's coaches be allowed to use the bus gate? If not where are King Henry school coaches supposed to pull up? Fifthly, Earlsdon Avenue is going to become very congested as it will become the main access road in to Earlsdon from Kenilworth Road. Closing so many access points is going to cause a huge amount of congestion in and out of Earlsdon which surely can be of no benefit to the environment. Please note that Broadway has a bend in the road which means people cannot see up and down when driving. Cars cannot pull in to let each other through so they get stuck.
Great
I DO NOT SUPPORT This is a ridiculous idea and will massively impact in a negative way how residents, visitors, trades & delivery people and customers access the locality. People will seek to gain access into Earlsdon through less suited roads e.g Davenport Road from the Kenilworth Road, from Albany Road and Earlsdon Avenue South and North - which are already busy. What impact will it have on King Henry VIII school too? Why should it only be buses that are allowed to pass through Earlsdon?
Good.
I love this proposal. Spencer avenue is unbearable at times and constantly clogged with traffic that cannot pass.

Comments regarding Spencer Road bus gate
Yes it has always been a through road but last few years things have obviously changed: Vehicles such as SUVs and vans more common, Hearsall lane is avoided as has its own issues, Butts and Ikea has had issues so traffic streams from Hearsall common and traffic comes down EAN down Albany and up Spencer. Traffic is now quicker and we have no prevention measures. Henry VIII coach comes up every day and parents galore to collect kids. We have had several incidents with cars hitting parked cars and even shunting up onto pavement and pets at risk. Only last month a car went into the wall at bottom of road. Cars accelerate up the road and the new "crap" noisy road surface makes the noise worse. Stop the through traffic please before someone gets hurt. Not sure letting taxis through is a good idea as they are part of the problem also. Could residents get through via the EAS zone permits ? This would have an impact on EAS., Kenilworth Road and or Hearsall lane and this would of course need to be assessed.
I'm against this as it will stop families in Earlsdon from accessing the swimming pool at King Henry's. We don't have council sports facilities in Earlsdon, and the concessional rates offered by the school are good value for local families. We swim at Henry's on a Friday evening, Saturdays and Sundays. It's not feasible to walk there, especially for the Friday night session, and installing a bus gate will make our journey longer and more polluting as we get stuck in traffic on the Kenilworth Road route
This would certainly stop Spencer Avenue/Road being a rat run when there are other local restrictions
I don't think this is a good idea as it will encourage traffic into other roads, causing new problems. The pinch point is a very narrow time over the year. You mention the parents dropping of in a wider area...where exactly?? Where do you think people who use Spencer as a cut through, should/would go?? The ringroad? Earlsdon Avenue (enough traffic on this already)?
Support. The infrastructure needs to support the buses more though, when turning into Dalton Road the buses often end up mounting the pavement on the corner and I have had to pull my son back a number of times so he wasn't clipped by a double decker whilst waiting to cross the road. The driving behaviours of King Henry parents can be pretty awful so this would definitely help the local population but I imagine there will be strong opposition to this from the school. Also will massively reduce the traffic volumes on Spencer Avenue.
Horrific worst thing proposed.
I wholeheartedly support this. Spencer Avenue has, over the years, become part of an unofficial ring road and rat run for South Coventry. The volume of traffic especially at rush hour and school times is far in excess of what the road is suitable for. The fanfare of car horns and revving engines is a real nuisance.
Not sure why this is necessary?
Yes, I think this is a good idea. Reducing the use of Spencer Ave and Road as a rat-run is a must before there is a serious incident
This idea is crazy shutting off this road to cars, all it will do is push traffic back down in to Earlsdon.
Three problems here: 1. more traffic likely to come onto Broadway. 2. Residents around the Spencer Park area will have to make considerable detours to get onto Warwick Road - increasing air pollution. 3. Extra mileage and manouverability problems for delivery vehicles, some of which are large.
This is not necessary and is too restrictive. It will force traffic onto other roads which will become over congested
Fully supportive on the proviso that EA permit holders are exempted and able to travel through the gate; this is a critical part of the scheme to reduce the through traffic on Spencer Ave but it cannot cut local residents off from that route into the city, the station, Central 6 and King Henry's. It would make any occasions on which it was necessary to drive our children to or from King Henry's School, I.e.in an emergency, very difficult.
Not only is this unnecessary but it will cause serious commute time congestion as traffic is forced only Earlsdon Avenue South or Albany Road. This leads to frustration and longer journey times. Traffic on Dalton Road and Spencer Road is not a problem even at peak times.
OK as long as suitable setup for drivers exiting the school and properties effected
I think this is a badly thought out suggestion. 1) It forces me and my neighbours to drive longer routes past more houses in the ELN area. Our congestion problem on Spencer Ave has been made worse by traffic diverting into the area to avoid the Butts and Ring Road changes, ELN changes will push the problem to another road. 2) Taxis are the biggest single problem, they don't demonstrate courteous driving, and don't have the driving skills to know the size of their own vehicles.
I would only accept this restriction if vehicles with local parking permits are also allow free passage.
This would be good if local traffic in the existing residents' parking area bounded by Spencer, Belveder Earlsdon

Comments regarding Spencer Road bus gate
Ave South and Albany road would be allowed through the bus gate by some kind of electronic system. Otherwise it will be extremely difficult for Broadway and Spencer residents to get to the ring road or into town without adding to congestion at Spon End.
A really bad idea it will mean at all traffic will be diverted to Earlsdon Ave, Beechwood etc. Local residents will not be able to enter these roads very easily. It will also reduce the number of people who use Spencer Park as people use the park from across the city and by restricting access from Spencer Road it will mean less people will use the park. There are at the most 6 buses an hour who would use the bus gate. Also parents dropping off children at Henry 8 school will be using the local roads. Could local car owners have access via the bus gate. The traffic on Kenilworth road is busy now with out extra from there being a bus gate..
Yes
The parents from the school can potentially cause a lot of problems for businesses.
I strongly oppose this suggestion as blocking Spencer Road with a bus gate will cause problems for our patients at Spencer Road Dental Surgery 8 Spencer Road. We have a significant proportion of elderly and disabled patients from Earlsdon who will struggle getting access to the surgery. The problems will be worse during King Henry school drop off and pick up time as a long queue of cars needs to turn back at the proposed bus gate which will affect the access to our car park. There are three surgeries @ 8 Spencer road including Dental Surgery, Physiotherapy clinic and Osteopath clinic. In my opinion strict implementation of 20mph zone at Spencer Road will control the traffic effectively with one way system on both Spencer Road and Dalton Road will solve the problem.
This will prevent traffic from cutting through to lower Earlsdon via Spencer road, which will force more traffic down Earlsdon Avenue and make the roundabout near Earlsdon school far busier/less safe
I disagree with this change as I don't think it is necessary and will cause disruption for those genuinely needing to use this route.
This will cause problems with the throughput of traffic on other roads
Good idea for certain times of day only
Having discussed this at a meeting, this does push more traffic into Kenilworth road. This would make the junction with Earlsdon avenue very busy. I would normally drive along Spencer to go to the station but would now need to go out to Kenilworth road. There was some discussion that locals would be able to go through the bus gate but I would live too far away. Would this be an option for more residents?
That's going to push the cars through to Dalton Road, isn't it? Is this not making life more difficult?
This is the feature of the proposal which I would consider the most beneficial. While it would lengthen a few of the car trips me and my family by a few minutes, it would dramatically improve our walking and cycling trips. It will make Spencer Avenue easier to cross, improving access to Central 6 and the city centre. To get the most benefit from the scheme, the bus gate should be operational 24/7, with passage only permitted to scheduled public-transit bus services, emergency services under blue light and active transport. No cabs, no residents, no coaches should be exempt. Taxis and PHV are a major contributor to reckless driving, particularly in the late evening and overnight, and each car that will be able to pass through will decrease the benefit of this measure. It also becomes easier to enforce: Every motor vehicle that is not a scheduled bus or traveling under blue lights should expect a fine. All evidence shows that modal filters are more effective the fewer the exemptions. This bus gate will need enforcement.
Strongly disagree as would add considerable extra time to journeys to the station area and displace traffic on to already very busy roads
Not a good idea as it is closing off routes that are used by everyday traffic and sending this traffic down someone else's road. Imagine the chaos in some of these roads on bin day!
Disagree strongly
No comment
Do not agree. I am not sure what this will achieve. The issues I am aware of with Spencer Road is volume and speed of traffic. Like a number of proposals the problem with Earlsdon is that it is cut off by the train line so there are few crossing places. Trying to push traffic away will not work, so it will cause more queues and issues along other roads, like Earlsdon Ave South, and Beechwood Ave. You will not get people driving all the way to the ring road to come up go via Butts Road to reach the North West of the City or Albany for Earlsdon. It will be a nightmare for schools.
As long as it doesn't bring more traffic to Broadway which is a nightmare already.
We reject this.

Comments regarding Spencer Road bus gate
Terrible idea that will make many journeys longer and more complicated, will mess up traffic flow, and make living in wider Earlsdon less livable.
A bit further away from where I live but don't see any issues.
I agree. It is a good proposal.
I approve of this as the minor inconvenience of a short detour is worth it to reduce through traffic
Ridiculous. Access to town, railway station and Central Six will be much more difficult. Sending more traffic along Spencer Road/Avenue will create problems. Who will benefit?
I do not support this proposal. It is a terrible idea. If necessary put a 20mph speed limit in place. Putting a bus gate prevents local residents freedom to move about the area in their vehicles as they wish. It will also force traffic onto already over crowded routes that will not be able to cope with the increased volumes of traffic. Kenilworth road, Broadway, Earlsdon Avenue north and south, etc. Access to Dalton road will be more difficult resulting in longer journeys and more pollution. Morningside access for visitors and residents coming and going is going to be greatly impacted. The ability to travel to and from the train station with this proposal becomes more difficult and time consuming. Implement the speed reduction and review after an appropriate period of time to measure the results.
No opinion
Disagree with the proposal. Not needed. This will move even more traffic onto Kenilworth Road and its junction at Earlsdon Avenue South or Beechwood Ave.
Not a fan of this as I use that route regularly
Absolutely not. Has anyone who lives in the area suggested this. Parking for parents at KHVIII already causes massive problems and will only be displaced by this proposal, causing more problems for residents.
I oppose this change. Traffic calming on spencer avenue is needed, I don't see a need for these restrictions on spence road
This will add to the already heavy traffic load along Kenilworth Road and, from it, the turn into Earlsdon Avenue South. It will also make Davenport Road a rat run for traffic having to return to Kenilworth Road. If the intention is to protect Spencer Avenue from speeding, there are alternatives, such as making Spencer Avenue one-way between Albany Road and Dalton Road with a 20mph limit (i.e., no entry at Spencer Avenue/Dalton Road). Possibly also speed humps. But do not impose a bus gate at the Spencer Road/Dalton Road junction.
Absolutely no. Preventing entry or exit to Earlsdon, excluding certain areas and cutting businesses off from their clientele and is crazy.
I would like to reiterate my suggestion that all local residents with a parking permit should be allowed to pass through the bus gate.
This proposal will likely create more traffic being forced down Mayfield Road, Belvedere Road and the surrounding residential roads as cars try to access Kenilworth Road, the city centre and east Coventry.
Impractical idea for residents on Spencer Avenue - better to make one way for whole road and use other measures to dissuade through traffic
good
Will Impact in a negative way.
Absolutely not. It's about time the entitled middle class people who use King Henry VIII were expected to drop off their children further away and taught them how to cross the road.
It is important that it should be an electronic bus gate to allow local residents (parking permit holders?) to be able to pass through.
Otherwise the journey by car from Broadway to the station and ring road is going to take much longer (with three sets of traffic lights rather than just one).
There is also the danger of shifting the congestion problems of Spencer Avenue to Broadway.
In particular there is likely to be significant extra traffic in the early morning with parents using Broadway when they deliver children to King Henry VIII School and in the late afternoon when they collect them + taxis when they create a new rat-run to bring people to Earlsdon Street at night.
if permitted vehicles includes those coming to my home.
The no entry shall be at the intersection between Broadway and Albany Road, so not to have any cut-through traffic in Berkeley Road North AND Broadway as there won't be then any reasons to drive in the two streets for non-residents

Comments regarding Spencer Road bus gate
Again, another proposal which will simply transfer the weight of traffic into another area.
I am not convinced blocking Spencer Road like this as currently proposed is a good idea or will work - it is a wide road with good visibility all the way along it, especially so since the residents parking scheme was introduced meaning a significant reduction in parked cars. As a Broadway resident - I don't think the impact on our street has been fully considered on the current plans. Broadway is not as wide as Spencer road which means that along the majority of the road it is only capable of taking one vehicle at a time. This can lead to traffic build up as if a vehicle travels up the road and meets one coming from the opposite direction due to the lack of opportunity to pull in inevitably one will have to reverse and as the road has a significant bend in the road other vehicles will be unsighted to the blockage and continue to approach - at busy times this can cause gridlock as drivers refuse or do not realise that they will need to reverse - the road takes some time to clear residents cannot exit or park (and it does cause danger to pedestrians and cyclists as cars try not to get caught up in the gridlock attempt to reverse at speed or mount the pavement to turn round) and then once cleared it can happen successively until the traffic dies down. This can also happen at non-peak times as deliveries are made to the houses along the street.
There is a concern that built up of traffic on Albany Road or Earlsdon Ave South as you approach the roundabout - cars will divert along Broadway / Belvedere (or even along Mayfield) or vice versa - which will have a significant detrimental effect on these streets - it will not make them more liveable neighbourhood it will have an entirely opposite effect. This should be considered properly before public money is spent on this aspect of the project.
I significant amount of Henry's traffic comes along Belvedere and Spencer Road at drop off and pick up - the concern is this traffic will do a loop using Broadway as the exit either back to Albany Road or back along Belvedere and this would lead to significant disruption as the road will not be able to cope.
I am against this proposal. The key issue on Spencer Road is speeding. This can be sorted through properly policed traffic control measures (e.g. cameras, speed humps etc). The displacement of traffic that would result from the installation of such a bus gate would cause significantly increased traffic on both Kenilworth Road and Albany Road. Traffic has already increased on and around Kenilworth Road due to the opening of Aldi at Central Six. In addition, the development of the VLR along Kenilworth Road will exacerbate the traffic problems, both during and after construction. The environmental impact of queuing traffic that will result from the proposals needs to be taken into account too.
A complete waste of time and will create traffic elsewhere
Trivial exercise
I understand the logic behind the bus gate, however I feel other measures should be explored to remove the Spencer Road 'rat run' situation. There are a considerable number of residents who exit Earlsdon via this road (myself included!) and do not wish to add to the traffic on Kenilworth road/undertake this extra part of their journey. If a bus gate were installed I feel it should be passable/exemptions allowed for EA residents. The council should only implement the bus gate and resulting EA exemption situation if they have the financial/technical capability to roll this out.
I strongly oppose this proposal. I do not perceive there is a problem at the moment. The impact of the change will be to increase traffic on Kenilworth Road, Albany Road and the A429, which already suffer from significant congestion. I therefore do not perceive this as a priority that requires investment at a time of significant financial pressure in local government.
I support this proposal. If possible, I would like a concession for residents of Morningside
Yes
This is completely unnecessary. This would induce even more traffic to Spencer Avenue making it even more of a pinch point in rush hour than it already is.
Against.
Not keen
And where would the other traffic then go to? On to the other roads, causing congestion. Terrible idea.
Not supportive, on balance this feels like a proposal to provide more parking for King Henry 8th School parents who seems to make little effort to reduce their dependency on car travel to drop pupils at the school. However if it does go ahead as a proposal suggest that the bus gate is limited to 7am to 6pm

Comments regarding Spencer Road bus gate
Utter waste of money , extended journey time to get to Morningside & the bowls club . Will cause chaos for children being dropped off & picked up from khv111 school . Leave it as it is It's not a problem !
Yet again another absolutely, crazy ridiculous proposal. This will just push traffic onto the surrounding roads and create new rat runs. I do not support this idea
I believe that this should have been more honestly described as 'closing the road to most traffic' rather than focus on buses. However, there may be a case for some restriction of through traffic. This could be achieved by allowing through Earlsdon residents who have an EA parking permit, including their visitors, and also allowing those who are resident but park their car off the road to apply for a permit - as discussed at the NENA meeting of 3 October,
Some of my comments in response to the proposal relate to the combined effect of the installation of a bus gate towards the top of Spencer Avenue and the introduction of a one-way system at the bottom of Spencer Avenue. My concern is that the undoubted problems of speeding and congestion on Spencer Avenue will be solved at the expense of residents on Broadway.
I am concerned about the bus gate both because of the displacement of traffic onto Broadway and because it will prevent my access to the A429, thus resulting in longer car journeys with a consequent increase in pollution and fuel use. Could holders of EA Parking Permits be allowed to pass through the bus gate, if it is installed?
The bus gate will block traffic which currently uses Spencer Road to leave Earlsdon from Spencer Avenue, Dalton Road, Morningside, Belvedere Road, Huntingdon Road, Mayfield Road and Berkeley Road North. Much of this traffic will in all likelihood be displaced onto Broadway. In addition, parents dropping off/ picking up children from King Henry VIII School are very likely in future to travel to or from the closest point to the school via Broadway.
If the one-way system at the bottom of Spencer Road is also implemented, even more traffic will be displaced onto Broadway (please see my response to Question 5).
It is unclear to me from the plans whether a bus gate is envisaged as operating 24 hours a day and seven days a week, or whether a more permissive regime is envisaged. If a bus gate is introduced, I would want it to operate 24 hours a day and seven days a week.
I am wholly opposed to taxis being permitted to pass through the bus gate. Taxis carrying passengers related to the 'night-time economy' which enter and leave Earlsdon via Spencer Avenue are very likely instead to use Broadway, which provides left turn access to Albany Road. We will therefore be subject to even greater levels of late night noise and disturbance than we currently suffer.
Broadway is a narrow and winding road. We already suffer from speeding traffic and consequent damage to parked cars, animal deaths and injuries and congestion. This will only worsen as the result of the proposals about the bus gate and Spencer Avenue.
I do not agree with this proposal due to the nuisance it would cause and the extra vehicle emissions from having to divert through a different route. I live in one of the streets affected by this proposal and to exit Earlsdon, I would need to drive through other busier parts of Earlsdon (via Earlsdon Ave S) or Broadway which has cars parked both sides narrowing the road and making it hard to see. Please consider an exemption for local residents.
There seem better alternatives to prevent 'rat-running' along Spencer Road (and if necessary Broadway) with their dense housing and heavy on-street parking - we need to use the wide Belvedere road which is the bus route instead. There seems no need to cut off access to Earlsdon generally and Spencer Park specifically from the city centre via Warwick Rd, provided that traffic heading to central or SW Earlsdon is pushed along Belvedere Rd..

Question 5

What do you think of this proposal:

Making Spencer Avenue/Newcombe Road a one-way system which would make Newcombe Road one way from Albany Road to Earlsdon Avenue North and Spencer Avenue one way from Albany Road to Mayfield Road. Cycles would be able to pass through and use the road as two-way.

Comments regarding Newcombe Road one-way system
Positive
Yes agree with this proposal.
Agree
Excellent plan as long as there are more carparking spaces made available
Will improve traffic flow and safety
Great
Agree
Again, just moving traffic elsewhere to give someone else a bigger problem
Fine
Probably a good plan, especially on Spencer Avenue. I have to drive to a friend's house and to a customer on this road and often get stuck in traffic where cars have failed to navigate passing each other and caused big tailbacks.
Great
Support this.
I like it. The crossroads on Albany Road feel quite dangerous as they are due to the reduced sight lines.
Doesn't affect t me
We live in XXXXXXXX on the other side of Earlsdon Ave, joining with Poplar Road. Are we going to be one-way as well??
We would like our side of Newcombe Road bollarded at the junction with Earlsdon Avenue to create a dead end from the roundabout up Poplar Road. This would stop lorries trying to cut through when they cannot negotiate the island on Earlsdon Ave.
More cars using Mayfield Road as a cut through?
Yes excellent
Who will benefit from this change? The main arterial roads will just get busier.
Unsure
unsure
Yes. Good idea. This is a dangerous intersection be ause cars try to cross from Newcombe Road to Spencer Avenue or vice-versa. But, you should consider, where will such traffic go after this change? To Earlsdon Avenue South? Or North, out of the zone, toward the Coventry City Centre?
See answer 2
Happy if the residents approve
Ageee
I would need more information about this
Supportive
Good idea.
Not sure
Good idea
Very good idea. This would solve an increasing issue on Spencer Avenue and do much for the mental health if it's residents!
Don't think this is necessary
Good idea.

Comments regarding Newcombe Road one-way system
This will likely cause excess traffic on Broadway.
Safer
Ok
Why?
Good idea.
Cycling against the flow on a one way street is dangerous.
i dont live or use these roads, not sure really. might help but equally could create more issues
It would be better to make Newcombe one-way the other way as the exit with the junction on EAN is terrible. I also can't see the benefit of making the short section of Spencer one-way that way.
Good idea. Please remember to add signs saying cycles can go both directions so drivers are careful to look out for bikes. Paint cycle signs on the road surface too.
Good
No opinion.
Good idea
No opinion
No chaos
Not necessary
Fully support one way system. Particularly Spencer Avenue. At peak times traffic stops both ways, very noisy and aggressive drivers refusing to give way creating chaos
No comment
Not sure - can be difficult to traverse spencer road but would this not just cause the same problem on broadway?
I don't see any value in this, as it will just shift traffic to Broadway.
In favour
Been needed for a long while, was a resident in Newcombe till 10 years ago and the volume of traffic has increase dramatically.
Strongly disagree. Will turn Broadway into a rat run, particularly the junction between Mayfield and Broadway to return onto Albany Rd. More sensible measures like traffic calming measure should be used in Spencer Ave/Road alternatively.
Will speed reduction measures be put in place? Which way is the one way to operate? The bottom of the road on Newcombe on to Albany is very difficult to exit left or right due to restricted sight lines; this is exacerbated by the parking on the pavement outside the Tanning Salon (lots of people complain about this business and the rudeness and inconsiderate clients they serve)
Don't do it
Don't agree, no need.
Support
I support it as it would make it safer for cyclists and still allow drivers to use the road.
I would add echelon parking along one side of each of these where practical
Good.
Disagree. Will this not just redirect traffic onto Mayfield, Belvedere, Broadway, Mickleton, Stanway etc?
Good idea, gets very difficult to drive on this road due to oncoming traffic.
This would push traffic to unsuitable roads and further complicate travel for residents of Spencer Avenue who are trying to get to Warwick Road.
Agree this would be a good idea.
Not sure and possibly not good for local shops there
This would be difficult to navigate
I have many concerns about this proposal.
In terms of making Newcombe Road one-way, this would vastly inconvenience residents as the junction onto Earlsdon Avenue North is regularly blocked with traffic and so exiting this way is very time consuming. As well as being annoying, my main concern is that traffic will build up down the street while waiting to exit the road and lead

Comments regarding Newcombe Road one-way system

to much more air pollution for residents. At the moment, cars very rarely choose to exit the road that way during busy times or school pick-up/drop off hours and instead use the Albany Road exit meaning that there is no build up of traffic on the street.

I also worry about the increase in traffic if the road was one-way. At the moment, the street as a whole is very quiet. There are businesses at both ends of the street (Taylors Butchers at the top and the funeral directors/curry house/tanning salon/nail bar/Godiva building company at the bottom of the street). The customers, drivers and delivery vans for these businesses do use Newcome Road to park on, but at the moment, just use the very ends of the street to do this and usually exit the same way, meaning that the road as a whole is pretty quiet. If it was one-way, all the business traffic would have to drive the entire length of the road to either get to the business or exit the road meaning we would have far more traffic including lorries. Coupled with the very difficult junction onto Earlsdon Avenue North, this would lead to a lot more queuing traffic and again, poor air quality.

Another concern is the safety of children. As it is dangerous for parents to park on Earlsdon Avenue North to drop their children at the primary school (and this is actively discouraged by the school), many parents use Newcombe Road to park up and take their children safely to the school without having to cross any busy roads. Although a few do come from the Albany Road end of things, many come along Earlsdon Avenue North and turn into our road from that direction. If they were stopped from doing this, I imagine that they wouldn't queue in the traffic to do 3 sides of a square to get to our road from the bottom but would try and drop their children off in less safe areas such as actually outside the school. on double yellow lines or on other side-roads where the children would then have to cross very busy roads to get to the school.

I also wonder how this would effect roads outside of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Scheme. If Newcome Road wasn't accessible from Earlsdon Avenue North, it's unlikely that people would queue in the traffic jams go to the roundabout and then down Albany Road to enter Newcombe Road from the bottom. The more likely scenario is that people will use Kensington Road instead and turn right at the bottom. This road isn't in the Liveable Neighbourhoods area but will be adversely affected by the huge increase in traffic this is likely to cause.

As mentioned in question 2, I think that a one-way road with cycles able to go the 'wrong' way on the road would be very dangerous. At the moment, Newcombe Road is a 2 way road and, because of this, cars go really slowly as they have to pull in to avoid other cars. I worry that if it is made a 1-way street, cars will speed up as they won't expect another car to come down, making it less safe for pedestrians and also very dangerous for cyclists who will be allowed to come down the road the 'wrong' way.

I also have concerns about making Spencer Road one way to Mayfield Road as this will hugely increase traffic along Mayfield Road and Broadway. This was trialled recently during Motorfest when Spencer Road was closed to traffic and led to huge traffic jams on Mayfield and Broadway. This would again lead to poor air quality (and vast frustration) for residents.

As mentioned in question 4, the restrictions around Spencer Road would lead to an increase in cars using Earlsdon Avenue South to exit the area onto Kenilworth Road which would have an impact on the residents of this road as well as potentially stop people coming into and out of Earlsdon to use the shops etc as it will be a lot slower to get in and out of the area from that direction.

Also as mentioned in question 4, restricting access to Spencer Road from either direction would reduce the use of Spencer Park by people needing to drive, rather than walk which would have a negative impact on the area.

The problem with adding more one way systems is that it puts significant pressure on all the remaking roads, shifting the problem. How do the suggestions actually alleviate the traffic problems that exist? I don't think that this is a good idea.

I am concerned that this increases the traffic cutting through from Earlsdon Ave South to Albany Rd via Mayfield and Broadway. Could Broadway also have a one way system to prevent this?

I cannot foresee any problems with this proposal.

This may possibly work. The junctions of both roads are bad for visibility.

Bad. It is already hard to get out at the top onto earlsdon Ave and particularly if yiu need to turn right. I always park faced down newcombe towards Albany road so it's easier to turn left or right and head up the the round about if I need to go towards hersall common. Plus you always have children and parants crossing at the top in the morning next taylors butchers. I don't see how making a street one ways would make more parking available.

Comments regarding Newcombe Road one-way system
The street is still the same length and width.
Perfect. As long as signage is good and planters/ road narrowing is used to enforce
Would this create more traffic on other streets ?
I am very supportive of this idea. I live close to this junction. We have seen a number of crashes. It feels very unsafe on a bike. Crossing the road as a pedestrian here is difficult. stopping some through traffic on spencer and Newcombe road would be good as these roads arnt really wide enough for it. Should make cycling less stressful.
Ridiculous... getting out at the top of Newcombe Rd onto Earlsdon Ave north is horrendous, and will be worse if all of the traffic is overly managed else where.
I am not sure where it is anticipated the current traffic would go instead? Although the two-way traffic on both Newcombe and Spencer means they can become bottlenecks with parked cars and passing traffic, this also results in much reduced traffic speed which would not be the case were the roads one-way.
One way would not stop the boy racers speeding up and down. It would make these roads more dangerous since they would have a clear run, knowing there is no oncoming traffic.
I agree wholeheartedly with this proposal.
Not sure. Will that mean more traffic using Broadway?
Agree
Cycles must have same rules as vehicles
Agree
Would cause too much congestion round the other roads. It seems like cyclists are getting the best deals.
I have limited information on the effects of this, but it won't really affect me.
This is a great idea.
I feel this would create jams and bottlenecks with drivers going to the Nursey and Doctors , pushing traffic back onto other residential streets, which you are proposing restrictions on. It will create accessibility issues. On its own it might work but not with restrictions applied to Arden Street.
This will be chaotic during peak periods
This seems sensible as Newcombe Road is almost impossible to navigate and although I don't agree with the bus gate I do agree that there needs to be some relief for Spencer Road.
Yes 👍
Yes, both initiatives would improve traffic flow along these roads and make them safer.
It will make things more dangerous, because speeding electric bikes used by Deliveroo, Just Eat couriers etc will have more opportunities to kill people with their terrible, inconsistent and unregulated cycling.
Totally unnecessary and would mean I would have to go out of my way to find a different route which would be longer
Indifferent
It will make negotiation around the area difficult
Ridiculous idea. Not needed
I think this is a good idea.
Excellent idea, this should be rolled out as soon as possible and extended to other coventry neighbourhoods, such as Stoke.
Great idea! Should Make it much easier to go up and should reduce cars getting scratched!
No value at all
Not sure about this proposal.
This will cause mayhem for those that live in these streets.
Up to the people who live there
Ridiculous one way will encourage speedsters Where are all these cyclists? See more white vans use road than bikes
Again, not brilliant. I understand why people want to reduce traffic on their own roads but they're not the only people to consider. We all have to drive down other streets to get to our own! Unfortunately not every road can be a cul de sac. The proposals give far too much weight to the wishes of a small number of people that live on

Comments regarding Newcombe Road one-way system
certain streets over the travel needs of Coventry residents, most of whom will be from Earlsdon just trying to get to where they need to go.
This may be problematic if the bus gate has sent more traffic down the hill on Spencer Rd, and then it will have to turn left into Mayfield and then onto Broadway. Seems like they will have increased traffic?
The one way on Spencer Avenue to Mayfield Road does not make sense.
Terrible idea. Is the Spencer Ave/Albany Road junction such a problem throughout the day. This will merely push traffic to the island outside the school/library and then onto the already congested Kenilworth Road
Disagree. Does not aid problem of speeding
I can understand making Spencer Road one way to Dalton Road but do not understand what is achieved by making it one way to Mayfield Road. This will just push more traffic onto Mayfield Road which is already a nightmare to use with parked cars either side.
No comment
See my answer to proposal 4. However, having cycles travelling against the general traffic direction I think is potentially a dangerous idea. Although, with the reduction in through traffic flow, it may work.
See previous comments - pushing traffic onto roads which aren't built to cope with increased traffic due to bus gates etc.
good idea
Totally unnecessary
no opinion
Agree making Newcombe Road one way. Can't see any point in making Spencer Avenue section one as would force cars onto Broadway. In any case, how could it be 2 way if blocked one end? There is not enough space to do dangerous U-turns, especially for large delivery lorries, etc.
Agree junction with Newcombe Rd is very dangerous, but traffic lights would be much safer. One way system in Spencer Ave. might ease up congestion, but same objection as above regarding bicycles being allowed both ways. Would just create an extra danger of colliding with cars coming the opposite way.
I do not support this proposal
No strong feelings but a bit inconvenient
Very bad
Terrible idea as this is not a congested area currently and isn't particularly busy. It's trying to solve a problem that doesn't exist.
Bad idea
Not Great unless the junction by Taylor's butchers was changed for better vision for pulling out. Also, I feel residents will go around and around on one way systems using electric/petrol (not great for air quality/people's finances) looking for parking spaces. Remember the roads being discussed don't tend to have garages or drives.
Again, makes life harder for motorists but a lot nicer for the minority on bicycles.
I think it's a very good idea
Have you modelled what will happen to traffic that normally flows through there? I believe that it will not reduce traffic in the area but will force it through other roads, specifically Earlsdon Avenue south which is already a fast rat run that is dangerous to cross
No - same as Answer No.3
No comment
I think my comments about making other roads in this area one way would encompass how I feel about this. If Spencer Avenue is one way from Albany Road to Dalton Road and Broadway one way the other way then other roads in alternate directions. I don't use Newcombe Road often so won't comment.
Can see the point.
What is the problem with the existing layout.
Again, I don't know what the issues are here, but happy to support if it helps solve a problem.
Newcombe Rd is a difficult road to negotiate. It is tricky to turn on to Earlsdon Ave North. However Spencer Road is an important rd and I don't like the plans to change this
Fine
See above.

Comments regarding Newcombe Road one-way system
Can't see what this is trying to achieve
I disagree
Why are we giving cyclists benefits over other road users. It would suggest that the bicycle lobby has been the greatest influence over these proposals whereas the vast majority of Earlsdon residents require the use of their cars for work and pleasure. Again, I have doubts as to whether this proposal brings any benefits to the majority of Earlsdon residents.
Absolutely fine with this concept, it is a great idea. I would even advocate a complete closure of the bottom of Spencer ave.
Good ideas Spencer Ave is so dangerous there was an accident there just today
Sounds complicated
One way system on Newcombe Road needs reversing (so it flows downhill). This would eliminate the dangerous junction at the top by the butchers where it is very difficult to turn out of Newcombe Rd. This would also force traffic from the Butts up to Earlsdon roundabout rather than using Newcombe as a rat-run.
Good
I am NOT happy with this proposal as it will increase the volume of traffic on Broadway.
I don't have an opinion on this
Having lived on Spencer Ave I fully support the proposal, if it had been in place we may not have moved
I don't agree with this as it will push all the traffic up Broadway.
Traffic would just divert to Broadway which is narrower
Ok
The junction improvements on Newcombe will make it safer. Making Spencer from Mayfield will increase traffic on to Mayfield.
Disagree for all the reasons above. What issue is being 'solved' here?
See above. These proposals could well threaten safety on Broadway.
Newcombe Rd is quite narrow especially with parking on both sides This would probably alleviate that problem
As the roads are very narrow, we would agree with this solution as a possible option
Unclear that this will bring a benefit
Absolutely unnecessary. You will create a motorway shortcut by doing this. Car drivers will put their feet down at the bottom of the road and speed to the top of the road. Due to this speed cyclists are at huge danger if you allow them unrestricted access. Perhaps if you had bothered to do traffic surveillance exercises on any of the roads of proposed changes, you would have realised how woke some of your suggestions are. Leaving the road 2 way, cars have to slow down and this reduces speeding and makes it safer for residents. We have children in this road, we have elderly people and disabled people who do not need fast traffic. I found out about the proposal to make Newcombe rd a 1way street 4 years ago from the sister of one of the council members. Apparently she and her sister found using my road very "slow". My reply was to suggest she got to know her car width so that she would find it easier. So there is no way this is a local resident request, it came from local government years ago.
Good idea.
I think there not that many cyclists .to implement these measures
Fully support.
What is the benefit of this? More traffic pushed up Earlsdon street
Fine
Please look at Point 3 and providing reasoning behind it?
I totally disagree with this. The junction of Newcombe and Earlsdon Ave Sth is dangerous as it is. Access to y property would be from Albany Rd only.
Spencer Avenue needs to be one way so in favour. Changes to Newcombe Road will add extra traffic to the roundabout by the Library so slightly concerned about that.
pulling out of Newcombe on to EAN is already a difficult junction, would this create more traffic here maybe
I fully support this proposal.
I can see this causing more traffic on Albany & Mayfield Road.
Too complex

Comments regarding Newcombe Road one-way system
One way for Newcombe Road does ease the dangerous junction with Albany Road. This is not an issue with Spencer Avenue. All affected residents need to have been approached even if only by flyers. Traffic from Spencer Avenue will divert to Mayfield Road and then down Broadway creating an additional risk at the Mayfield Road Broadway crossroad
I think only the people who live on those streets should decide. If it goes ahead the traffic would be worse on Broadway which is a much smaller road.
I agree with the proposal but I am concerned that this will increase traffic on Mayfield Rd as traffic will be forced to turn right from Spencer into Mayfield
No , it's a terrible idea
Not necessary
X
Agree - low visibility and often dangerous vehicle manoeuvres at this junction
Do you agree with the direction of the proposed one-way streets? Overall, yes. There is a risk that vehicles entering Spencer Avenue from Albany Road are unaware of the bus gate at Dalton Road, so traffic increases on Mayfield Road / Dalton Road / Belvedere Road as a result. Changing the direction of the proposed one-way on Spencer Avenue may help resident outflow, but would also increase on Mayfield Road. The current proposal seems to be the best trade-off.
Do you think the one-way on Spencer Avenue needs to be extended? No - this would limit residents' options for ingress/outflow.
Again this puts pressure on earldon avenue route and school traffic is pretty bad
This would need to be clearly signposted to avoid putting cyclists in danger
Not a good idea
I think that sounds good. I'm particularly pleased that as a person who commutes on my bicycle, I'll feel safer
Good idea
Disagree
Completely unnecessary, who asked for this? What problem is it seeking to address???
I think this would deter motorists from using these roads as a 'cut through' so will cut down traffic. So I support it.
Good idea
Not in favour of one way on Spencer Ave. This will push traffic onto Broadway. We looked at houses on Spencer Road but chose to move onto Broadway as it is much calmer and less traffic. Sorry to sound a bit selfish but those on Spencer know it is key through road through Earlsdon.
I don't agree
It will just force more traffic up Broadway an equally tight road.
No opinion
Agree
I have no issues with this proposal
I support this, and as I said above I would also support making the lower part of Broadway one way.
Convergent traffic onto Mayfield Road will make local parking difficult and challenging for residents.
There are two problems here. One is that all residents of that stretch of Spencer will have to drive up Broadway and then do a U turn into Spencer. Secondly when through drivers find they cannot drive up Spencer they will drive up Broadway and because of the bus gate, would turn into Belvedere to get to Earlsdon Avenue South. This would create chaos on Broadway which is narrower than Spencer. It would also increase traffic on Belvedere which would be likely to be quite speedy as it is a much wider road.
I understand that Spencer is currently used by a lot of non-residents and often cars go at speed, but I feel a better approach would be to reduce the speed of cars by installing speed bumps and imposing a 20 mph speed limit. I do not accept your arguments on page 3 of sheet 15 under "Alternative proposals" that traffic calming would have a negative impact as this would be counterbalanced by drivers having to make longer circuitous journeys which would produce more negative impact.
* Against Spencer Avenue one way. Residents are already being restricted by the Bus Gate proposal. This area

Comments regarding Newcombe Road one-way system
was not included in the initial consultation; - the measure is being proposed due to traffic displacement
No. It seems a pointless proposal and inconvenient proposal as of my answer to question 3.
I've often thought that putting a one way system in place for Spencer Ave and Broadway would be sensible after seeing how Providence Street/Moor St one worked. Making Newcombe Road one way in that direction is madness' have you tried getting out onto Earlsdon Ave? Visibility is awful and dangerous. Making more do this is not helpful.
No opinion
This would be a positive move, as long as it doesn't encourage drivers to ignore the speed restriction.
No Opinion
There are two problems here. One is that all residents of that stretch of road will have to drive up Broadway and then do a U turn into Spencer. Secondly when through drivers find they cannot drive up Spencer they will drive up Broadway and because of the bus gate, would turn into Belvedere to get to Earlsdon Avenue South. This would create chaos on Broadway which is narrower than Spencer. It would also increase traffic on Belvedere which would be likely to be quite speedy as it is a much wider road.
I understand that Spencer is currently used by a lot of non-residents and often cars go at speed, but I feel a better approach would be to reduce the speed of cars by installing speed bumps and imposing a 20 mph speed limit. I do not accept your arguments on page 3 of sheet 15 under "Alternative proposals" that traffic calming would have a negative impact as this would be counterbalanced by drivers having to make longer circuitous journeys which would produce more negative impact.
I realise that a 20 mph speed limit has been politicised by the current government trying to gain votes, but I feel that the only way to improve our living environment, make it safer and reduce pollution is by having a 20 mph limit in all urban side streets as has been introduced in Wales. It is most concerning that central government is talking about taking the authority from local councils to reduce the speed limits in towns.
The corner on Newcombe Rd and Earlsdon Ave is deadly dangerous due to the curve, parking, and the speeding of the traffic on Earlsdon Ave. If Newcombe Rd is to become one way, 20mph speed limit should be properly enforced way before the currently proposed point on this end of Earlsdon Ave, and also the parking in front of the Taylor's Butchers should be cut back, so cars/pedestrians coming out from Newcombe Rd could see the traffic.
Crazy
Don't agree with Spencer AVE becoming one way to Mayfield rd
Fully approve
Good
Would be easier when driving
Very supportive, excellent.
No, I think this will cause a build up of traffic and cause distractions on other streets. Again the cyclists should not be allowed as it's an accident waiting to happen. They should follow the road laws.
Approve
not in favour
Agree
DISAGREE I disagree with making roads one-way. All these proposals will cause more traffic and dreadful queues along Warwick road and Albany road. With residents parking both sides of Spencer Avenue there is no room to speed and again Bin lorries Ambulance etc will block the road so how do you get out if its One-way?
Driving along Newcombe Road is very difficult as it is narrow with parked cars either side so a one-way system could help. Not so sure about Spencer Road.
Seems OK
Think this could help.
Some concern that this will encourage use of the western part of Newcombe road / poplar as a rat run to avoid traffic queueing up to the school. A little disappointed there wasn't a suggestion to make Poplar / little Newcombe one way or potentially blocked at Earlsdon Ave N end.
See answer to question 4 re Spencer Ave. Acceptable for Newcombe Rd.

Comments regarding Newcombe Road one-way system
In favour
I regularly walk to Newcombe Road from Albany Road regularly to see a member of my family. It is on a very dangerous bend which you have to cross very carefully because there is a blind spot also and the Albany Road can be very busy. I welcome any proposal that will make crossing this road mores afely
This would make it dangerous for drivers and cyclists, the rule should be the same for all road users, you cant set different standards as it will be confusing for everyone.
Again cyclists travelling both ways in one-way streets is a bad idea. Part of Spencer Ave. one-way? So anyone living at the Albany Rd - Mayfield Rd end of Spencer Ave would only be able to access their property from Albany Rd if travelling from the city or the Kenilworth Rd? NOt a good idea.
More congestion on earlsdon avenue south and Albany Road.
I wouldn't like this if I lived on Mayfield.
Sounds difficult for residents
I slightly worry the impact this would have on Broadway, has any simulation been done?
Ok re Newcombe Rd but not Spencer Ave
There does not appear to have been an impact assessment on the traffic flow on Broadway as a result of this proposed change? If Spencer Road is one-way Broadway will inevitably have an increased level of traffic. This would be further compounded by the introduction of a bus gate as traffic would only be able to leave Spencer Road by going back down Broadway or Belvedere Road.
In case you are not familiar, Broadway is despite its name, a narrow road with parking on both sides of the carriageway. Visibility is limited as the road bends before the junction with Mayfield Road, making passing traffic even more hazardous.
Good idea, should be safer and less of a rat run.
I think this is a good idea to make drivers aware that this is a residentia area. My only worry is that people will drive faster if it is not two way, they tend to slow down for other vehicles.
A hotch potch of a solution. There is an issue about cars going both ways down Spencer Avenue and Broadway, with cars parked both sides of these roads, there only remains a single central channel for cars and this causes problems for cars trying to pass each other in opposite directions. If these two roads were designated one way (in opposite directions), this problem would be solved.
I do not support this proposal.
not needed
It's very difficult to get out of Newcombe turning right by the butchers. I avoid it. il's very difficult to see left because of the angle of the road. Add to that peak time traffic and you're stuck Why not make it one way down towards Albany?
Support this.
Serves no useful purpose. It will make access to retail park / railway station difficult
I will I crease traffic on broadway and make it difficult for local residents.
Good
I think this is a very good idea, but in order to work it would really need clearly defined bike lanes for cyclists travelling counter to the flow of traffic, which may unforutnately be difficult to implement due to the number of parked cars on both sides of the street in these roads.
Not happy with this the traffic has to go somewhere, and is it really that bad?
Spencer Avenue is so dangerous. The noise created by speeding traffic is scary! It's used as a rat run for impatient people who swear at each other all hours of the day. People using Spencer avenue as a cut through show no regard at all for residents. I've been sworn at many times trying to get my toddler out of his car seat. It needs to be slower and one way or we need to introduce a turning point at the top of Spencer avenue to make it a dead end. This way the cut through wouldn't be used!
All these extra one way systems is just going to cause massive confusion and my street is going to become a rat run. Against.
Traffic down these roads will just be diverted and make it harder to use the adjacent roads.
Please do it

Comments regarding Newcombe Road one-way system
Again should help with roads being used at cut throughs. Earlsdon wasn't designed for as many cars as we have here now
No comment
Again not needed it would restrict traffic flow and cause more traffic to go down certain roads.
Brilliant! I see people whizz down Spencer Avenue daily and then cut up and through - these roads are one way due to the parked cars and people treat them as race tracks. As a cyclist I've been nearly knocked off because there's no where to go when people try to squeeze past. Please could you consider bike markings/a cycle lane on this when you implement it to make cyclists more visible.
Very good
Newcombe onto Earlsdon Avenue is not a good place to get out as it is. This doesn't seem to for with the bus gate proposal
Disagree.No benefit.
Fully support
No. Pointless. Appears to add to congestion at the Library Roundabout and displace traffic onto Broadway.
Not sure as this would cause a rat run through small end of newcombe road and down poplar. Small end of newcombe should be closed at earlsdon ave junction making it a T junction no through road from poplar. My parents live on small end of xxxxxxxx we spend a lot of time there.
No strong feelings either way
Sounds like it will just cause short term confusion and frustration and create unintended problems in the surrounding areas. I would like to be able to drive from my house in both directions/to both junctions more than I would like my road not to continue to be a rat run.
The Spencer part of this will add unnecessary strain on an already heavily congested stretch of mayfield rd between Broadway and Spencer. Strongly against. However, no opinion either way on the Newcombe rd stretch
Sorry I'm losing the will to live here
Can't see what this would achieve
Completely hate it! Dont want it for the reasons above
I think this would lead to an increase of speed up these roads. Currently the passing of cars slows progress in these streets. I don't agree with this proposal
Not fussed
I think this proposal would go a long way towards deterring through traffic on Spencer Avenue / Spencer Road and diminish the hazard posed by two-way traffic where there are houses with parking on both sides of the relatively narrow road in Spencer Avenue.
This appears to be proposed to reduce the rat run - I can see people taking a route down mayfield or belvedere instead (if having to avoid the bus gate).
Seems ok, would need to do a few test runs in reality to be able to tell you what the user experience is. And unintended consequences are.
I approve of any measure that deters cars using these roads as a rat run.
I don't use Newcombe Road so can't comment.
Agree largely in principle. As we are directly affected by changes to Spencer Ave which are significant, I think the first communication was poor, there was insufficient information on the context / why of the proposals, road names impacted were confused e.g. Newcombe / Spencer Ave. The supporting detail on the website has more context which I appreciated. Maybe these should also of been distributed through letterboxes to directly impacted households, particularly the demographic I suspect will complain more will not always have access to this material as I think this would of headed off some of the resistance with accurate information. At this point, it is unclear however how we will access our households and I would greatly support the bus gate being extended to allow the area permit holders.
Firmly Against
Yes - I think this would improve traffic flow in the area and reduce people using Spencer Avenue as a cut through to town rather than the main road
Good idea
I think this is another piece of over engineering. There is little or nothing wrong with the way that the road currently works.

Comments regarding Newcombe Road one-way system
This can work but hard to see the benefit
Again another unnecessary closure. More road signage just makes it more confusing and off putting for drivers .
Agree
No opinion
Again it makes it a lot more difficult to access Earlsdon and no one would want to got to Earlsdon any more. However one thing that really upsets me is the amount of people who use these electric bikes they don't look where they are going, they cut in front of motorists, they have no lights on their bikes and you cannot see them in the dark due to no lights and dark clothing. I especially mean the ones who do the ' just eat 'deliveries they have no road sense.
I have no particular view but the exit from both ends of Newcombe Road is hazardous so if this improves that it is to be welcomed.
This looks like it might restrict access to the four houses of Spencer Mews which would be unacceptable. Turning right out of Spencer Mews is already difficult because of the restricted views caused by parked vehicles One way traffic on Spencer Avenue would be sensible though
Disagree with it. Confusing and unnecessary
Agree but a camera vital as many motorists dont care
Makes life harder for people.
This will make the junction of Spencer Avenue and Mayfield road busier . It is already used as a drive through.
Bad idea. When we drive down to leave Spencer we will have to turn left onto Mayfield which is tight when cars parked each side and then drive down Broadway which is a much narrower road than Spencer. Don't think needed.
Not sure. Whilst it would improve the traffic on Spencer Avenue it will make it more difficult for residents to eg access the train station
So is spencer avenue still 2 way from mayfield to dalton road?
All our families are in favour of these. Suggestions: "Paint signs on the road to show cycles can ride both ways" "Please plant trees along the corner of newcombe and albany to stop cars parking on the pavement"
This is a terrible idea. The junctions of Mayfield with both Spencer and Broadway are already dangerous and congested. Forcing all cars up mayfield and then right into Broadway will make this problem even worse.
Again, not sure. There will be displacement of local traffic onto certain roads which for the residents there probably feels unwelcome.
I think this would be very confusing
Please see my comments on Spencer Avenue in above response. The proposed changes to Newcombe Road are also likely to be chaotic. This is also a parking area for collecting children from Earlsdon school. The junction with Earlsdon Avenue is already very difficult to navigate. With parking on the corner and it being the bus route I do not see how forcing more traffic through this junction can be beneficial.
I can see no benefit to this proposal. Dangerous as it would increase traffic to the already hazardous junction of Newcombe Road / Earlsdon Avenue north
This will reduce speeding on Spencer Rd and make crossing Albany Road easier which is positive. I would however like to see barriers put in place (planters, seats , trees or a cycle parking provision) to ensure that Broadway is seen as an unattractive alternative to Spencer Rd as a through road onto Earlsdon Ave Sth or into area
No thank you.
No. Simply moves problems, shows lack of analysis.
I don't agree with the one way system, as it will just push the traffic into other streets and cause more congestion in Earlsdon
I do not think Spencer Avenue should become one way. By making Newcombe one way this again will displace all traffic to Earlsdon Ave. Also Newcombe Road is quite steep so not sure if the roads were icy this would pose a problem.
Great
I DO NOT SUPPORT
Again i fear that this is just going to push more and more cars down onto roads that are less suited - e.g Broadway

Comments regarding Newcombe Road one-way system
Good. Again, hard for two cars already so this makes sense.
Not so sure about this as if through traffic is reduced (by bus gate at Dalton) then most issues resolved I would think. I am not sure what benefit this measure gives other than restrictive for residents and will mean more traffic at base of Broadway. Newcombe issue is again cut through traffic heading to spencer so gate should reduce this surely. Also Newcombe residents would have to come down EAN to roundabout and down albany to newcombe which seems unecessary to me ? Its the cut through non residential traffic we want to stop as this is the speeding and volume. Residents at base of spencer and deliveries would have to go up spencer round mayfield and down broadway which again seems unnecessary.
making Newcombe one way seems to make sense as it's narrow and used by through traffic
If 4 above is implemented then proposal 5 would make access to Spencer Avenue overly restrictive. I should prefer proposal 4
Agree with this
i fear this would encourage faster speed and be counter productive. The cycling issue for Newcombe Rd needs to be sorted, however. Cyclists can go on the dual path in Spencer Park , as we know.
Fully support. It would break up the Newcombe road and Spencer Avenue 'rat run', which would help to reduce the high speed, high volume traffic every day. Would also mean we wouldn't have to endure endless car horn arguments where the road isn't wide enough for cars to pass each other and everything comes to a standstill.
Terrible
I wholeheartedly support this for the same reasons as given in 4 above.
Ok if a cycle path in both directions is provided - just road markings
It could funnel traffic through smaller roads for residents trying to get off of Spencer Avenue and not be hit with a charge from the bus gate. Needs some more explanation. But again, if it keeps traffic to main roads, then yes Id be for it.
By shutting roads, people have to make longer journeys and make other roads more congested. The sheer stupidity around this scheme in it's entirety baffles me.
We are concerned about this increasing traffic on the lower part of Broadway and Mayfield Road.
This is not necessary and is too restrictive. It will force traffic onto other roads which will become over congested
No view on the Newcombe Rd part of this but question whether the no exit / one way element of Spencer is required given that the bus gate will significantly reduce the overall traffic using that junction and therefore the number of cars cutting across from Newcombe to Spencer. It will also serve to send local traffic heading to Albany Red down Broadway, which is a narrower road and less able to handle volumes of cars.
All this does is to force traffic down Broadway and make it more difficult to exit to Albany Road - and to what purpose? Traffic on Spencer Avenue is not a problem.
OK but will it effect bus routes?
If required this should be part of phased approach. Spencer Ave one way wouldn't be needed at all if Spencer Rd is restricted. No knowledgeable local driver tries to use Newcombe Rd, as the visibility at either end is so poor, and it is too narrow, let Newcombe residents decide what they want.
I am concerned that this would divert traffic to Broadway which is narrower than Spencer and create difficulties accessing the Gilbert richards Centre and Spencer Park.
Really bad idea it will create problems on Mayfield road which is already busy and traffic going up Newcombe road will creaat problems.
Yes
Mixing two way and one way traffic could cause confusion and accidents
Business will be affected as customers will not be able to access the premises easily.
It seems good proposal
Surely it would be safer to have Newcombe Road one way in the other direction - forcing all traffic to turn out of the top of Newcombe Road on to Earlsdon Ave is asking for accidents close to the school - that junction is so blind to traffic, even at 20 miles per hour.
I disagree with this change as I don't think it is necessary and will cause disruption for those genuinely needing to use this route.
This will cause major problems on other roads. This is disjointed thinking.
Goid idea to save blocked traffic
Another muddle-causing idea. Also, what's the status of electric bikes? Are they treated as "bikes" and can they

Comments regarding Newcombe Road one-way system
go both ways? Delivery riders going far too fast are a real problem!!
I do wholeheartedly approve of the buildouts to improve visibility on Albany Road and Earlsdon Avenue South. This is a great, simple, straightforward method to improve safety (and reduce crossing distance). Again, as a cyclist, I am not too enthusiastic about one-way roads. My fear is that drivers not expecting oncoming vehicles assert their might and push through against contraflow cyclists. At the same time, a one-way road may also speed up traffic. I would definitely not make the one-way road any longer, for fear of creating a Spencer Avenue-Broadway circular racetrack, with traffic speeding up on both streets.
Terrible idea- see above
Definitely not good as this would create mayhem at the Earlsdon roundabout by the library. Also the extra traffic would just be cutting through already busy streets such as Huntingdon, Mickleton and Broadway.
Disagree strongly
No comment
Cycles should t get priority. They should follow the rules like everyone else if it becomes one way.
Reject this idea. Again because reducing options for the flow of traffic will just shift the problem to somewhere else....like whack a mole.
Agree with this plan
I agree. It is a good proposal.
I approve of this proposal. Current traffic is regularly either at excessive speed or log-jammed by large cars trying to pass each other in opposite directions which frequently causes arguments. Car door mirrors are often damaged.
Unnecessary, too restrictive. Coupled with proposal number 4, traffic coming along Spencer Avenue from the Recreation Park will have no direct access to Albany Road resulting in more traffic along Broadway?
I do not support this proposal. Introduce a 20mph speed limit first then review the effects of that action.
It is a difficult junction to come out of newcombe road onto earlsdon Avenue North. One way system should be the other direction
Disagree with the proposal. Not needed. Driving out onto Earlsdon Ave North is already a difficult manoeuvre.
Not a fan as it will put more traffic on Earlsdon avenue. Infact it's a ridiculous idea. Fire whoever came up with it.
Can understand wanting to stop the rat-run aspect that these streets experience, but from a personal point of view can only see this increasing traffic on other Earlsdon roads, and in particular on Earlsdon Avenue South.
Not familiar with this area
The only variation I would make to this, would be (as stated in the previous response) to make Spencer Avenue one way from the Albany Road to the Dalton Road junction.
As with other proposals, this will push increased traffic onto Earlsdon Road North, which is already very congested and busy.
One way needs to go further
good
Will impact negatively on other parts of Earlsdon
Absolutely not.
Good idea as long as this does not generate an increase of traffic on Broadway. Every time, there has been roadwork on Spencer Avenue, there has been a very substantial increase of traffic on Broadway with irritate motorists (and trucks and coaches) following their GPS cutting through to avoid backup at the roundabout; the scheme is viable if a no entry is placed between the intersection between Broadway and Albany Road.
This proposal is the most dangerous in my opinion. Spencer Avenue is already a rat-run for speeding traffic. This will only increase if drivers know there is no chance of meeting vehicles travelling in the opposite direction. It will also move traffic away from Albany Rd as they will be forced to negotiate the residential Mayfield Road and Broadway instead. Pedestrians will be at far greater risk.
The proposal to make Spencer one-way as far as Mayfield Rd will effectively make the Mayfield Road junction on Spencer a replacement for the Albany Rd junction further down and will move traffic congestion from Albany onto the far more restricted and residential Mayfield Rd. Spencer Ave is already a rat-run for speeding cars, this will only increase if people think there is no likelihood of meeting traffic travelling in the opposite direction.
I do not think the bottom of Spencer Road should be made one -way. Any traffic coming down will go down Mayfield and attempt to access Albany Road from Broadway - these roads are less suited to the traffic and it would make sense to allow vehicles to use both as they do say today. Turning out of Broadway on to Albany

Comments regarding Newcombe Road one-way system
Road is not as easy as Spencer Road because it does not give as good a visibility as you get from Spencer Road where you can see down Albany road towards the Butts.
I am against this proposal. When combined with the displacement effect of Proposal 4 (Dalton Rd bus gate) this proposal will create more traffic in central Earlsdon at the clock. I question the perceived benefits of the proposal too,
Unnecessary
Unnecessarily complicates traffic flow.
Not a problem for me - works as a measure to avoid the car rat run situation (which as a locally based driver I also hate!) , and beneficial as a cyclist.
I do not support this proposal as I do not perceive there is a problem at the moment. I do not see this as a priority that requires investment at a time of significant financial pressure in local government.
I support this proposal.
Yes
Another unnecessary proposal. I require access to my road and my house which is between Mayfield Rd and Albany Road from both directions. I thoroughly oppose this and it would be ignored by drivers at night especially taxis
Ok. How will it affect cyclists going against the car flow? I suspect motorists won't give way so either clear cycle contraflow lanes are needed or cyclist passing places / refuges.
No opinion
Again, why has nobody grasped the danger of having one way roads for cars but 2-way for cycles? Awful idea.
Supportive - notwithstanding previous comment about bus gate - the suitability of spencer ave for through traffic from albany road to the junction of dalton road is appalling /
It is difficult to comment on this proposal separately from the proposed Spencer Road bus-gate. I'm sorry for the resulting repetition.
I am concerned about the proposal to make Spencer Avenue a one-way system as it will increase the traffic level using Broadway for the reasons listed below. (I have no objection to the Newcombe Road proposal).
Broadway is a windy, narrow street which already suffers from too much, too fast traffic. I understand that the Liveable Neighbourhood Team accepts that the proposed one-way system will result in an increase in traffic using Broadway and it is disappointing that this has not be quantified.
If the proposed one-way system is implemented at the Spencer Avenue/Albany Road junction it is likely that all the local traffic which currently exits to Albany Road from Spencer Avenue will instead use Broadway to do so. (This will include traffic from Spencer Avenue, Dalton Road, Morningside, Belvedere Road, Huntingdon Road, Mayfield Road, Berkley Road North)
If the proposed one-way system is implemented at the Spencer Avenue/Albany Road junction it is likely that taxis and Ubers which currently take passengers to and from Earlsdon Street via Spencer Road/Spencer Avenue (all day and late into the night/early morning) will use Broadway to access Albany Road.
With the bus gate in operation many parents will deliver/collect their children to/from Henry VIII School by parking on Spencer Avenue beside the park. If the proposed one-way system at the Spencer Avenue/Albany Road junction is implemented their only route back to Albany Road will be via Broadway.
Finally - what will be the implications of the bus-gate and Spencer/Albany one-way system for coaches taking children to/from Henry VIII school? Could this not result in coaches attempting to use Broadway to access Albany Road (as occasionally happens now).
For Broadway residents it would be best if the one-way system in Spencer Avenue were not implemented.
No view on Newcombe road . Spencer road should remain 2 way .
Another crazy idea. I do not support this proposal
Support
Some of my comments in response to this question relate to the combined effects of the introduction of the bus

Comments regarding Newcombe Road one-way system

gate and the proposed one-way system at the bottom of Spencer Avenue.

I do not object to the proposal to make Newcombe Road one-way. However, I believe that those most directly affected, i.e. residents of Newcombe Road, are perhaps best placed to comment on this.

My major concern is that the proposal to make part of Spencer Avenue one-way will inevitably displace traffic onto Broadway. It is very likely that traffic which currently uses Spencer Avenue to reach Albany Road will in future use Broadway instead. This includes traffic from Spencer Avenue, Dalton Road, Morningside, Belvedere Road, Huntingdon Road, Mayfield Road and Berkeley Road North.

Moreover, taxis related to the 'night-time economy' will pass through the bus gate and, with their access down Spencer Avenue to Albany Road blocked, will use Broadway to enter Albany Road, since it provides a left turn towards the High Street; they will not use Dalton and Belvedere Roads onto Earlsdon Avenue South since the right turn onto the Avenue provides an impediment to easy progress.

If the bus gate and the one-way system in Spencer Avenue are introduced, parents picking up or dropping off children for Henry VIII School will not be able to pass through to the A429, or exit onto Albany Road via Spencer Avenue. It is most likely that they will enter or leave the area via Broadway. Furthermore, there is a risk that coaches related to Henry VIII School may also follow this route.

The undoubted traffic problems on Spencer Avenue should not be solved at the expense of residents of Broadway. Under the current proposals, this is undoubtedly what will happen, and I am opposed to their introduction.

Agree

The problem with the full set of proposals is they are almost entirely a neighbourhood Traffic Management Plan and do not follow the policy intent as set out by Government and the Council's own documents of improving quality of life and supporting local walking and cycling. More focus is needed on specific crossings for people and cycles at recognised problem spots, not re-directing traffic everywhere. ON THIS SPECIFIC PROPOSAL, a one way will "prevent" (or displace) "through" traffic in one direction but might increase it in the other direction if the route seems less congested to cut-through driver (look at how tricky it is to travel on Broomfield Road with its two way traffic).

Question 6

What do you think about this proposal:

Adding new pedestrian crossings on Albany Road, Earlsdon Street (between the Co-op and the City Arms) and Beechwood Avenue, as well as making improvements to the existing zebra crossing outside the library. Also changes to the Spencer Road/Dalton Road junction to make it easier to cross the road.

Comments regarding new pedestrian crossings
Positive
Agree. This is essential as it's impossible to cross here
This would be well worth doing and safer than everyone just trying to cross anytime. It could cause a lot of traffic up the highstreet as there's no much space on the road because of parking outside the coop and cars coming from various street there.
Good
Excellent plan
Great
Excellent
Great
Agree
We have been asking for a crossing near the Co-op for decades so yes.
Agreed these are required, especially the crossing on Earlsdon street
Good idea
Needed
Good. These are all places that are tricky to cross, but pedestrians frequently need to cross there.
I agree with these
Great
This is a brilliant idea. Walking around with a newborn in a pram I find crossing beechwood avenue difficult due to the fast traffic so this along with the speed limit will help!
Yes - we need more pedestrian crossings and it's odd there isn't already one outside the co-op. Many people cross here.
Good idea
More Zebra crossings are good
Yes
This is one of the most important changes. This crossing at the coop is essential
great idea, needed
Yes. THE COMMENT I CARE ABOUT THE MOST: Put the pedestrian island on Beechwood Avenue near Beechwood Court to the West of the electric pole that is in the pedestrian pavement on the south side of Beechwood Avenue, otherwise pedestrians won't use the island or will have to step into the street when encountering the pole in the pavement. The pavement on the South side of Beechwood avenue doesn't extend past the tennis club entrance to the East, this is why the island should be put West of the traffic pole. Additionally, and better, the traffic pole in the middle of the pedestrian pavement should be removed or the pavement extended. The relevant image is from sheet Number 1, point 4, PDF page 4: https://ehq-production-europe.s3.eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/3410bd8ad0a6a11dec0d97cea85dd805c8c0f0ce/original/1693986593/20fb87b34d7db4f988e

Comments regarding new pedestrian crossings
8ef28e27c09bc_Information_Sheet_Number_1.pdf?X-Amz-Algorithm=AWS4-HMAC-SHA256&X-Amz-Credential=AKIA4KKNQAKICO37GBEP%2F20230908%2Fau-west-1%2Fs3%2Faws4_request&X-Amz-Date=20230908T071754Z&X-Amz-Expires=300&X-Amz-SignedHeaders=host&X-Amz-Signature=fc008ac12f2c72ca974865bbd0103b65e04eafa44788ed8cc9c18fc40fbdcd96
About the pedestrian crossing between Co-op and the City Arms, consider putting it at least a car's length into Earlsdon Street so that traffic may sometimes continue to flow when a vehicle must stop for pedestrians crossing between Co-op and the City Arms, otherwise you will have many cars idling at the roundabout; that is bad for the air and will give the appearance of congestion which will make the neighbourhood feel less liveable.
There is a bus stop and a lowered kerb on Earlsdon Street near the City Arms. Placing the pedestrian crossing between those might be good. If you put it higher on the street, people won't use it (especially the tippy from the City Arms), if you put it lower you'll block the roundabout and create traffic.
What improvements will be made to the Zebra crossing near the library? Consider putting rumble strips or speed bumps on approach to the roundabout, especially on the downhill lane of Earlsdon Avenue South toward the roundabout.
Otherwise, I agree with these pedestrian crossing improvements.
Yes great idea. Earlsdon street is really hard to cross and the existing crossing is too far up.
Excellent idea. Long overdue
Good idea
This essential and perhaps single most important part of plans
I agree with this proposal
Very good idea
Happy with these proposals
Very supportive. I think any measure that can be implemented to reduce traffic speed and improve crossing safety in this area will be a huge benefit.
Definitely.
In favour
Great idea
Supportive of this.
Excellent. Very much needed.
Good idea.
This is an excellent idea and should have been done years ago.
Good ideas, place where traffic can actually see pedestrians crossing though.
Ok
Good idea
Another crossing is needed on Earlsdon st, - maybe better placed further up Earlsdon st for safety
I support this
A pedestrian crossing between the Co-op and the City Arms is long overdue.
yes sounds like good ideas. be careful on positioning on crossing near city arms - don't want it too close to roundabout -
i think outside albany club would be ideal
beechwood avenue - much needed -dangerous bend. maybe near st barbs church?
Any improvements to pedestrian crossings are to be welcomed
Very much needed. I often have to cross these roads with a young child.
Good

Comments regarding new pedestrian crossings
Yes, it is difficult to cross the road safely in Earlsdon High St Currently
I worry about the safety of a pedestrian crossing on Albany Road. There is currently a serious problem of speeding traffic on this straight stretch of road and on Earlsdon Avenue South. Could be addressed by incorporating speed tables into crossings to slow traffic.
A crossing on Earlsdon street is much needed and would be well used. The location so close to the roundabout sounds challenging though and could cause traffic issues onto the roundabout which is already challenging during school run hours
No chaos
Yes this is very much needed, currently very dangerous outside coop to cross over.
No
Agree
Love the idea of adding a crossing and making improvements
Strongly in favour - have seen elderly and disabled people struggle to cross here
Yes, these are very much needed.
In favour, particularly across Earlsdon Street and Beechwood. I also suggest an additional zebra crossing on Earlsdon Avenue North to mirror that on Beechwood as there is limited enhanced crossing between the Earlsdon Roundabout and the Memorial Park.
Really should just make Earlsdon high street completely a pedestrian area only.
Good idea
Agree. Dangerous to cross Berkeley North on Earlsdon Ave South particularly barring the zebra crossing by roundabout. Even then, motorists don't fully observe the zebra crossing where appropriate.
Fine
Would cause congestion on roundabout, put it by Millsys
Concerned that a crossing outside the Co op and City Arms will cause congestion on the roundabout with traffic queuing up.
Fully support. Some drivers on Albany Road drive too fast and aren't careful enough to check for people crossing the existing zebra crossing. Lighting is also poor, reducing visibility at night. Could that crossing be improved, for example with decreased crossing distance, traffic calming, and improved lighting?
New pedestrian crossings would be great as they would allow people to not have to walk as far when crossing the road.
Agree
Agree with this
Good.
Strongly agree
Good idea. The zebra crossing is too close to the roundabout.
Great idea
Agree with improvements to crossing outside of the library to make it one lane for traffic.
Good idea
Good idea
Any new pedestrian crossings would be welcome as long as they are sensibly placed and away from junctions where cars approach quite fast (the current crossing on Albany Road near the roundabout is a little intimidating as cars come round from Earlsdon Avenue North quite fast and then have to try and stop quickly for the crossing).
This is a good idea.
I am in favour of this, though I have some reservations about traffic backing up during busy periods. Can a designated drop off point be included outside the city arms? Taxis/Ubbers etc frequently block the road here when picking up and setting down.
Much needed ! It is a nightmare trying to cross the road at these points with the number of delivery vehicles using the routes. It is particularly dangerous for children and those with mobility or visual problems.
Crossings are welcome and much needed.

Comments regarding new pedestrian crossings
Thus makes since and is needed. Albany road is difficult or a danger to cross to go across to the park. And you get alot of people come down Newcombe Road crossing over to head up to the train station. Like wise on Dalton road. And beechwood, where school children cross heading to king Henry's, finham park schools.
Great idea for crossings. More parking enforcement in the area would be great too
Ok
This is very much needed I stongly support it. I feel that where poplar road could also be improved with safe crossing at the island as you have to watch the island carefully and hope no one drives around the island and onto poplar whilst you are trying to cross. Cars should still give way to pedestrians. Is there something that could be done.
This will cause chaos. The high st is massively congested at school times and another crossing will only make this worse and cause greater congestion.
These seem like sensible proposals, although traffic queuing across the clock roundabout should also be reviewed.
This is required
A better zebra crossing across Earlsdon Street has been needed for many, many years and I agree with this proposal in the short term. In the long term, however, I believe Earlsdon Street would benefit massively from being completely pedestrianised (with clearly demarcated cycle routes, and moveable bollards to allow for delerties to the various businesses on the street itself). I don't see any sensible reason to allow passenger car through-traffic on the high street itself when alternative routes (Kenilworth Road and Earlsdon Avenue North) are already available. I believe it would improve Earlsdon High Street immeasurably. Hopefully others will become convinced of this if we start the process with more regular street markets and other reasons to temporarily close the road to car traffic.
Agree
Agree
Pedestrian crossings are ignored by most vehicles, how will new ones be policed?
Agree
Perfect.
I like the idea of this a lot. It's very frustrating as a pedestrian trying to cross the high street near the bottom, and as a cyclist dodging pedestrians. An extra crossing would get used a lot.
I support these proposals, but wonder if it makes more sense to reverse the directions of travel for both roads. Exiting Newcombe onto Earlsdon Ave North is currently dangerous due to poor visibility. Perhaos a toucan crossing is needed here too, or a mini roundabout?
The lack of an exit from Spencer onto Albany means drivers will divert onto other side roads
In favour these are needed
Agree
Crossing on Beechwood and Albany yes, although I do worry about the current speed of cars on Albany and whether that would be observed. Earlsdon Street I think this will bring the street to a standstill between the people at the City Arms the school and the never ending queue of people going to Greggs/Coop. Which in effect then reduces the route from my area into the city to 1 viable route down Beechwood. If you keep Warwick Avenue and Styvechale Ave open then yes.
👍
Good idea
Yes, good ideas although I have never had problems at these junctions myself.
Fine
Unnecessary
Good
I agree with this. The pedestrian crossing on Beecheood needs to be a proper crossing with lights and needs to be situated between warwich and styvchale avenues to allow pedestrian crossing for those roads.
They are too close to the roundabout.
I think this is a good idea.

Comments regarding new pedestrian crossings
Excellent idea, this should be rolled out as soon as possible and extended to other coventry neighbourhoods, such as Stoke.
Great idea should have been done years ago!
Good idea
I'm hoping this would work and benefit those that live and work/visit in this area.
A waste of money.
Is there a history of accidents - not to my knowledge
Fine although not sure why the crossing can't be closer to the roundabout (where the existing dropped kerb is) without needing to reduce parking.
All good.
Okay
Reasonable subject to no loss of already limited parking
Totally agree.
I agree that new crossings are required but a crossing near Poplar Road is dangerous. As we already have 3 crossings near to each other on the roundabout drivers are just getting going and then are faced immediately with another crossing. I have seen many drivers not stop and have personally had many near misses on the crossing on Earlsdon Avenue.
Improving the crossing is a sensible proposal
Agree. This is needed on Albany Road. On Earlsdon Street, hopefully it will focus peoples minds to cross at the designated place. I am sceptical about that though, because they rarely use the existing one further up by the post office, even when they are near to it.
support this
Beechwood needs a safe crossin at Rochester Road junction - roundabout side (not bates road side.)
This is a good idea
re beechwood crossings - it might be a map-scale issue but the crossing nearest Bates Road appears to be very near blind bend, needs to be further away. There should be crossings along Beechwood Ave after Rochester Road too. Our problems on Rochester are largely to do with restricted vision through selfish and dangerous parking which affects both drivers and pedestrians. Longer double yellows round the bends and a zebra crossing would help. see later comments re proposed road re-organisation
Good
Agree
Yes, agree
I support this. It is a good idea.
Good idea
Bad
Another pedestrian crossing is a good idea but not too close to the roundabout by the city arms. It would be better to be adjacent to millsys.
Spencer road - yes Spencer ave - no Earlsdon st - no Beechwood av - just 1
All great. As long as the 20mph speed limits are policed!
I agree that Albany Road can be difficult to cross and also outside the Co-op but Spencer Road/Dalton Road junction is very easy to cross.
I think it's a very good idea
I support this proposal
The crossing by the island are already too close to the roundabout - people don't see pedestrians clearly enough as they are coming around the island.
Supportive

Comments regarding new pedestrian crossings
I think the crossings at the library should be traffic light controlled and the central islands dispensed with. The timings could be set to give ample time for pedestrians but would allow traffic to flow and avoid the congestion at school opening and closing. As for crossings between the co-op and the City Arms these would be redundant if the proposal to make Earlsdon Street pedestrian only is adopted, though this itself may be fraught with other difficulties such as bus routes and deliveries. Perhaps closing this to traffic apart from public transport (buses and taxis) and deliveries, but then there would be the problem of how to get into the one way system for Moor Street and Providence Street.
Good.
Good proposal. Agree
Great idea.
Will it be safer for school children ? Crossings on Earlsdon street would be good as it can feel tricky to cross as a pedestrian .Slow speed would be good too
Excellent
Agree
Good idea
I disagree. We will lose parking outside the coop, which is needed for elderly and disabled residents.
Pedestrian crossings close to junctions are extremely dangerous so, if you install them they should be some distance from a junction. I see no benefit in pedestrian crossings on Beechwood Avenue as the proposed sites do not often see people crossing the road at that point.
Great improvements.
Great idea. I also think one should be considered on earlsdon Ave South by style stychele avenue as this is so dangerous (by old people's home) or move entirely to another part of the road
Good idea.
Agree strongly. Also need pedestrian cross on Poplar Rd next to the roundabout to make a 'ring of crossings' around the roundabout.
Much needed in all areas
Yes - good suggestions.
I welcome this
This will create gridlock 4 crossing on roundabout
Good idea
I support the proposal
This will be good
Agree
Ok
Good idea
Disagree. Another zebra crossing at this point will create unnecessary problems. If another zebra crossing is needed move it further up the road
In favour
Happy for these improvements to help pedestrians
We would not want a pedestrian crossing between the Co-Op and the city arms as this would risk majorly increasing congestion at the round about, where congestion is already very bad at times. Improving the zebra crossing from the library and putting one on Beechwood Av would be a good idea in our opinion.
This sounds great. I also think we need a safe crossing at the bottom of Beechwood avenue. The traffic speeds are awful coming over the bridge and it feels really dangerous crossing the road at that end. We have to do this multiple times a day with young children and it terrifies me.
Yes - very beneficial for pedestrians to improve their safety noting in particular the proximity to Earlsdon Primary School and high use by children.
Congestion in Earlsdon is caused by buses and the school. We used to have a lollipop lady who did an amazing job at end of the school day. We need to upgrade the existing zebra crossings in Earlsdon to traffic lit ones

Comments regarding new pedestrian crossings
Absolutely a great idea.
Brilliant idea as it is so risky crossing to the Co op ...cars spin fast around that corner from Earlsdon Avenue South ...I have witnessed two casualties thereit's the speed of the cars on Earlsdon Avenue South that cause this as previously stated there are no humps or Cameras ..why does it take casualties to see this is the problem and so long to implement a pedestrian crossing
Fully support.
Yes this will help safety, although needs to be well planned as could cause traffic build up on the roundabout
good idea
It isn't a problem now. You will have 3 crossings within 100m
Positive for pedestrian
I welcome this
There are good parts and bad parts. Earlsdon Street good. Albany Rd & Beechwood depends where they are. Spencer Rd & Dalton Rd pointless.
Strongly in favour. New crossing points are needed here.
agree
Good
I fully support this proposal.
Good! But having a pedestrian crossing on this part Beechwood could be problematic given the sharp bend.
To complex
If it helps pedestrians then it is good
Good idea
Good ideas
Fine- makes sense
Sensible
Good
Very difficult place already for traffic . Current crossing places are accessible and near
Agree - have had multiple 'close calls' as a pedestrian at all of these locations
Yep ok with safer crossing points
Agree, this is long overdue.
This is a very good plan
This is a good idea
I'm not sure about narrowing the road here as I feel it would increase the queuing time for cars, which I'm worried will make drivers stressed and angry and make them take risks that could make using the crossing more dangerous.
Good idea
Ok
Makes sense
Definitely support this proposal.
Good cause blockage onto the roundabout
In favour
Yes, I agree
All crossings should become pelican/toucan crossings to reduce congestion
Strongly in favour, this improvement is long overdue
Agree
Yes, yes, yes, yes please.
These proposals are long overdue and should be prioritised for completion.

Comments regarding new pedestrian crossings
Support this,, particularly a crossing at the co-op, but this should be a zebra crossing because people will not wait for traffic lights changes before attempting to cross the road.
What has happened to the existing pedestria crossing on the Albany Road between the Earlsdon Methodist Church and the Library ?
The proposed pedestrian crossings will slow traffic down during the peak rush hour and school drop-off pick-up times.. Traffic is very slow travelling from Earlsdon Avenue North to Earlsdon High Street. Having a zebra crossing so close the the Co-op will make parking in Earlsdon High Street far more challenging for shoppers and users of the local amenities.
I agree a pedestrian crossing is required in Earlsdon Street and this seems a good idea. I feel the one outside the library is fine as it is.
Additional pedestrian crossings are helpful. One between coop and city arms in particular. Although this is likely to clog the roundabout.... I don't think the need is great at the Spencer Road / Dalton road junction even at school times.
Strongly in favour
Co-Op/ City Arms crossing would be a welcome addition.
Agree. Long overdue.
This is a good proposal, however, it would be good to have another crossing between Millsy's and Bosphorus on Earlsdon high street.
Pleased to see this - long overdue. Ensure street lighting on crossings are LED. The current crossings on Earlsdon St are lacking.
Sensible
Sounds good
All good.
Fully approve
Agree
About time ! My three children have grown up now needed this years ago
Yes, this is essential.
Yes I agree to this
There is a perfectly functional (and large) zebra crossing outside the library and one by the roundabout at the City Arms. So we do not need another one. We also do not need changes at Spencer and Dalton Road to 'make it easier to cross the road'. School pupils and residents have crossed successfully for generations and there are not numerous fatalities. It is not an accident blackspot. Please stop infantilising people. We can cross the road just fine. This is yet another waste of money.
Very much needed.
Approve. However, if the bus gate is approved, the need for changes to the Spencer Road/Dalton Road junction to make it easier to cross the road, would be reduced or even removed.
agree with this proposal but consideration needs to be given to the location of the crossing on Beechwood Avenue to allow both pedestrians and road users ample time to see each other
Agree- overdue
I agree to the extra zebra crossing but feel the extra parking space is dangerous. Being so close to the crossing, any driver pulling in or reversing to a space will create queuing on the roundabout. We already have this!
Agree with additional pedestrian crossings. However, I believe the traffic situation has got a lot worse since the lollipop person was taken away. She used to keep the road much safer by managing the people crossing and prevented congestion around the island. Without her, children and families often cross in a non-stop stream, leading to tailbacks and congestion.
Sensible
Good
Strongly supportive.
Yes Please

Comments regarding new pedestrian crossings
The new crossing on Earlsdon St. is acceptable changes to parking etc. necessitated by the changes acceptable as long as there are no losses to parking spaces in that area. Changes to the zebra crossing outside the library need modifying. Here are some suggestions: 1) Change the zebra crossing into a traffic light controlled crossing so that both cars and pedestrians know who has the right of way. Currently pedestrians cross at the zebra crossing in dribs and drabs and often unexpectedly and in a hurry making the crossing dangerous plus frustrating drivers and also making pedestrians uneasy about crossing with cars often wanting to proceed between pedestrians. (You might want to consider traffic light controlled crossings for the other zebra crossing adjacent to the roundabout particularly the one crossing Albany Rd.). Traffic light crossings control both pedestrians and vehicles only allowing one to proceed at any time. 2) There is no need to change the width of Earlsdon Ave North entering the roundabout, instead mark the road in such a way that the left hand lane traffic turns left or goes straight on and the right hand lane traffic goes up Earlsdon Street.
In favour
Excellent idea! Can this be implemented ASAP. These are 2 areas that can be very difficult to cross! It would make us feel alot safer to cross the road
Sounds like a good idea.
Pedestrian crossings OK
Supportive of this
any improvement to pedestrian crossings is a good thing.
Fine
The best thing would be to move all the pedestrian crossings further back from the roundabout.
Agree that these would be good, the crossings don't seem well designed currently.
Good idea
Great idea
I support this proposal because increasing the number of pedestrian crossings would help to slow down traffic.
Essential, we have been waiting years for a safe way to cross these streets!
This is one of the best features of the scheme. It will make it safer and quieter and less polluted for children walking to school.
Improvements are needed at this junction. Pedestrian need to be controlled as well as traffic. Crossing points need to be a safe distance from the roundabout.
good
Definitely approve.
Pedestrian crossing betwenn Co-op and City Arms is urgently required.
Support this it's very difficult to cross near the Co-op.
Parked vehicles make your proposal difficult
Improvements to current crossing outside the library are welcomed to prevent the roundabout becoming blocked at certain times of the day (ie school arrival and leaving times) . Nontonadditional crossing outside the coop as there are plenty kf ways to cross the road safely by using existing crossings. Anybadditional crossing is going to prevent traffic flow at times of ndaybwhen the roundabout becomes congested
Good
For me, these long overdue measures are the most essential of all the current proposals. I remember campaigning years ago for a zebra crossing outside the Co-op after my son's friend was nearly run over there on their way to Earlsdon Primary school, and I hope this will be implemented as a matter of high priority whether or not the rest of the Liveable Neighbourhood scheme goes ahead.
You have clumped three proposals together. If by pedestrian you mean a Zebra crossing 1. Yes - a zebra crossing from Co Op to City Arms 2. Depending where it is on Beechwood Avenue, yes. (although I have never had a problem) it may well slow

Comments regarding new pedestrian crossings
down the traffic 3. I have never had a problem crossing Spencer at Dalton road. Is it a problem at Henry's start and end of day pick ups/drop offs?
Good idea
Please do
This is the most important aspect. Also the crossing outside the post office is very dangerous, cars don't seem to see it. I have had several near misses on this crossing since living here. It is used by school children crossing to meet their friends on the walk to school and it's very concerning.
No comment
Crossing by Co-OP is easy now I say this as a 69 year old pensioner It is actually easier to cross there than on the zebra crossing (where present day regulations are not enforced such as parking on zig zag lines parking on double yellows and even on the crossing at times.) You will also reduce places for shoppers to stop on an already poor high street.
This would be great!
Excellent, please do it all asap
The crossing by coop will cause more traffic congestion and this will be harmful to the environment. The current crossings are badly placed near the roundabout causing congestion around school times. Lollipop person needed again!
Agree
Support
Yes, Useful, especially new crossing in Earlsdon Street.
Agree
Excellent idea
Yes to all, especially a 4th zebra crossing at the clock roundabout.
Strongly in favour
How about getting the bikes and e scooters off the pavements
Ok
This makes sense. I agree with this
4 zebra crossings would be a nightmare. I think traffic would build up/stop especially at school times. I dont agree with this additional zebra crossing. No view on Dalton Road Spencer Road proposal.
Sound good
I am often aware of the absence of a pedestrian crossing from the City Arms to the Co-op in Earlsdon Street. Crossing the road in Beechwood Ave in the vicinity of the Riddings is also potentially hazardous. I cross Spencer Road at Dalton Road regularly and have not found this particularly difficult or hazardous because of the existing refuge island.
The crossing on the high street near the co-op is in the wrong location. Most people don't naturally cross here. It would be better being located close to or at Millseys - you only have to observe the road to see where most people naturally cross. It is also a challenging junction at moor st so would help slow cars down here, and stop people keep parking on the double yellows around the moor st junction and obstructing visibility for pedestrians. This is a real bug bear - its so dangerous for pedestrians when people illegally park around both moor street junctions
The earlsdon roundabout is a nightmare for traffic as it is, and you are forcing all traffic down the high street as a result of these proposals, so it will only get worse. Pedestrians are often on the opposite side to where drivers are naturally looking for oncoming traffic at the junction - its not a good idea having crossings at the roundabout . As a pedestrian I tend to avoid crossing at the roundabout because its dangerous. I prefer to walk up a street and cross. The beechwood one is useful but please ensure its away from the blind corner, people come round very fast.
Have the unintended consequences been heard and factored in.

Comments regarding new pedestrian crossings
I agree that new crossings are desirable on Albany Road, Earlsdon Street and Beechwood Avenue but I have often crossed Spencer Road by the junction with Dalton Road without having any difficulty.
Yes I would support proposals to improve the pedestrian crossings, particularly on Earlsdon Street and Spencer Road.
Disagree with additional roundabout crossing, it is possible to navigate round the island as it is with the other crossings, maybe look at restructuring for pedestrian throughput but slowing all traffic is unnecessary.
In favour
Yes in favour - it's very hard to cross the road by city arms to co op currently, my son's have nearly been run over
Good Idea, will make it much safer.
Increasing pedestrian crossing is helpful
Ok for pedestrians but worry about the impact on traffic flow if cars have to constantly stop
Improved crossings are always a good idea particularly on the High Street and by the school. Earlsdon Ave north and South will be busier because of some of the ridiculous proposals you are putting forward.
Agree
Good idea
A new crossing would be better, however no one looks when crossing a road anymore.
This should have been done many years ago! Great idea.
reasonable idea
Not sure if this would replace or be in addition to the existing earlsdon street crossing
Agree
Good idea
Not aware there is a problem with crossing the road
Important for safety and heartily agree.
Defintely yes
Its not hard to cross Spencer avenue at the Dalton road junction as there is already a sanctuary in the middle of the road I cross there regularly. A pedestrian crossing is definitely needed on Albany road to enable people getting off the number 2 heading to town to safely cross the road. I agree with a crossing on earlsdon street
All our families are in favour of these.
Good idea
Any measures to improve or add pedestrian crossings are most welcome as long as there is adequate space & visibility for all in order that the crossings operate safely & effectively.
agree these proposals are a good idea.
The idea to add another crossing to Earlsdon Street is ok providing you are prepared for the congestion that would arise from 4 crossings in close proximity. As the bus stop outside the library is inset from the flow of traffic widening the pavement outside the library means that whenever a bus stops so does all the traffic behind it and as this is likely to increase with the one way system on Newcombe Road more chaos ensues. Having done the school run with my own children in the 1980's and my grandchildren in the 2010's I have never found it difficult to cross the road outside this school. If the bus gate comes into force on Spencer Road the only reason to make it easier to cross is the foreseen increased traffic on Dalton Road. With regard to Beechwood Avenue surely it would be possible to incorporate the crossing points into the traffic calming plans.
On Beechwood Avenue the pedestrian crossing outside Hearsall Golf club is completely unnecessary and the crossing between the two traffic calming points should be incorporated into one of those points.
Yes agree but unsure how you propose to make Spencer Rd/Dalton Rd easier to cross. Cars currently cannot see pedestrians or cyclists trying to cross. What will be done to ensure visibility? and how will crossing be eased when dark and at other times?
This is good.
Yes, but roundabout congestion may be an issue.
Adding and improving pedestrian crossings is a good idea

Comments regarding new pedestrian crossings
Good idea to add extra pedestrian crossings. There are currently quite a few crossings close together near the library which causes congestion so it may be worth adding additional ones further up Earlsdon Street. Supportive of all safety measures to help people cross the road safely.
Great. Much needed
There is actually a necessity to keep traffic flowing and with too many crossings in close proximity there is the potential for gridlock which is sometimes experienced at school time on Earlsdon Avenue - as an aside this was NEVER an issue when there was a lollipop patrol which ensured traffic flowed whilst children were able to cross safely and maybe this would be a better way to spend the money - on real people.
A crossing at the church on Beechwood Avenue seems sensible but there does not need to be a crossing on Spencer / Dalton as there is a safe crossing spot already there.
Great, been waiting years for this.
The crossings are very close to roundabout and I often see people driving and concentrating on the roundabout (as busy) and then accelerate off and see the crossing very late. Maybe visibility could be improved or space. This again is mostly a risk from EAN turning into Albany but also Albany into EAS. I have seen near misses.
Generally good except a safe crossing is desperately needed at the junction of Rochester Road and Beechwood Avenue. Many pedestrians from Rochester Road, Woodfield Road and Dorney Close need to cross Beechwood Avenue to reach the shops, primary school, library and other local services. We can't cross on the side close to the bend due to lack of visibility. We need to be able to cross Beechwood on the church side of the junction, not the Bates Road side. The pedestrian refuges will help children walking to Finham school along Beechwood, but there's nothing to help the children walking to Earlsdon school
Agreed
Enthusiastic about this
The problem here is too much traffic and not enough public transport. Even more challenging is that I would say 2 out of 3 trips on foot to Earlsdon St reveal people parking on zig-zags and like to 20mph, or even 30 mph, if there is no policing, the expenditure is pointless. We need to encourage all the locals to come on foot and discourage others to use their cars unless they have to, and are prepared to look for a legal space. I see people arriving for coffee near the current zebra crossing and they don't even use a vacant parking space, just stop on the zigzags. I have challenged a couple of times, but it is nerve wracking I'm not sure what improvements out side the Library re crossing entail, but it isn't brilliant at the moment.
Fully support.
Agree
I support this.
Agree
Yes. It needs it. Please improve safety. The sites mentioned are not fit for purpose as it is and it worries me having two small children.
The theory of this sounds great, but the impact will be that the bus stop will have to move, congestion will be caused with the loading bay and also car parking spaces will be lost.
All good
This is an improvement if pedestrians become safer but I would like these the safety stats first as I consider this to be extreme and unnecessary, pending safety data
Supportive of these subject to them being sensibly located with good fields of view either side.
Good ideas.
Good
New crossings are a good idea.
BUT why not Poplar Road, pedestrians here cannot tell if vehicles on the roundabout are going to enter Poplar or Earlsdon Ave North.
The crossing between the Co-op and the City Arms would be very useful. It is very hard to cross there at the moment. At the moment I find the traffic island at Spencer Rd/ Dalton Rd adequate for crossing over to Henry's.
I am okay with this,

Comments regarding new pedestrian crossings
Very Much Needed
Zebra crossings should be moved further back from the roundabout to avoid existing conflicts with them blocking exit from the roundabout, or replace roundabout with cross road traffic lights plus crossing lights
Business owners and customers should get some exemption.
I support this proposal
Good ideas
I'm not sure I understand all of these proposals from the different factsheets especially the reference to Beechwood Avenue here. I am in favour of the zebra crossing on Earlsdon Street between the Co-op and City Arms although I think this will cause increased congestion at the roundabout at the bottom of Earlsdon Street. It maybe that a zebra crossing could be better positioned away from the roundabout past the Moor Street junction. I am not opposed to the toucan crossing on Albany Road by Spencer Park. I am not opposed to removing the pedestrian refuge on Spencer Avenue but am opposed to the bus gate (point 4 above). I'm not sure where the pedestrian crossing proposal on Beechwood Avenue is. I am not opposed to the improvements to the zebra crossing outside the library although I think it will increase the queue of traffic either side of the roundabout.
Seems a sensible idea
Also need more focus on fixing the uneven and broken paving in the area
Additional crossing points would be good at all these areas.
Pedestrian crossings sound good but will this mean that the bus stops will have to move and will that impact on traffic?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Albany road: the crossing is in an interesting location and will work well as a gateway. I personally would prefer a joint foot-cycle zebra crossing, giving instant priority to active travel (and probably cheaper than a toucan crossing). • Earlsdon Street: This zebra crossing is long overdue. A fantastic idea and sorely missed now. Having to cross between shops either side of Earlsdon Street often means chancing it. This should not be necessary. Get this one done ASAP. • Beechwood Avenue: I cannot find a proper crossing of Beechwood Avenue in the plan. Do you mean the refuge islands near Bates Road and near the Golf Club? The former one is miles off any desire line and pointless from a pedestrian crossing perspective. The latter one is also nowhere near a desire line. Beechwood Avenue needs a proper crossing, preferably directly north of the intersection with Rochester Road. The new highway code would give pedestrians crossing the new side road Beechwood Avenue priority over traffic into and out of the northern section of Beechwood, but in my opinion, safety would be improved by formalising this priority with a side road zebra crossing. <p>I am a trustee of 42nd Coventry Scouts, based at St Barbara's Church. We have around 80 children from the local area attending events at our hut every week, and we encourage them to arrive by active travel. My 11-year-old son now makes his way there on his own, and I would be much more comfortable, if there was a pedestrian priority zebra crossing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spencer/Dalton Road: A buildout with a raised table instead of a traffic refuge is a good idea. A more formal priority to pedestrians with a zebra crossing would be even better.
Agree
Good idea for new pedestrian crossings especially between the Co-op & City Arms and Beechwood Avenue which is very dangerous on the bends by the golf club and Bates Road.
Agree strongly
Yes
Agree. Especially the Earlsdon street one
Fully agree with this from the basic starting principle of enhancing safety.
This is an excellent idea and would definitely help with the safety of crossing at those areas
Yes it's a good proposal.
Approve
Another pedestrian crossing by the Co-op would be useful.
This is not necessary, we already have sufficient crossings in this area. What data is available to say they are required? This will have a negative impact on buses and businesses, and parking.

Comments regarding new pedestrian crossings
Agree with this. Also would like an additional crossing on Poplar Road so that there is a safer crossing for children walking to and from school
A new pedestrian crossing would be welcome at Albany Road. Is this the Toucan crossing detailed in Question 7?
A new zebra crossing would be welcome at Earlsdon Street (between the Co-op and the City Arms).
Zebra crossings are NOT needed on Beechwood Ave.
The existing zebra crossing outside the Library is fine as it is. Leave it alone.
Changes are NOT needed at Spencer Road/Dalton Road junction "to make it easier to cross the road". There is already a 'central' stopping point in the middle of the road for pedestrians. This is a new facility, and does NOT need changing. In fact, the road there has recently been resurfaced.
Needs this
Good
Can certainly see the need for this, however if this means a new crossing immediately on turn into Earlsdon Street, can only see this as the same dicing with death as the crossing between the church and the city arms. Traffic approaches this crossing at speed and often does not stop due to closeness of island. Can only see this repeated if mirrored in Earlsdon Street.
I approve of adding new pedestrian crossing. Crossing at Spencer road/dalton road is not currently a problem.
There are already three pedestrian crossings on Earlsdon Avenue South, Earlsdon Avenue North and Albany Road, around the "clock" traffic island, so it is very unclear why additional crossings are required in this vicinity. Putting no entry at Spencer Avenue/Dalton Road (as mentioned above) would make it easier to cross the road there.
Yes, Especially Earlsdon Street.
A pedestrian on Beechwood Avenue would be helpful.
Good idea, make high street one way and increase parking for local shops
very good
Not difficult crossing road Spencer/Dalton as refuge satisfactory.
No it is unnecessary.
No need for improvement to Spencer Road crossing if there is a bus-gate.
agree to another crossing between Coop and City Arms.
Shall have been done a long time ago
Generally a good idea.
Happy with this
I strongly agree with these.
I like it
Yes
As a local resident/pedestrian user, the pedestrian crossing outside Coop/city arms is a no brainer and should have been implemented a long time ago! Given the speed that some drivers use the roundabout at, I feel that this needs to be implemented with other traffic calming measures e.g. 20mph limit. As a regular cyclist on the sustrans station route I actually don't find the Spencer/Dalton road crossing that problematic, but would appreciate it if there was a 20mph limit/traffic calming measures to slow the odd person going too fast down spencer road/avenue.
I support this proposal.
I strongly support this proposal. This will make the area much safer for pedestrians.
In favour of Additional and improved crossing
Yes, essential

Comments regarding new pedestrian crossings
I agree with the crossing on Earlsdon Street though the traffic is usually so slow on that road it is easy to cross and most drivers let you cross. The on on Spencer Rd is again unnecessary as I have never encountered problems crossing that road at any time of day
Needed for a long time. However, this will not stop entitled people parking on the zig-zags as happens every day – sometimes up to 3 vehicles parked on them. The road is wide enough to have peninsulas on the north side of the crossings so parking would be permitted up to the crossings. Likewise at the approaches to the crossings install guard rails on the pavement the length of the zigzags to further discourage illegal, inconsiderate, selfish and dangerous parking. Also add free parking for 30 minutes in Warwick St carpark – I think you are more likely to be ticketed there than for parking illegally on Earlsdon St or overstaying the no return within 2 hours – as several drivers already do every day.
Why are pedestrian crossings so close to the roundabouts at least once a week we have near misses
Yes definitely
Excellent idea.
Supportive - suggest that the crossing on Beechwood Avenue is nearer the junction of Rochester Road and not opposite the entrance to Bates Road
I support these proposals.
Spencer road/dalton road the crossing is perfectly adequate.do we really need 4 crossings by the island ?!!. Narrowing the road outside the school will cause a big backlog of cars in Earlsdon ave north when the bus stops , now at least the traffic can keep moving . Who on earth would want to sit on a bench right by a road when cars are at a standstill ?!!!
This would work if you remove the bus stops outside of Greggs and Weatherspoons. If the bus stops remain it will just cause gridlock
I am in favour of these proposals as they should increase safety and reduce speed. My only concern is that a crossing between the Co-op and the City Arms might lead to traffic backing up at the roundabout, causing further congestion problems.
Agree
Support these limited extra crossing BUT many more needed to implement the policy objective of safer and easier walking. There is NO crossing now or planned for the 500m stretch of Earlsdon Avenue North between the Broomfield Road traffic lights (Old Clarence) and the Library crossing at Earlsdon Roundabout. The package of Council proposals aim to INCREASE the traffic on this road ("its claimed to be a suitable road") but with no help for pedestrians. By contrast, Earlsdon Ave South has a number of pedestrian 'islands between the Clock and the Water Fountain. The other place desparately needing a crossing is Beechwood Avenue close to Kenilworth Rd, with traffic coming off a fast road. Lots of people from central and northern Earlsdon heading to the park need to cross Beechwood Ave to get to the pedestrian crossing on Kenilworth Rd, as well as the hordes of Finham Park pupils walking to and from school.

Question 7

What do you think about this proposal:

Toucan crossing at the entrance to Spencer Road on Albany Road, improving the Sustrans National Cycle Route, allowing both pedestrians and cyclists to cross the road.

Comments regarding a toucan crossing on Albany Road
Positive
Agree
Good
Excellent plan
Good plan
Great
Agree
Yes
Good idea
Needed
Sounds good.
I agree with this too
Great
Positive
Good. Although there is scope for the Sustrans route to be improved further by taking it off road down the alleyway behind Belvedere Road.
Always happy for a cycle route
Surely this will create traffic backup and slow traffic flow on a road that is going to be busier if you close off others
Yes
Yes please it sounds amazing!!!!
sensible
Ok
Yes in favour
Great idea
Ok
Agree
I agree with this proposal
Good idea
Good proposal
Very supportive
Yes.
In favour
I think you mean Spencer Avenue!?!
A much needed improvement
Good
Good idea.
This is an excellent idea and should have been done years ago.

Comments regarding a toucan crossing on Albany Road
Ok
Restricting parking would be a better idea
I support this.
dont see maybe bikes so cannot comment
Good idea as the visibility for crossing the road here is difficult due to the curve of the road. This will be helpful to people walking through Spencer park to get into town
Excellent idea. We cross this part of Albany road every day with a young child and bicycles to visit Spencer Park and it can be terrifying. Will we have to press a button? If so can the change be instant? Priority for crossing would avoid frustration of waiting/danger of kids not waiting if it takes too long. A zebra crossing might be clearer for drivers and match the ones at Earlsdon roundabout, it would also make a good statement at the entrance to the 20mph zone.
Good
Yes, please.
As above. Could something also be done to replace the numerous missing trees that used to line Albany Road. These have been cut down over the years and not replaced. A similar replanting scheme was undertaken in Spencer Avenue a few years ago and has transformed the local environment. I understand that the City Council has made a commitment to plant several thousand urban trees.
No opinion
No chaos
Ok
Agree
Sounds good
In favour
Yep, all crossings helpful for pedestrians.
In favour
Good idea
Seems all proposals in favour of Spencer Ave at detriment to others, i.e Broadway residents taking the hit in the proposals significantly.
Please speak to a cycling organisation before inventing s cycle plan - the new cycle route at junction 7 doesn't work - you can't access it from Albany Road and when you can get on it... it's stop start every few meters - it is quicker to cycle on the road - this is not how to implement a cycle Lane that you want used. Please look again at junction 7 - and please make sure cycles have space to cycle in - not shared pavements, not extra lights which mean stopping multiple times on a cycle path - especially when that is not mirrored on the road
Good idea
Support. Would be good to see additional cycling provision on Albany Road to connect to it
Helpful as not all cyclists feel safe cycling on the road, but even if they did, they've got to lock up somehow.
Agree
Agree
N/A
Strongly agree
Good idea.
Good idea
Agree.
Good idea
Good idea
Yes, this would be a great addition
This is a good idea.
In favour.
Good idea.

Comments regarding a toucan crossing on Albany Road
Yep, good idea.
Good
Been needed for a while
A crossing here is very much in need. It can be very hard to cross and speeds can be high. A toucan crossing would not be my first choice as there are toucan crossings in the area that can take a long time to change and that leads to people taking risks and drivers then getting frustrated waiting at a red light whilst no-one crosses. Would it be possible for it to be a Zebra crossing? I think it would be good to give Cyclists and pedestrians priority. I think it would match the Zebras on Earlsdon Island. Could it also be a raised crossing to help slow traffic entering the area I'm aware the road will be narrowed but at night time we get extreme speeding and the road narrowing might not be enough to slow some of these drivers.
Yes, crossing this road on a bend is dangerous
This is a good suggestion.
A crossing at the end of Spencer Avenue is vital since it is dangerous trying to cross by the Cinnamon Gold takeaway
I think a Toucan crossing here is a good idea only if followed up with measures to really encourage and allow safe cycling along both Newcombe Road and Spencer Avenue to make this a viable route. I used to regularly travel to the station from the Hearsall Common direction and I never even thought of taking this route, so I imagine it'll need improvements and clear signposting.
Agree
Agree
Not necessary
Agree
Again....too much emphasis on cyclists. They get on my nerves.plus the electric powered cycles are dangerously ridden.
I would like this a lot.
I support this proposal
The proposed toucan crossing here needs to be responsive the needs of pedestrians and not force long waits
In favour. Much more sensible to do this than the bus gate.
Agree
OK but again I worry a bit about speed of cars here observing it.
Yes 👍
Good idea
Yes. We need to move to idea that cars and cyclists share the road. Unless we make it easier for cyclists to feel safe on the roads it is harder to get people out of cars for shorter journeys. This would be a good start and it is a dangerous crossing place for me as a daily cyclist.
It will make things more dangerous, because speeding electric bikes used by Deliveroo, Just Eat couriers etc will have more opportunities to kill people with their terrible, inconsistent and unregulated cycling.
Unnecessary
Good
Agree
Most drivers ignore these anyway
I think this is a good idea.
Excellent idea, this should be rolled out as soon as possible and extended to other coventry neighbourhoods, such as Stoke.
Great idea
No point
The only sensible suggestion in this scheme
Seems over the top to me
A solution to a problem that doesn't exist, but we'll have another empty cycle path we can admire.
Yes please.

Comments regarding a toucan crossing on Albany Road
Okay
Reasonable
Totally agree
Putting a crossing on a corner is asking for trouble. Drivers coming up Albany Road and turning into Spencer Road will immediately be confronted with a crossing which may have someone on it.
Toucan crossings use traffic lights, so will act as traffic calming at this dangerous junction. However, they will only function as such when people or cycles are crossing.
Good idea
no opinion
Agree
Yes, agree
It seems like a good idea.
Good idea
Bad
Cyclists have a perfectly acceptable route through Earlsdon to the town. There is no need for additional crossings to cater for this.
Possible as long as kids can't mess with it setting it off and not crossing
Great
A good idea as crossing there is a bit difficult.
I support this proposal
Don't you mean Spencer Avenue at Albany Road? Shows you how much thought is going in to this! It would be another halt to traffic within a short space of road. No
Supportive, this is a dangerous crossing point for pedestrians and cyclists.
How many crossings does Earlsdon need. But if the 20mph limit is adopted, perhaps some other traffic calming measures and a shared space arrangement similar to the ones tried in the City Centre with varying success. Pinch points in the road to slow the traffic further?
Good
Sounds good.
I don't know what a Toucan crossing is ?
Great
Agree
Ok to have a pedestrian crossing but not needed for bikes (there hardly are any)
Not needed. I disagree.
I have no problem with the idea but again the crossing should not be too close to the junction as this is dangerous. Again, we seem to be letting the priority for cyclists overwhelm the interests of the majority.
Great idea.
Good idea
Agree.
Good
Yes - agree.
I welcome this but have a concern that traffic travelling away from Earlsdon may not have much warning of the crossing. Could this be dangerous?
Good idea
I support the proposal
Good
Agree
Ok
Agree

Comments regarding a toucan crossing on Albany Road
In favour of more crossings generally, but unsure about this location
Very much in favour
no opinion on this one
Will be of benefit to road safety. Cycle route needs to have a clearer dedicated lane to maximise the benefit
Not necessary
Good idea. Crossing the road here is dangerous atm
Yes good idea all toucan crossings reduce speed of cars
Would prefer a zebra crossing but fully support a two-can crossing.
Good idea
I welcome this
Totally against will cause congestion on Albany Rd and Spencer Ave
Strongly in favour. Getting around Earlsdon is difficult as a pedestrian.
agree
Good
I fully support this proposal
Fine.
Ok
Fine
Agree
Back this change
Fine
Ok
Good
X
Agree - corssing is much needed in / around this location
Probably needed when traffic builds up on Spencer abenue
OK
This is ok
I'm really happy about that, because it's terrible at the moment. This would be a great improvement to accessing the park on route to the train station!
Good idea
Ok
Doesn't seem vital but only a small change overall
Definitely support this proposal.
Waste of time
In favour
Yes, i agree
Pelican or Toucan: doesn't really matter.
In favour
Agree
Yes please.
I have no issues with this proposal
Support this.
No real objection to this
A crossing is desperately need here to get to Spencer Park and to bring children home from Hearsall School.
Ok.

Comments regarding a toucan crossing on Albany Road
Confused, Spencer Road doesn't meet Albany Road, Spencer ave does. I don't think adding toucan will be needed. Only pedestrian crossing points are needed.
Good
No Opinion
I believe this is on Albany Rd and Spencer Ave (rather than Spencer Rd), and is a good proposal.
Good idea.
Ok
Sounds good
Good idea.
Fully approve
Good
Agree
Good for environment
Very supportive, excellent.
N/A
As above, pedestrians and cyclists do not need these kinds of crossings here. It is not an accident blackspot. Can we have some data, please, that shows this is necessary? It may sound harsh but people need to take care of themselves and learn to cross the road correctly.
Approve. However, if the bus gate is approved, the need for this change to the Spencer Road/Dalton Road junction would be reduced or even removed. If the bus gate is not approved, then I would recommend the toucan crossing.
not in favour
Agree
DISAGREE I actually feel that cyclists are classed as more important than any pedestrian. There are many elderly people living in Earlsdon and yet we have to suffer being nearly knocked down by cyclists who DO NOT USE A BELL and DO NOT remain on their own cycle routes very often. Why should they have more preference? I do approve of a National cycling route that goes through cities.
Agree
Has anybody counted the number of cycles using this route ? Too much investment for such a small minority.
Good
Crossing here would be helpful.
Acceptable. See comments re Spencer Ave. in #4
In favour
Excellent! A lot safer to cross
Good idea.
There is no entrance to Spencer Rd on Albany Rd. Should this be Spencer Ave ?
Supportive of this
Fine
Absolutely not. Pathetic idea.
Sounds good, it's difficult to cross there
Not adverse to a crossing here but it doesn't seem like a great cycle route if it needs to use a toucan crossing
Good idea
Yes
I support this proposal, not because of the benefit to the National Cycle Route, but because a pedestrian crossing would help to slow down traffic.
Superb: anything that helps pedestrians and cyclists is to be welcomed in what is a very congested place to live. If it was safer I am sure many would elect to walk/cycle more often.

Comments regarding a toucan crossing on Albany Road
This will change things for the better. I will use this crossing a lot with my grandchildren and we will cycle that way.
I don't understand this. I did not think Spencer Road was part of the National Cycle Route.
good
Definitely approve
NA
Not necessary
This is not needed
Good
Again, I think this is essential and would like to see it implemented asap independent of the rest of the Liveable Neighbourhood proposals.
May be of use
Good idea
Please do it
This would be an ideal place for a croo
No comment
No real problem here but as a cyclist (I do not own a car) I have no problems cycling in Earlsdon but the proposals seem anti car to me.
Brilliant. Please could you put one at Spencer Road up by Dalton Road as the cycle route goes from Broadway across Spencer Avenue/Road and it's awkward and dangerous to cross on a bike as you're going from pavement in the park to try to then get onto Dalton Road as per the cycle route.
Excellent
See no benefit
Support
Yes. Useful.
Agree
Excellent idea
Sounds reasonable but what's really needed is separation of cyclists and pedestrians. There should be proper SEPARATE cycle tracks not shared space with walkers. There should be a new, cyclists-only bridge over the railway line parallel to 'Anarchy Bridge'. This would take it back to its original purpose as a FOOTBRIDGE. Too much Sustrans-type development has relied on sharing/taking space away from pedestrians rather than creating additional safe spaces for cyclists. Stop doing things on the cheap to tick a box.
Serves no purpose. I thought the cycle route was at the top of Spencer and along the park?
? Where does the bike route run? Does this mean the cyclists are being encouraged to use the pavement?
Ok
Not a fan of this. I think this is ok as it is
Agree
Seems fine
See my comment re cycling on proposal 3.
Agreed this is welcomed - as someone who regularly walks down spencer park BUT you must do something about the electric bikes! The amount of times I have either nearly been knocked myself or seen someone else nearly knocked over by a bike bombing it down there at 30+ mph. More delineation of the path might help this.
Yep seems ok.
Good idea.
Yes I support this (think you mean Albany Road and Spencer Ave)
I don't think is necessary with also the one way proposal. The one way proposal will significantly reduce traffic providing further opportunity to cross the road.
Mainly in favour

Comments regarding a toucan crossing on Albany Road
Think this wrong - do you mean Spencer avenue here? For this, think it's a good idea.
Good idea
I don't understand this location. Albany Road links to Spence avenue not Spencer Road.
If Spencer Avenue is meant then this onto of the other proposals around Spencer Avenue makes th attraction of living on this road less
Again, possibly a good solution for pedestrians but not sure what the impact on traffic could be
Crossings here are a good idea only because you are going to make the traffic on Albany Rd a LOT busier.
Good idea
Again some cyclists have no consideration for other road users.
Good idea. As I have mentioned crossing here is hazardous.
Spencer Road does not join Albany road. Stupid Idea
Disagree
Agree
Not sure
Do not agree
Excellent plan and good for safety
If Spencer is made one way at that point, this will be a nightmare as most Spencer ave traffic will now be using that junction to turn
You need to slow the traffic coming up under the railway bridge otherwise, there is likely to be fatality when cars cannot stop in time at this crossing. Traffic lights would be better and the crossing should be in between Broadway and Spencer on the Albany road
All our families are in favour of this. Comments: "Great for cycling and walking". "Please signpost all the way to the train station, after you get to the bottom of the ramp at Central Six it's not clear how to cycle to the train station, we've had visitors getting confused". "Please signpost cycles from Earlsdon roundabout to this crossing, paint a cycle lane on Albany Road (where there is a solid yellow line) to stop cars parking on the pavement outside the cafe."
Good idea
Absolutely. Yes please.
I think you mean Spencer Avenue not road here. Good idea
I think this is on the junction with Spencer Avenue not Spencer Road. I can see no real problems with this proposal.
There is no entrance to Spencer Road on Albany Road but as shown on the map I would not object to a crossing at the entrance to Spencer Avenue on Albany Road
This will slow traffic on a major road which is the road drivers need to be directed to as opposed to the small side residential roads. How can this continue to be a major road with a toucan crossing?
Also good.
Yes.
Toucan crossing is a good idea
Supportive of having a crossing but not aware of there being a cycle
Great
I DO NOT SUPPORT
I don't think this is necessary
Great.
There is no entrance to Spencer road from Albany ? This is Spencer avenue no ? But I am in favour of any cycling measures as this is a step forward but again without the through traffic this crossing would be improved immediately anyhow.
Good idea

Comments regarding a toucan crossing on Albany Road
Agreed
Very good
Yes, as long as it is n the right place!
Fully support, it can be really tricky to cross this bit of road.
Disagree
I support this.
Agree
Happy for it, but it wouldn't effect me personally.
Makes sense.
Good
I'm against this is it will cause the traffic to back up like in other areas of the city
Fully supportive, save for previous comments around whether Spencer Rd needs to be one-way for that stretch between Albany Rd and Mayfield Rd.
Unnecessary
good as huge new student block will mean more bicycle and foot traffic
Firstly Spencer Road and Albany Road are not adjacent, I assume you mean Spencer Ave. I don't observe a significant flow of bicycles at this point and the delivery drivers won't wait for a crossing. But if a pedestrian crossing is installed, also allowing bicycles is not going to affect traffic much.
This is definitely needed as it is very risky crossing on foot here because of the bend after the railway bridge and the speed that drivers come through. I cross here on my way back from Hearsall School and find it quite dangerous.
This would be good
Yes
Ok
Cyclists should have this benefit.
It is good proposal
Good idea
I have no objection to this.
The roads are too narrow fir this
Also need to fix pavements to improve for oedestrians
Good to have easier cycle crossing
Copying from above: Albany Road: the crossing is in an interesting location and will work well as a gateway. I personally would prefer a joint foot-cycle zebra crossing, giving instant priority to active travel (and probably cheaper than a toucan crossing). I do however not think that this would create a convenient low traffic route from the roundabout to Spencer Park: The direct way along Albany Road is 330 m, the proposed low-traffic route is 620 m, so almost twice as long, with a bonus uphill section on Poplar Road. A convenient safe route would take road space off Albany Road to create a direct protected cycleway. Albany Road is wide enough to do that. Also, guidance says that suggested cycle routes are not longer that corresponding car routes.
Agree
Good idea
Agree strongly
Ok
Prioritising pedestrians and cyclists is a great idea anywhere.
Yes.
Agree with this
Agree with this plan
Yes it's a good proposal.

Comments regarding a toucan crossing on Albany Road
Approve
I am supportive of this proposal.
No opinion
Agree with this proposal. A pedestrian crossing is needed here. Is this also part of Question 6?
Needed
Will this be on the -blind- corner near Chinese? If so, then no.
This would be helpful
Presumably this should mean the entrance to Spencer Avenue, not Spencer Road. In any event, it would be a potential safety hazard if it is adjacent to Tanning Salon.
Not sure if best type of crossing. Is it still needed with reduced traffic due to one way. Could you narrow entrance if one way to make easier to cross (like top of Newcombe Road proposal
very good
Not necessary
No absolutely not.
Not necessary.
I thought the Sustrans route was along Dalton Road.
agree if to be used by Earlsdon Park Village too.
Good proposal
Not sure whether this is a good idea or not. Ideally a working model of the proposals would provide simulation for this and would provide a clearer indication of what is planned.
I do find it odd that the suggestion is the Toucan crossing is used by cyclists - cyclists are in fact not entitled to legally cycle on the pavement and therefore not on Toucan crossings either.
I agree with this.
I like it
Yes
Good idea - difficult currently at certain times to cross the road as a cyclist/pedestrian.
I do not object to this proposal, but do not view it as a change that will deliver any benefits. As someone who regularly crosses the road at this point it has never been a problem. I therefore do not see this as a priority that requires investment.
I support this proposal.
In favour
Yes
Spencer Road does not connect with Albany Road. If you are mean Spencer Avenue you will be adding to already high levels of congestion and pollution on Albany Road at rush hour
The more crossings the better
Yes
Sounds like a great way to create congestion, gridlock and frustration.
Supportive
I support this proposal.
Yes
A recipe for disaster - drivers will be turning from a fast flowing road onto a slow moving road. Encountering cyclists as the driver enters Spencer road could cause shunt accidents or cyclists been run over. I do not support this idea
This is presumably about the entrance to Spencer Park on Albany Road, not Spencer Road? I would support a crossing. I think lights at the junction of Spencer Avenue and Albany Road are not necessary.
I am in favour of this proposal as it should increase safety, reduce speed and increase cycle use.
Agree
Welcomed.

Question 8

What do you think about this proposal:

A range of measures to reduce traffic on Beechwood Avenue. These include:

- narrowing the mini roundabout at the junction between Beechwood Avenue and Hartington Crescent
- changing the layout at the junction of Beechwood Avenue and Rochester Road
- installing pedestrian islands
- Adding a chicane close to the entrance to the tennis club so that traffic entering the more built-up area has to give way to traffic coming the other direction.
- upgrading the guardrail by Palmerston Road
- making it no entry to Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Road
- adding extra double yellow lines
- Measures to limit through journeys on Arden Street, Shaftesbury Road, Warwick Avenue/ Styvechale Avenue, Stoneleigh Avenue/ Woodland Avenue through no entry points. These measures could include planters or bollards, and we are interested in whether you would like to be involved in the design and maintenance of these

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
Agree with all these. Just can't understand the 'reduction' of the mini roundabout on Beechwood- there is no roundabout and is always area where cars wait to see who's going first!!
Agree with some of these ideas but need more detail on how it will be made possible.
I see no reason to make styvechale avenue or Warwick no entry it is never busy but provides an alternative route for residents to avoid the already congested kenilworth road. Also see no reason to limit through journeys on stoneleigh avenue I travel during peak hours and never have any problems with traffic. People who use these roads will need to drop off children and go to work it will only increase congestion on busy main roads and cause more mayhem. I see no reason why these measures have even been suggested as I live by the busy main junction to XXXXXXX and have never encountered any issues with traffic. Increasing double yellow lines again I see no purpose in as people need parking who are visiting the area like the high street or the park. We should encourage this for businesses it's already a nightmare to park anywhere near the High Street and I often avoid going solely for this reason. I can only think these suggestions have been put forward by people who no longer travel to work or need to drop children off!
Good idea apart from making Styvechale and Warwick Rd no entry- this seems a bit silly
Beechwood ave around the bend by the golf club long car park can be treacherous anything to minimise that risk . Stoneleigh is used as a rat run cars speed up and down so anything to stop that risk is great
Good plan to reduce speeding and people using roads as cut through. Closing the Stoneleigh Ave / Kenilworth Road junction is excellent
Great
Why are all these lumped together? It makes a response harder,
Apart from the chicane on Beechwood Avenue, which is a serious safety hazard , I would not do any of these so called improvements. There are so many greater priorities for money such as crumbling schools, lack of housing, shortage of NHS staff , bankrupt councils etc and yet we are wasting money on schemes that will benefit a few but inconvenience many more. And in the process force traffic to travel further and thus emit more carbon dioxide, pm2.5s and brake dust
Agree with these measures
Good idea . Would like to be involved with planting planters
Needed

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
Date=20230908T071754Z&X-Amz-Expires=300&X-Amz-SignedHeaders=host&X-Amz-Signature=fc008ac12f2c72ca974865bbd0103b65e04eafa44788ed8cc9c18fc40fbdcd96
I DISAGREE with 'making it (Beechwood Avenue) no entry to Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Road' because (1) that will force residents of that road to use Kenilworth Road or Earlsdon Avenue South to get to their homes. This, especially at the intersection of Kenilworth Road and Stoneleigh, will increase congestion and (2) allowing cars to turn from Beechwood Avenue into Warwick and Stoneleigh Avenues is a natural traffic calming measure; vehicles have to slow and sometimes stop to turn from Beechwood into Warwick or Stoneleigh. This slowing and stopping should be happening on a road we want to be slow, not on roads that are intended for through traffic (like Kenilworth Road or Earlsdon Avenue South).
Sounds great
Great idea
I'm not happy with the no entry signs, it may develop a rat run
Agree with all
I would need further information
Good idea
The proposal for the roundabout near Hartington Crescent is a good idea. There also needs to be restrictions on cars parking on the grass verge on beechwood. It completely blocks the view of people crossing the road on Hartington of cars coming from the bridge.
I don't think I agree with closing access to Warwick Avenue, it is a wide street and is already a quiet street with bearily any cars parked on the road, it should be taking more traffic if anything.
Supportive of any initiative to make road crossing in the area safer. What I cannot support is the no entry proposals to styvechale and Warwick Avenue...these measure push additional traffic's onto Kenilworth road but also force all northward travel (not on a bike) from woodland avenue, stoneleigh avenue and Southleigh and Eastleigh avenue onto the already congested Kenilworth road. I only see Warwick ave and Styvechale ave benefiting from this change.
Also, you mention no entry point for woodland ave and stoneleigh ave in this survey but there is nothing on the map or info sheets stating plans for these two roads other than 20mph limit.
In favour of traffic calming but hard against making it no entry from Beechwood onto my road, This is the way I access my road 80% of the time and the traffic further down Kenilworth Road is often extremely congested, making it much harder to get home. There isn't a huge volume of traffic coming down the road just an occasional idiot going too fast - AND THEY'RE USUALLY COMING FROM EARLSDON AVE SOUTH END ANYWAY!!!. This feels like a big overreaction and would be great if just speed calming instead.
Ok
N/a
Excellent very much needs. So dangerous currently
Good idea.
Chicane great, again carefully position zebra crossings. Where will the traffic that uses this go? Back onto the Kenilworth Road...where will it back up to.....
See other comments. As a resident of one of these streets i like the idea of closing Styvechale Ave at one end but am concerned about the traffic travelling down Earlsdon Ave south
No need for this - just implement a 20 mph speed limit
I agree with everything accept the no entry on Warwick and styvechale Ave. This will cause no end of tail backs on Kenilworth road. Especially on school runs.
pedestrian islands - yes good idea! chicanes good i think -
no entry on Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Road- bad idea! speed bumps would be better! please don't do this!
please dont do the no entry points - roads far too busy and too many residents and business to cope! need as much flexibility as possible. rather one way systems and speed humps than no entry!

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
I think all traffic calming here is great news. Not sure of the benefits of closing Warwick and Styvechale unless it's to stop people using Beechwood from the Kenilworth Rd to avoid the lights at the top of EAS. The route from Earlsdon St, up Arden St into Hartington and then Beechwood is the main route to "Fatty Island" and access to the A45 from Earlsdon. The route round Hearsall Common via EAN is much longer, as is via Kenilworth Rd.
All these will help to reduce driving speeds and make it feel safer for walking and cycling. Some greenery would be great and wild flowers to attract bees.
Good
No opinion.
The chosen street furniture, bollards, guardrails etc should be in keeping with the Earlsdon Conservation Area,
I live on xxxxxxxx and would VERY much support this. It is an inconvenience for access to the south of city but the benefits far out way this. XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX and have always been alarmed, concerned and angry about the speeds of people using Warwick Avenue as a cut through to avoid the Kenilworth road lights. I also very much support the crossing by Beechwood Tennis club
No chaos
I would support Warwick Avenue being blocked off for on one side
Will increase traffic in other areas
Spencer Avenue has issues with speeding. Used as a cut through. Please consider
No preference
In favour
I think the following are a good idea: changing the layout at the junction of Beechwood Avenue and Rochester Road installing pedestrian islands Adding a chicane close to the entrance to the tennis club so that traffic entering the more built-up area has to give way to traffic coming the other direction. upgrading the guardrail by Palmerston Road
The below will cause unnecessary congestion, frustration and disruption and I am against them: narrowing the mini roundabout at the junction between Beechwood Avenue and Hartington Crescent making it no entry to Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Road adding extra double yellow lines Measures to limit through journeys on Arden Street, Shaftesbury Road, Warwick Avenue/ Styvechale Avenue, Stoneleigh Avenue/ Woodland Avenue through no entry points. These measures could include planters or bollards, and we are interested in whether you would like to be involved in the design and maintenance of these
In favour
I very much welcome the blocking off of Warwick Avenue at one end to stop the rat run and speeding of cars so long as Warwick Avenue becomes a resident only parking. That is critical otherwise it would become a long car park road and that is not acceptable.
Needed urgently.
We rely upon access to Warwick Ave to see elderly parents on Stoneleigh Ave from Earlsdon Ave South. This ruins so disagree with part of proposal.
Fine
Reduced roundabout & chicane by tennis club are good ideas the rest is will cause problems.
I don't think traffic will be reduced on Beechwood Avenue using these measures, maybe slowed down. Definitely no to making Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Avenue no entry. No need for no entry points on Stoneleigh Avenue, Woodland Avenue, Shaftesbury Road etc. it's just making life difficult for residents.
Mostly support. Support all measures except changes to pedestrian guardrail. Current accidents there are because of traffic volumes (which proposals would reduce) and speed (which would also be reduced). 'Motorway style barriers' would be incongruous with the character of the area, and should not be needed if the other proposed measures work in the way intended. Would there be a way to further improve cycling?
Bollards and more yellow lines would definitely prevent people from parking across the pavement and blocking them for pedestrians.

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
<p>Reducing traffic on Beechwood is a good idea, this should be coupled with speed calming devices particularly at the bend/adverse camber between the tennis club and the golf club entrances.</p> <p>Disagree - No entry into Stychechale & Warwick Avenues as this will limit local access to town.</p> <p>Strongly Disagree - No access to Stoneleigh Ave - this will create chaos for those exiting Beechwood onto Kenilworth Road which is already beyond capacity. Additionally, closing off Stoneleigh will create a car sales cul-de-sac for the car vender resident.</p> <p>Traffic calming devices such as planters, seating, chicanes, echelon parking etc would create a far more effective deterrent helping to reduce car crime making the area more pleasant by embracing the 'woodland' element.</p>
<p>Strongly disagree with no entry to Warwick Ave & Styvechale Ave</p> <p>Any measures to improve safety on Beechwood Ave bends are urgently needed</p> <p>Disagree with yellow lines</p> <p>Stoneleigh Ave & Woodland Ave require traffic calming rather than No entry which would cause major problems with congestion on Beechwood Ave.</p> <p>Planters & Bollards at 2or 3 points along Stoneleigh Ave/woodland Ave would resolve the 'rat run' problems whilst maintaining a free flow of traffic for residents.</p> <p>Additionally, a 'cul de sac' end at Stoneleigh Ave/kenilworth rd would allow the person who is clearly running a car sales business there to use the whole of the area for parking.</p>
<p>Fully support the proposal re Beachwood Ave ad 100% support the limitation to cut through Stoneleigh Ave onto Kenilworth rd. speeding traffic is becoming more dangerous and only having one exit could support in reducing crime and theft of motor vehicles on this St.</p>
<p>Strongly agree</p>
<p>making it no entry to Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Road- VERY STRONG OBJECTION. Kenilworth road is already very busy and will make it worse if I have to queue on that for longer to get home. Absolutely no need to block access.</p> <p>Speed bumps would be a good idea but definitely do not think blocking our access is necessary.</p> <p>VERY STRONG Objection to all no entry points as it will make the other roads more congested.</p>
<p>No comment</p>
<p>Not sure except the bend near the tennis club would benefit from a chicane</p>
<p>Definitely do not want no entry on Styvechale and Warwick Avenues. These roads are not very busy and this measure would direct all the traffic from residents back round to the high street. What a bad idea!</p>
<p>I don't live round this bit or regularly drive here so I have no comment on this. I support whatever the residents of these roads say as they will have to live with the restrictions</p>
<p>Whilst limiting journeys to these roads the measures will then put pressure on other roads unless you ensure residential parking scheme is extended to the roads around the high street particularly Berkeley Road South, Moor St, Providence Street. therefore in its current form I disagree with it.</p>
<p>Has thought been given to keeping Warwick and Styvechale Ave open to through traffic in at least one direction. Both streets are easily wide enough to accommodate traffic and could be made one way/have traffic calming measures to slow cars down. This would alleviate pressure on Earlsdon ave South by providing alternative routes.</p>
<p>I approve of the plans to make Beechwood Avenue safer. It is only relatively recently that there has been a problem with motorists using it as a through route and driving too fast (a result of SATNAVs directing drivers to take a cut through route?)</p> <p>I have no objection to restricting entry from Beechwood Avenue to Styvechale Ave. and Warwick Ave. to cycles only, as long as they do not become one-way roads. It is important to keep the exit onto Beechwood Avenue from these roads. To create a one way system here would involve residents and delivery vehicles having to perform 3 point turns thus creating even more hazards.</p> <p>It was also mentioned to me by a local resident that there had been a proposal to introduce speed bumps. While I can appreciate the need for them in Coat of Arms Bridge Road where there is a school and few houses, I would strongly object to introducing them to residential roads, especially ones which are used by many cyclists.</p>
<p>No to the no entry points.</p>

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
Some measures are needed to slow traffic I agree and stop rat runs but closing off roads would only direct traffic on the already full and bussy main roads such as Kenilworth and Earlsdon Ave.
Not relevant but makes sense
I am concerned regarding being able to enter my street from Hartington Crescent via Arden Street. Also any traffic that wants to go to Warwick Road will come down Clarendon Street. Also, Clarendon Street is always full for resident parking. I am concerned that these measures will push more visitors onto Clarendon Street.
I support these changes.
So making traffic less likely to stop at the roundabout on beechwood Ave? I've nearly been hit numerous times at this junction as drivers ignore the island so making it smaller will not help. How do you propose to change the Rochester Rd junction? Better signage on beechwood near the tennis club would probably suffice? No entry to Warwick and Styvechale is crazy? So residents have to drive miles out of the way and sit in more traffic to get home? Either funnels g more traffic through Earlsdon high st or more congestion on Kenilworth Rd which is busy and will create more pollution due to idling engines. If you limit entry to Arden and Shaftesbury how does traffic get out of Earlsdon towards canley station etc? Would make getting children to school who live outside of Earlsdon to school a problem for working parents or getting children that go to schools in either Tile hill or canley much more onerous.
I am supportive of these measures although I do not believe that they will have any impact on traffic speeding between the mini roundabout and St Barbara's Church. The measures do not address this and in fact make it worse. Traffic that has been forced to slow down for the roundabout and/or the elbow bend (it has to do this anyway) would still have a long straight stretch of road to speed along. It is this stretch which already suffers with that issue and frustrated drivers are likely to go quicker between the proposed measures as a result. The research conducted only appears to evaluate daytime traffic and fails to consider traffic which speeds along this stretch of Beechwood Avenue in the early to late evening.
No need to block Warwick Road and Styvechale Avenue.
I agree with all the specific measures proposed here at the moment. However, we might find that actually we should think about routing more, not less, traffic through Beechwood Avenue as an alternative to routing it along Earlsdon Street (which as I've already mentioned should have a medium- or long-term goal of being pedestrianised). If Earlsdon High Street were pedestrianised from the roundabout to Stanley Road, then Beechwood avenue would become the main form of access for the side roads that can't be accessed from Earlsdon Avenue North/South.
Agree
Agree
Agreed to making the Beechwood end of Warwick Avenue a no entry. At the moment Warwick Avenue is used as a cut through for traffic . Warwick Avenue should then also become a resident only parking street. Many people already use Warwick Avenue to park and then go to the train station for the day. This will prevent the road from becoming a car park when closed off at the Beechwood end.
Closing Styvechale and Warwick Avenue will increase traffic through the dangerous bend on beechwood by the golf course
Agree
Really pleased to see that Stoneleigh Avenue has been included in the streets to limit through traffic!
Do you mean Warwick Ave for no entry? Very happy with limiting traffic short cuts through our Stoneleigh avenue. It is getting beyond a joke with cars travelling at speed and using it to cut through.
I support all these very sensible proposals. I would like to see more traffic calming such as speed bumps, particularly by the crash barrier on the narrow bend that keeps getting knocked over. One of the most dangerous corners for cyclists is riding from by St Barbaras towards the park on the rightangle corner at Bates Rd. There is no proposal to make this safer for cyclists and I would like to see this reconsidered
In favour of all except the entry restrictions . This just creates issues for Earlsdon residents getting to and from their homes pushing traffic onto Beechwood Avenue , Earlsdon Street and Kenilworth road for Earlsdon Ave South - congestion , volumes and air pollution would all get worse on routes heavily used by school children and other pedestrians . Why isn't the Golf course being made to expand its parking area ? Too many members are parking on Beechwood and other road junctions !

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
Agree with the exception of the changes to Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Avenue. I cannot see any benefit to be gained by these changes.
Most of these seem very sensible although I don't really understand the closure of Warwick and Styvechale as outlined above. I do need to be able to get to the city centre in some direction (!) I drove home at 5.30 tonight along Warwick Avenue and did not encounter another vehicle in either direction.
This is perhaps the most dangerous area due to the s bend that catches out bad drivers and has been a hit spot for crashes. Reduce traffic and slow it down.
Yes but I don't feel that Warwick Avenue and Styvechale Avenue are pinch points or busy. Some calming measures good but no need to restrict vehicles on those roads.
There is no measure to reduce the considerable dangers on Beechwood Avn, from the very dangerous S - shaped bend between the golf clubhouse and the tennis clubhouse, and the 90 degree bend further up from the tennis clubhouse. Both these places have had numerous accidents because of speeding drivers and oversized vehicles having to use both sides of the road.
Unnecessary
I dont agree with the below: - no entry to Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Road (Avenue) - Measures to limit through journeys on Warwick Avenue/ Styvechale Avenue, Stoneleigh Avenue/ Woodland Avenue through no entry points. These measures could include planters or bollards, and we are interested in whether you would like to be involved in the design and maintenance of these
Disagree with the no entry points on warwick and styvchale roads. If we have to drive in to Earlsdon it will make it much harder and produce more fumes from the cars generally as people have to drive further. I don't agree with closing the junction at Stoneleigh Avenue onto the kenilworth Road. Getting onto the kenilworth Rd is difficult now if we all have to go to beechwood to get onto it it will be a nightmare. Traffic lights will be needed from Beechwood onto Kenilworth Road, queues will build up and turning right out of Stoneleigh or Woodland will be impossible especially in the mornings. We were told the reason for this junction closure was to stop cyclists having to turn right on to the Kenilworth road, Cyclists do not need to turn right onto the kenilworth road, at present. They go on to the cycle path and if they want to cross the road they use the pedestrian crossing to join the cycle path on the park side. For the University they stay on Canley ford side. I have cycled this route myself and so know cyclists do not turn right out of this junction.
Waste of time and money
I don't agree with making it no entry to Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Road from Beechwood Avenue as I don't think this will achieve a net benefit for the residents. I think it will just create more traffic between Beechwood Avenue and Earlsdon Avenue on Kenilworth Road and I don't think it will impact the number of drivers who speed on Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Road.
Excellent idea, this should be rolled out as soon as possible and extended to other coventry neighbourhoods, such as Stoke.
Yes a prove of all
Do not think these measures will reduce traffic on Beechwood Ave, rather make it awkward for people who live in the roads off Beechwood. Measures to reduce speed would be more effective, eg. Sleeping policemen / other traffic calming measures Chicane is a good idea
The amount of heavy vehicles that deliver goods in this area should be taken into consideration.
In the consultation meetings earlier in the year, council representatives stated 'I can categorically confirm that no roads will be blocked off' the plans that you have plate now blocking off roads. This is hypocrisy in the extreme! No one wants access to any of our streets blocked for access. Please reconsider.
Measure do need to be taken to slow traffic on Beechwood but I do not agree with blocking roads off or making them one way money would be better spent on better pavements so people could walk in them and not in the road the pavement in Warwick Ave and stychall are a trip hazard fir the elderly
Are there many accidents 20 mph will solve
I can't see any justification for reducing traffic on this road - it's a good, wide through route. People need to travel!! I can completely understand the need to slow it down in places, but the majority of road users shouldn't be

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
punished because of a small minority of speeding motorists. Speed pillows would do the job just fine. I was told there are objections to this - one of these was the noise cars make when passing over them. What a ridiculous objection, plus be honest they're being installed elsewhere in Coventry - they were added on Cannon Hill Rd very recently.
I like all of these measures.
Dislike no entry to Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Avenue from Beechwood Avenue.
Points 1-6 are reasonable. The others are ridiculous. Through traffic down Warwick, Styvechale, Woodland & Stoneleigh Avenues is already fairly low and these proposals will bring Kenilworth Road to a standstill.
Too many different things to comment on here. Disagree strongly with all one way/closure proposals. Does not aid problem of speeding in any way, just makes life difficult for residents, increasing journeys and emissions. Guard rail agree Chicane agree Reduce roundabout disagree-does not aid problem of speeding.
I agree with traffic calming on Beechwood Avenue but am concerned about making both Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Avenue no entry. This will force all traffic from these roads to exit onto Earlsdon Avenue (which is extremely busy all day, and especially in the mornings) This will increase a chance of accidents on Earlsdon Avenue as drivers try to cross traffic lanes to exit onto Kenilworth Road.
Strongly against the proposed no entry points to Warwick Ave and Styvechale Ave. Residents of these roads would still drive along Beechwood Ave but would just have a longer journey that adds to congestion on the Kenilworth Rd. There is little through traffic (vehicular) on these roads and the result is likely to be less sustainable transport rather than more sustainable transport.
Some traffic calming measures are unfortunately needed on this street, (mainly due to a few inconsiderate people), but this is overkill. Traffic will instead go down Earlsdon Avenue North and South, creating increased congestion & moving the pollution right into the heart of the area.
mostly good (bullet points 1-5 and 7 ticked) Warwick should be open to through traffic - it's wide with driveways. Too much traffic will be pushed on to Rochester (a main walking route to primary schools and shops.)
Traffic slowing measures acceptable but no need for no entry into the aforementioned roads from beechwood avenue and Arden street etc
I am not keen on the proposed change to the priorities on the Beechwood /Rochester intersection. It feels unnecessary - we just the 20mph zone, a zebra crossing, and longer double yellows, there is no need for a road reorganisation Also, the closing off of Shaftesbury and Arden will result in increased traffic to that junction which will affect the nursery and the buses.
Chicane should slow traffic approaching the bend ie towards Kenilworth Rd. Traffic going the other way is about to be slowed by Bates Rd. No entry to Styvechale Ave and Warwick Ave should be alternate ends.
Agree to the first 6 points to slow traffic. Disagree to making it no entry to both Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Road the cycle route, but perhaps ok if just Warwick Avenue, as would allow cars to reach Osborne Road.
Not sure about no entry points, especially with regards to Warwick and Styvechale Ave. Crossing from Bates Rd. definitely needs improvement, but not sure how it would link to new junction layout with Rochester Rd.
I do not support this proposal
Do not agree on no entry, entry should stay for either S. Or W.
Some good some bad
Narrowing roundabout - no, needs to be more emphasized with a raised middle with a feature. Keep it large. Pedestrian islands - yes fine Chicane - terrible idea. The entrance to the tennis club already causes traffic issues as cars slow to turn into the entrance. Adding this feature would make this worse. Guardrail at Palmerston Road - Needs sorting properly as this has been an issue for years. Proper speed

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
restrictions and signage would improve this.
No entry to Warwick Ave/ Styvechale Ave - awful idea, worst of the lot. These roads are sleepy hollows with only local traffic. You will make the Kenilworth road, Beechwood Ave and Ealsdon street way more congested as a result. Also restricts access to Spencer park from side of south Earlsdon. It also reduces the number of routes into the city.
All a bad idea
The first 6 points I agree with. I also agree with the extra yellow lines and measures to restrict journeys on Arden Street. The other roads mentioned are wide enough and in some cases straight enough to cope with two way traffic. Plus the properties on these roads have garages and driveways (some have both).
Limiting the use of roads is a terrible idea. It pushes more traffic onto the remaining roads. I walk Styvechale Ave and Warwick Ave every day. They are quiet roads and already perfect for pedestrians and cyclists. Why are you always attacking motorists? You seem to think everyone in Earlsdon rides a bike and works at the Uni.
I think it's a very good idea
Reducing traffic on Beechwood will again push it onto Earlsdon Avenue south resulting in more stationary traffic and higher pollution levels on that road. This is of particular concern because it will result in higher levels of pollution next to the primary school
No chicane - just wastes everyone's time and gets people annoyed
Very supportive. I use this road as a pedestrian, cyclist and driver, it requires the extensive mitigations proposed to make it safer for all users.
That's a lot for one question. I've no great views on the mini-roundabout but think the layout at the Rochester/Beechwood could be improved and made safer. Other traffic calming measures such as the chicane would help reinforce the 20mph limit but then would an upgrade of the guardrail be necessary? I cannot see the point of making Styvechale and Warwick Avenues no entry, but would see the point of making them one way (though they are not as narrow or problematic as some of the other roads in the area and not as parked up since most residences have off road parking. Does someone have shares in "No Entry" signs?
Agree. However, making Warwick Ave & Styvechale Ave no entry from Beechwood Ave will make Earlsdon Ave North from Kenilworth Rd (B4107) very congested. You are just moving traffic from one end to another. Think about applying a 20 mile an hour limit seems much better idea.
Changing the Rochester / Beechwood junction is ridiculous. Improving crossing at Beechwood by St Barbara's would be good. Warwick Ave and Styvechale aren't busy. Why block access. Adding more double yellow lines will limit parking and damage businesses as footfall will reduce.
This is really important, so pleased it's on the plan!
Concerned this makes routes more tricky and actually will increase traffic on Hearsall Lane as it won't be direct access to a Earlsdon Ave any more .
Really concerned about both Styvechale and Warwick Ave being closed off from Beechwood, again this restricts our access to Earlsdon Ave as a way of avoiding Kenilworth Rd, you will be creating queues on Earlsdon Ave S and Beechwood Ave to get on to Kenilworth Rd which will also have increased traffic. I don't think this has been thought through. It is almost impossible to turn right out of Beechwood on to the Kenilworth Rd now and with the new light system at the junction of the Ken Rd and A45 traffic can trail back to coat of Arms Bridge and beyond! This measure will make it so much worse.
Agree apart from Styvechale and Warwick Avenue no entries. Will load more traffic on to Earlsdon Avenue South.
Reducing traffic on Beechwood avenue will send more vehicles down Earlsdon st, not a good idea. The other suggestions for Beechwood ave are good, but I can't see what losing entries to other roads is going to achieve
I disagree plus would like to know the impact on delivery vehicles, emergency services vehicles and refuse lorries of all one way street proposals.
I think most of these proposals are contrary to the interests of all of our residents. The chicane idea on Beechwood Avenue should be replaced with traffic lights (one by the entrance to the Golf Club the other by the Tennis Club) with speed cameras on them. It would be a nonsense to close through journeys on the roads suggested (with the exception of Stoneleigh Avenue) and this would have a dire economic effect on the High St.. The idea that you want help designing and maintaining planters suggests you have already decided this idea is a good one. You only need to look at the aggravation such scenes have caused in other areas to realise the conflict such plans create for no material benefit.

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
Agree but don't think warwick or styvechale need to be one way they are quiet roads and will draw more traffic onto the busy earlsdon Ave south where lots of pedestrians walk down
One way 'gate' needs to switch to the other end of Warwick Ave. This would make Styveshale / Warwick a one way loop. It would ease congestion one the junction of Kenilworth Rd and EAS.
Agree with all of these measures however there are no measures proposed between Rochester Road and the island at Hartington Crescent and from the island up towards the railway bridge .
Any measures at limiting journeys - bollards/planters are ridiculous and should be avoided/disregarded entirely.
I broadly welcome these proposals with the following points: Something additional is needed to prevent cars crashing on the S bend when travelling towards the memorial park. The proposal does not have anything to slow down cars travelling from the 90° bend to the S bend. Also - the T-junction with Kenilworth Road and Beechwood avenue gets blocked very easily because it is very difficult for cars to turn right onto Kenilworth Road from this junction. The blocking of Stoneleigh, Warwick Ave and Stivichall Ave will likely causes (a) long queues down Beechwood Avenue and/or (b) traffic avoiding this junction by driving through Earlsdon to get to the traffic lights at the Junction with Earlsdon Ave Sth and Kenilworth Road.
Most of these ideas are valid but not the proposal to make Warwick and styvechale avenues one way, this will simply increase the traffic in beechwood which is very heavy now
I support the proposal
I don't think this sounds good as it makes it hard to get around and feels like barriers at every street. I am not in favour of the above
Do not agree with one way systems - not supportive at all. Please consider other traffic calming mechanisms
No. Use different traffic calming measure speed bumps. You'll just psss the traffic on and clog up main road
If traffic measures are designed to reduce traffic on Beechwood then this pushes more traffic down the highstreet and Earlsdon Ave South. Quadrail and Chicane good idea. No entry to Styvechale and Warwick rd pushes more traffic onto Earlsdon Ave south. Extra double yellow lines, where exactly?
Disagree. These proposals need separating out. Blocking roads is NOT a solution. As noted above, it is a lazy way to spend money unnecessarily. I do not know what problem this is trying to solve. Speed bumps on Beechwood Avenue would help without any need for the above. It is a nonsense to just disallow things then leave the neighbourhood to get on with it. There is no issue on Stoneleigh Avenue.
Strongly in favour of the Beechwood Rd improvements. Strongly opposed to blocking Styvechale Ave and Warwick Rd. More traffic will be forced on to Beechwood and back into Earlsdon Street. Also strongly opposed to closing the Stoneleigh Ave / Kenilworth Rd junction. It tackles a problem that doesn't exist. There is little or no rat-running along Stoneleigh Ave, but there is a speeding problem. Planters would enforce the 20mph limit. The closed junction would also force more traffic on to Beechwood and add to the pressure on the Beechwood / Kenilworth Rd junction. I would strongly advocate planters on all the major routes to slow the traffic.
These measures will create a safer environment all round so I'm in favour
disagree with narrowing the roundabout, disagree with changing the junction layout to Rochester Rd as this could be dangerous with cars coming round the bend. Disagree with installing pedestrian islands as the road does not seem big enough as it is. A chicane close might be an idea to slow down traffic on Beechwood Av. Yes please upgrade the guardrail. We disagree to the no entry from Beechwood to Styvichale or Warwick Road as we don't see how it would slow down traffic on Beechwood, it does not feel like they are used as rat runs and both roads are anyway broad enough not to be adversely affected by current traffic levels. If the extra double yellow lines are meant for Beechwood, yes that is a good idea as any parking makes the road even narrower. We disagree with any measures to limit through journeys on the other roads as they are already limited through current parking arrangements.
People already park on the double yellow lines outside our house entering the allotments, these aren't monitored and there are always cars parked on the double yellows. How will you monitor the other proposed double yellows? A safe cross outside the nursery would be good for the amount of families crossing there. I think we need speed chicanes at the bottom of beechwood avenue. The rubbish littering, speeding and engine noise make beechwood avenue really undesirable, so anything we can do to stop this in the evening would be great.
Oppose the introduction of no entry points on the roads noted - these will make the main roads even busier, increasing journey distances and times (for all journeys at all times) and hence emissions. Resident access will also be hindered. Traffic calming measures such as speed bumps and road narrowing would be preferential in

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
limiting speeds and improving road safety , whilst maintaining access for residents and allowing use of alternative routes at particularly busy times.
All of these are totally unnecessary
You're piling alot of changes into one question here! The chicane is a great idea. For the other changes I suggest modelling this first to see what the impact is.
As a resident of atvyexhal and Earlsdon Avenue ..the residents will need access both ways to get out without haveing to go along the kenilworth road !!.
Fully support.
I think a lot of these ideas restrict traffic flow and will push more traffic down Rochester Road from Beechwood Ave towards the high street, or back up the other direction, which I do not want or support. Why no entry to Styvechale or Warwick? They are not private roads, so why are they special and have restrictions? If anything, as wider streets, they should have more traffic diverted through them to reduce traffic load off the high street where more pedestrians will be. The measures listed will not reduce the traffic, just slow it down and push it down Rochester Road. Safety measures for pedestrians are good, also upgraded guardrail. Traffic calming/slowing measures sound good, but do not need the 20mph limit plus these. Not sure a chicane is a good idea, if you come round the sharp bend you should already be going slowly, but you might come up to stopped traffic without much warning.
Closing Arden St at junction with Hartington Cres. would remove a well used shortcut but remove an unruly chicane of a rat-run. This would surely improve things immensely for this end of Arden St as well as giving extra St parking to Hartington residents. A good idea.btw I'm sure 'Warwick Road' is a typo!
Why have both styvechale and Warwick Rd no entry from beechwood Ave? Something needs to be done resend in beechwood Ave. I don't understand how the other proposals would be of benefit
Where will the traffic that is limited from these roads go??? Radcliffe Road, will become busier, more congested, parking issues passing points are few when both dies of road are used for parking. You are only moving the traffic issue to a more concentrated are.
All these measures for No Entry on Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Road will seem to cause more traffic than reduce especially towards Rochester and Radcliffe Road into Earlsdon Street? As mentioned for Beechwood Avenue you need to have Average speed cameras to be in force to instruct the drivers to speed at 20mph which will resolve issues of accidents occuring on the blind bend
Again this is too all embracing as each proposal should be looked at separately So not a lot
Not in favour of the no entry to Styvechale Avenue as would make it more difficult to access our home. Currently rat running from that direction is not a major concern. Maybe "Access Only - no through road" signs could be an alternative. Whatever happens needs to be consistent with Warwick Avenue though. Everything else is a positive.
agree junction improvements and pedestrian islands agree chicane & guardrail but there should be 2 chicanes, 1 either side of double bends, similar to Coat of Arms Bridge Rd disagree Styvechale ave & Warwick rd, these roads are wide and straight enough to take passing vehicles agree Arden st & Shaftesbury, however am concerned Rochester rd, could struggle with extra traffic double yellow lines?? there are plenty of these but rarely enforced, especially outside Millisy's
Not sure about restricting access to Warwick Avenue and styvechale as wasn't aware of any problem there.
I fully support this proposal
If you try to reduce traffic on Beechwood, it will may increase elsewhere. However, chicanes, pedestrian islands and all traffic claming measures are good as this may not reduce traffic, but reduce the ability to speed. No entry to Warwick & Styvechale Avenue seems a bit pointless and would surely increase traffic on Earlsdon Avenue South. Upgrading the gaudrail is a very good idea! Bollards, planters and any traffic calming measures on these roads are good, blocking entry seems pointless.
This is complex. Beechwood Road is a worry. I can see no virtue in banning entry into both Warwick Street and Styvechale Avenue. They are not heavily used as "rat runs" and restricted entry would create longer driving, inconvenience and more pollution to local residents and this is not enhancing a liveable neighbourhood. Closing access to Stoneleigh Avenue from the Kenilworth Road would create a large area becoming a cul de sac which I cannot see as beneficial to residents. I also really question this route being a "rat run" as my regular but

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
occasional use has never encountered this, nor have friends who live in the road. There would be a need to change the priority of the junction with Rochester Road and Beechwood Avenue if that is the only route to the allotments, Canley and beyond. I hope the proposed plans would make this safe or even, perhaps, considering traffic lights which could take into account the main flow of traffic
I think beechwood needs to be reduced to 20 and possibly chicanes or speed bump. I don't think anything else needs to be done
Agree
Back any idea that makes Beechwood Avenue a safer place. Particularly around bend by golf club. Perhaps warning lights?
I am utterly opposed to the idea of closing Warwick and styvechale Avenue, stoneleigh and woodland. This would achieve nothing but traffic jams and there is no issue to solve . As a resident of Woodland the through traffic is fine. If you change things we will constantly be queuing in a bottleneck
All you need to do is put some traffic calming on beechwood AVE and the other problems will resolve without having to do anything else. It is not sensible to block roads for emergency service access or for the ease of residents to visit friends and family. If beechwood is sorted by stopping people using it to cut from tile hill to Kenilworth road and make the a45 the better route, then traffic issues would be better. More double yellows on beechwood would be beneficial as crossing is difficult with the parked cars.
All the problems seem to be caused by people using Beechwood as a shortcut through to the A45 at Tile Hill. It was very quiet before the retail park was built and access to the A45 created. Hence I think that traffic calming along Beechwood would be enough to solve the problems and stop it being used as a through route. It's difficult to cross Beechwood safely due to speeding traffic. Closing side roads would cause chaos at the junctions of Beechwood, Earlsdon Avenue and Stoneleigh with Kenilworth Road which is already busy.
Very concerned about these proposals and think they need more thought Arden street - currently traffic comes up Earlsdon street and turns around in Arden street end by the organic shop or in Stanley rd entrance - dangerous for motorists and pedestrians this will further create this happening at the Stanley rd entrance so more danger for Stanley rd residents . Unclear why one way is needed on styechale and Warwick - they are large wide roads - closing them creates more traffic up the dangerous entry past the golf club on beechwood . The mini roundabout and crossing sound dangerous . Beechwood to bates is a blind corner and the crossing would be hard to see in advance. The chicane and traffic calming could be replaced with a one way traffic light system ensuring people have to slow Uncertain why double yellows are required - it feels safe to park on beechwood - again a wide road leading to the park . Why do it one side only - surely this makes it worse - containing vehicles to one side makes it harder for home owners to exit due to visibility .
Agree - all the measures make sense
Can't see the point of narrowing the roundabout. Drivers will abuse it. Chicane, yes. Limiting access to styvechale and Warwick av is again creating a build up in beechwood Arden st also is a definite no! Our road will get more traffic turning around. More problems parking. Can't remember when I last parked my car anywhere near my house in Stanley. Often have to use Palmerston. !!!! To conclude, when kenilworth rd has any problems. Traffic is always re routed through earlsdon. With many routes then unusable it would be a nightmare. And increase problems for our community
Agree with some of the traffic calming measures on Beechwood Ave. Concerned about the change of priority at the Rochester Road junction, this would need to be clearly signposted to avoid accidents defining the change. I'm very concerned about the changes to Styvechale Ave and Warwick Road junctions; this again will force more traffic down Earlsdon Avenue South causing more of a nuisance to those living on the street. We have already had several car accidents trying to pull out of Hollybank (which is on the bend with very poor visibility) and the council have thus far not attempted to improve the situation.
Most of these proposals are unnecessary and will cause problems for local residents
I agree with making the existing roundabout a more mini roundabout. I don't agree with changing the layout at the junction of Beechwood Avenue and Rochester Road, because I don't think it will be very helpful for residents. I would prefer a pedestrian crossing to a pedestrian island but otherwise I'm in support of those changes east of

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
bates road and by the club house. I think narrowing the road to the entrance of the tennis club is brilliant. I'm very happy to see the suggestion for a substantial guardrail on beechwood.
Yes please!
Strongly disagree
I am opposed to your plans for Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Road as I need to enter these roads from Beechwood Avenue to access a safe right turn into Kenilworth Road. One solution would be to make these roads no entry from Earlsdon Avenue South rather than from Beechwood Avenue
Absolutely NO to entry restricted entries. It's generally only people who live locally that use these streets anyway- to get to their own homes. Why over implicate the whole of earlsdon with so many no entries and extended one way areas? It works at the moment, earlsdon is not congested and traffic flows freely. The concern is you are introducing measures that will cause congestion and contribute to an increase in air pollution. WHO ASKED FOR THIS AND WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU ARE SEEKING TO FIX???????
Definitely pro having a chicane or other speed restricting measures on beechwood rd however.
Beechwood Avenue is definitely a road that needs traffic calming measures, so I support the proposals. I will be personally inconvenienced to a certain extent with the limited through journeys on Styvechale Avenue, however I understand the reasoning behind the proposal and therefore support it.
Happy with this
No opinion
That's fine
Again, all of these measures will just create more congestion somewhere else. Annoying both residents and road users.
I'm strongly in favour of all these proposals, particularly closing the Styvechale rat run from Kenilworth Road.
Agree
I think the work on Beechwood itself is an absolute must. But I think all the no-entries should be trialled in the first instance.
I agree with these proposals
In favour of all these.
The junction changes at Rochester/Beechwood Avenue so Rochester is the primary route and traffic already in Beechwood Avenue has to stop and then crossover to Rochester Road can only delay the traffic flow and make the tight bend at the top of Bates Road more dangerous with traffic stopping around a blind bend.
Sheet 14 "We are proposing a road closure on Stoneleigh Avenue at its junction with Kenilworth Road to prevent through traffic."
This proposal does little to help local residents
Residents living in Woodland and Stoneleigh Avenue will have to exit onto Beechwood Avenue in order to make car journeys to the City Centre or Kenilworth. This will make turning right into Beechwood difficult as traffic will already be backing off from the Beechwood / Kenilworth Road junction. Will probably encourage more anti-social behaviour as a meeting point at the end of Stoneleigh Avenue where the planters/bollards will be sited.
Beechwood certainly needs calming down. My grandchildren were going to cycle to Finham from their homes on Hartington Crescent and Shaftesbury but although it would be safe from the other side of the Kenilworth Road to the school, the dangers of Beechwood have prevented them from cycling. They often have to be picked up by their parents in cars which is just adding to traffic and pollution.
* Road restrictions across the Earlsdon area will INCREASE the amount of traffic on Beechwood Avenue not reduce it eg, traffic unable to enter Styvechale and Warwick Avenue trying to access the Earlsdon High Street and beyond will be forced past the golf club or back onto Kenilworth Road
* The 'traffic calming' measures will cause more congestion by restricting traffic flow. Cars will be stopping and starting more often increasing fuel consumption / pollution
* Traffic will back up on a blind bend if traffic flow is changed outside St Barbara's church to give priority to traffic

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
on Rochester Road
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The pedestrian refuge point outside Beechwood Court is too near the bend and not needed here. Pedestrians from Bates Road walk left on the bend towards the church or right towards the tennis club. Crossing is safe here. * The guard rail should be replaced / maintained by the Council anyway * Again, traffic measures put in place because of concerns about traffic displacement from other roads. * What data supports closure of Stoneleigh Avenue at Kenilworth Road? Not enough people cycle along Stoneleigh / Woodland Avenue to warrant this. The congestion at this junction is due to a resident parking numerous cars for his business which restrict turnings in /out. This will dead end will become a business car park. Have the Council looked into this? * Do the Council have a budget for the maintenance and upkeep of benches, green spaces and planters blocking entry to roads ?
I do not agree at all with measures to make roads no entry points. I am very firmly against this.
Some traffic calming on Beechwood Ave is needed, to stop those who like to take the bends quickly., so the chicane is a good idea. The junctions on the road are not a problem so blocking off Styvechale and Warwick Ave will just make locals lives difficult and cause problems elsewhere. Similarly narrowing at Hartington Crescent is not needed. Restrictions on Arden St would make life for those houses better I suspect as the road is quite narrow . Shaftesbury is not a problem.
No opinion
All good.
<p>Agree to all in principle.</p> <p>As currently designed, the chicane close to the entrance to the tennis club will do very little to slow traffic as it approaches the double bend. The give way needs to be on the other side of the road to slow the traffic effectively. Also, the specification says it would be an informal pedestrian crossing - but there is no pavement for the proposed chicane to join on.</p>
These are all good suggestions, except for limiting the traffic into Warwick Avenue/ Styvechale Avenue, Stoneleigh Avenue/ Woodland Avenue. These are all very wide road with large houses which mostly have their own driveway, therefore both ways of the road are available for traffic to go through. This feels like giving privileged area even more privilege, while making narrower street (like Warwick Street) more traffic and parking issues.
How will double yellow lines be enforced? There is a general lack of parking enforcement of existing restrictions. More pedestrian islands would be welcome.
Pathetic
Cars and taxis would continue to use the entrance to Stanley Rd as a turning point. I mentioned this big problem during the audit walk!
<p>People living in Stoneleigh and Woodland Avenues might feel cut off if can't use Styvechale or Warwick Avenue. They will have to use Kenilworth Road which is a busy junction.</p> <p>The restrictions on Stychevale and Warwick will mean more traffic on EarlsdonAve South and Earlsdon St. Also possible 'rat run' through The Firs to get from Kenilworth Rd to Earlsdon Ave South to acess Warwick and Styvechale.</p>
Fully approve
I don't agree with blocking off Stoneleigh Avenue with the Kenilworth Rd. I think this will lead to a lot of congestion at the junction of Stoneleigh Avenue with Beechwood Avenue. Also blocking Styvechale and Warwick Avenues will add to this congestion. I think traffic calming in Stoneleigh Avenue would be an better idea.
Will be difficult luvng on stanley road, already we cant park in the road due to cars parking when they use the high street
Yes, agree to all of these. I would be supportive making the entrance to Arden St from Earlsdon St a genuine 'no entry' and one way only from Warwick St down to Earlsdon St on Arden. The speed of traffic here is also something I'd be in support of restricting, through traffic calming measures.

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
I agree with everything apart from the no entry points. I think there should be speed bumps in place as it will stop people cutting through as it will make their journey longer.
Again, I would like to see data (and not modelled data) that suggests Beechwood Avenue needs traffic calming devices. The guardrail by Palmerston is destroyed because someone crashed into it - it has been like that for a long time now and no-one has even fixed it which speaks for itself. No benches, planters and bollards - no street furniture at all, please - as it just looks untidy and is an additional expense and something else that needs maintaining. Town planners! None of you live in Earlsdon or even Coventry and none of you have any idea what it is like to live here. You have not been in traffic at 8am trying to get your kids to school and to work on time - the frustration of finding that certain routes you have used for years have suddenly been closed off is going to be intolerable. Once you stop the free flow of traffic in one area, you create bottle-necks and congestion in others.
In favour. I assume narrowing the roundabout would deter large vehicles from turning I to this residential area and dissuade drivers from seeing the crescent as an easy short cut.
Approve
consideration needs to be given to the junction of Hartington Crescent and Beechwood Avenue current roundabout. suggest that this is turned into a T-junction with priority to Beechwood Avenue and allow for two lanes from Hartington Crescent for right and left turns. there should be less traffic needing to turn left from Beechwood Avenue. Traffic coming from Kenilworth Rd direction will also need a right filter from Beechwood into Hartington making it a safer junction.
Agree. Planters preferable. Shared resident maintenance should be easy to establish
<p>DISAGREE</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pointless narrowing mini-roundabout at Beechwood Avenue & Hartington Crescent further - it's already so small it's hardly worth driving round it! 2. Not sure it's worth spending all that money when the church side of the road isn't congested and I wouldn't try and cross the roads right by the junction in any case. 3. Adding the chicane might work but it's the bend that causes more problems as big cars overlap the white lines in the direction from Beechwood / Kenilworth Road to the dangerous bend before church. 4. Yes, upgrade the barrier but signs are needed to warn motorists. 5. Making Styvchall & Warwick Avenue no entry from Beechwood Avenue will cause huge problems for residents and also from ourselves living in Woodland. <p>I really do not think anyone has considered how residents leave and return to their homes. With the proposed plans I will no longer be able to exit Stoneleigh road onto the Kenilworth to travel to work in Kenilworth. I can turn right to get out the road at peak times when the pelican crossing is used by children walking home from 2 nearby schools.</p> <p>To exit on Beechwood Avenue is a hazard:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) It is impossible to see to turn right as there are always parked cars by the woods. b) It is impossible to turn right onto the Kenilworth road and most times. The pelican crossing there is never used apart from at weekends when people go to the Memorial park. c) the only easy way to get onto the Kenilworth road is to use the traffic lights at top of Earlsdon Avenue South but with Warwick and Styvchale Avenues no entry - I can't do that either. <p>How do I get to work?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6) Add double yellow lines along the top of Beechwood but be careful where else as many residents do not have off road parking. 7) I do not want any no entry points but I certainly would not want planters only to be filled with weeds. I am a keen Gardner but the current craze of not mowing lawns and allowing wild flowers (weeds) to take over is not right for inner cities. Having a relative with hay fever he now suffers terribly. It will be an eye-saw and why? who wants to decorate the end of a street? <p>ANOTHER WASTE OF MONEY AND RESOURCES</p>

<p>Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue</p>
<p>I agree with the suggestions above and Beechwood Avenue is a clear priority for traffic calming, but I am concerned about the knock on effect of no entry points in the roads proposed. I live in XXXXXXX and it is already difficult turning onto Kenilworth Road from Earlsdon Avenue South. I walk daily to and from the Memorial Park and the traffic is always tailing back there. I know that some residents would welcome it as they believe it will solve other problems (improve security by limiting the getaway route for car thefts etc, issues with someone parking multiple cars at the junction) but I'm not sure it would make a difference. Some residents believe the road is used as a way to avoid the lights on Kenilworth Road, but I have not experienced issues with speeding cars or heavy traffic. It is generally a quiet road, wide enough for cars to pass safely.</p>
<p>Warwick Avenue and Styvechale Avenues are the least busy, quietest streets in Earlsdon now. Why direct traffic away from them to Earlsdon Street</p>
<p>Agree with upgrading the guardrail by Palmerston Road. Do not agree with any of the other measures.</p>
<p>These sound like sensible improvements aimed at discouraging use of Earlsdon as a rat run to Kenilworth road.</p>
<p>agree with narrowing the mini-roundabout agree changing layout at Beechwood/Rochester Road Agree chicane at the Tennis Club.</p>
<p>As a resident of Beechwood Ave here are my comments and suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Hartington Crescent and Beechwood Ave roundabout. The roundabout needs to be a physical presence not just painted as well as narrowing the road. Making a driver manoeuvre round the roundabout will slow down the traffic. 2) Changing the right of way at the Beechwood Avenue/Rochester Rd. junction is not acceptable. If you want to make a change that is more acceptable to me then propose a four way stop junction with no right of way in any direction. 2a) As I also understand the proposal you would restrict traffic crossing the junction making it turn rather than go straight across. How do I go home if I come down the Kenilworth Rd? If I have understood this correctly it is totally unacceptable. 3) Pedestrian islands will mean a reduced number of parking slots along Beechwood Ave. not acceptable. Alternatively if you want a crossing at Rochester Road then make it a traffic light controlled crossing this could be used by both Rochester Rd. and Bates Rd. pedestrians. 4) it is necessary to slow traffic down on both sides of the Z bend on Beechwood Ave. a chicane on one side won't work traffic often comes faster from the Kenilworth Rd end of Beechwood Ave. and can drift into the middle of the Z bend causing it to be dangerous. Sleeping policeman humps on either side of the bend would be a much better means of control (you might not like them but I believe they need to be reconsidered). The guard rail should be upgraded. 5) The desire to stop traffic leaving Beechwood Ave on Styvechale Ave, Warwick Ave, and Shaftesbury Ave; means that more traffic will be channeled down Beechwood Avenue as well as potentially Arden St. and Earlsdon St. rather than being dispersed across all the other roads mentioned. It may be desirable to the residents of those streets but what of those people living in Beechwood Avenue etc. You considered stopping all but bus traffic going over the railway bridge on Beechwood Ave. but decided against it because it would increase traffic on Earlsdon Avenues North and South I agree that that is not desirable. You need to reconsider these proposals to prevent the flow of traffic on some roads in Earlsdon and some how reduce the desire for thru traffic passing through Earlsdon to come into the area. Reconsider sleeping policemen strategically placed these slow down traffic and should minimise numbers that use Beechwood as a rat run. 6) Extra double yellow lines should only be used for safety. It is not acceptable to add extra lines they will reduce road parking slots in what are already congested streets.
<p>In favour of all</p>
<p>Beechwood Avenue is a danger Zone and there has been several accidents. I know people whom will avoid walking on the bend after several accidents along here. Any measures that will slow traffic down here are needed urgently before another accident will happen.</p>
<p>I don't agree with blocking off styvechale and Warwick ave, this will only increase volume of traffic coming down beechwood ave. Beechwood ave is already busy and people will just use beechwood ave as a cut through.</p>
<p>I also don't agree with double yellow lines on one side of the road on beechwood ave outside number 20-22 beechwood. We xxxxxxx and it will just push people to park on our side of the road. It's already difficult getting on and off the driveway with the amount of people parking on beechwood ave to use the golf club and this will just increase with double yellow lines on opposite side.</p>

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
This will just cause chaos for the residents in the roads that you are restricting access to, the best way to calm all the through traffic would be to add speed bumps that you have to slow down for, otherwise you risk damaging your car. That way all of the idiots that use these roads as race tracks won't be able to anymore.
Changing the layout between Beechwood and Rochester how exactly? Where along beechwood would there be pedestrian islands? Some of this road is already narrow. Absolutely against any measures to restrict access to roads through no entry points. How can they be no entry without being no exit? What about access for emergency vehicles or bin lorries? Some residents will have longer journeys to access their homes and there will be more traffic forced onto already busy roads. Adding insult to injury asking residents to be involved in the upkeep of planters ! The double yellow lines already in existence are ignored so who and how will extra ones be policed.
Supportive of everything but the no entry to Styvechale avenue and Warwick Avenue
no entry points on Styvechale, Warwick Arden, Shaftesbury and Stoneleigh/Woodlands avenue is not a great for residents getting in and out of the area. Agree Double yellow lines is a good thing. Beechwood Avenue needs traffic calming this has become a rat run.
No entry to Warwick/Styvechale Avenues will cause a problem for residents
Spend the money on fixing potholes instead.
Just pushes traffic onto other streets in the area
Am I missing something, does this not just drive a lot of traffic down Rochester Road?
Good idea
See no benefit in narrowing the mini roundabout No entry to Styvechale and Warwick Aves seems ridiculous. These roads are not that busy Plans to limit through journeys unnecessary
I do not support the proposal to make it no entry on to Styvechale avenue and Warwick Road. These changes add to the disruption and traffic displacement and I fail to see why the other more minor changes in this list would not achieve the desired outcome.
The speed and volume of traffic on Beechwood is a problem, especially the blind corner into Bates Road, and all of these measures should help.
It is a good idea to stop racing.
Making Warwick Avenue and Styvechale Avenue one way - why on earth!!! Another way to cause chaos, can't see any sensible reason for doing this
I do not support any of the proposed measures to limit through journeys by no entry points. Again I feel the inconvenience and increased journeys far outweigh any benefits sought. some parts good others not
Don't add more yellow lines. Parked vehicles slow down traffic naturally. Don't like Warwick and Styvechale Aves blocked off. I use these to get to Avondale. Yes to crossings and chicane and Rochester priority on Beechwood and guardrails. No to Arden at and roads that side of Radcliffe and Rochester being blocked off. Too many no go areas for emergency vehicles to negotiate. Planters and Bollards block these services.
MANY people cross the road at the Beechwood Ave/Rochester Rd junction - both residents of Rochester Rd/Woodfield Rd etc and vistors to the many events in the church.
Strongly support efforts to limit through journeys on Arden St XXXXXXXX
Disagree with all except for measures at tennis club entrance. Easy fix cut back trees for visibility.
-
Ok
I am strongly in favour of reducing both the speed and volume of traffic on Beechwood Avenue, and making it safer to cross as detailed here. Particular points of concern for me are the blind bend at the entrance to Bates Road, and the narrowness/bendiness of Beechwood Avenue between the tennis club and the golf club. As a cyclist travelling from Earlsdon towards The Riddings, it is particularly nerve-racking to have to move into and wait in the middle of Beechwood Avenue to turn right on a bend where oncoming cars do not expect a bike to be crossing, and it is also scary to be overtaken very close on the narrow/bendy section between Bates Road and

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
Kenilworth Road. Ideally I wish Beechwood Avenue could be widened enough to put cycle lanes in both directions.
I can't see making it no entry to Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Avenue no entry from Beechwood Avenue helps you are funnelling yet more traffic on Beechwood Avenue who want to get to the Kenilworth road
Most of these I agree with apart from "No Entry" into Styvechale and Warwick. Frankly, that's just a stupid idea
I am appalled at the proposal to stop us entering both Warwick Avenue and Styvechale Avenue from the Beechwood Avenue end....I use it frequently (from both ends) to go to town via Belvedere Road and then via KH into town and also to turn right at the traffic lights into Kenilworth Road to go South eg to the A45 There are times when Turning right from Beechwood Avenue into Kenilworth Road is not easy because of the traffic viz Express buses, Park and Ride vehicles and sometimes streams of vehicles going in both directions. (Sometimes it can be done relatively easily) I try to avoid using the High Street because of buses, delivery vans, pedestrian crossings (especially at school times) I am Totally Against this proposed closure of Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Avenue, both are quite wide roads and should be available for Public use including parking
Please donit
All needed
Narrowing mini roundabout is not necessary - wasted expense. - Strongly opposed to no entry into Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Road. Will mean I have to drive onto Kenilworth Road to get to Coundon, adding to Kenilworth road congestion and using more fuel. I have not seen any congestion in these roads especially Warwick Avenue which is sufficient wide to allow parking and two way traffic. - Will there be a negative impact on Fire engine and Ambulance access should much of Earlsdon become one way or would this be improved? - Strongly opposed to closing south entrance to Stoneleigh Avenue. I use that entry/exit to Kenilworth Road for majority of my journeys. It is more difficult to get onto Kenilworth Road at Beechwood Avenue - 25 years living here tells me that. - Seats and planters are a total waste of expense and will require ongoing maintenance by council. We have an exceptional Memorial Park where community can sit and meet and enjoy pleasant surroundings. In all honesty planters will not be maintained by neighbourhood in the longterm. I would like to see the detailed evidence supporting the argument that Stoneleigh Avenue is used as a rat run - not just findings from insurance black box data.
You have put so much here it is hard to break it down I think this is done so it is hard for an individual to comment clearly on this Your first point is wrong due to closures etc more traffic will be directed onto Beechwood Changes on dangerous mini roundabout are a good idea (muted by residents when it was first done but ignored) No need to change Beechwood junction I pass there nearly everyday and have never incurred a problem A chicane would cause tailbacks and lead to frustrated divers speeding up to get through it Guard is a good idea No entries on the 2 roads mentioned are unnecessary (unless of course residents there want a quiet residential street themselves bur will still drive their cars into Earlsdon and cause problems in other peoples roads) Why double yellows the ones we have are not enforced Limiting traffic in these roads is a poor idea ,the road I live on will have many more problems due to this RADCLIFFE ROAD IS NOT MENTIONED ANYWHERE IN THESE PROPOSALS NOT EVEN ON THE MAPS SO MUCH FOR US BEING PART OF A LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOOD!!!!!!
I don't use or access these roads so can't comment but if residents want them then great!
Good
Closing access to Warwick Ave and Styvechale Ave seems unnecessary. Rather have traffic calming eg narrowing like on Coat of Arms Bridge
No entry to Warwick Avenue and Styvechale Avenue is pointless. There is no problem to address
Fully support
a. narrowing the mini roundabout: Yes. Useful. b. changing the layout at the junction of Beechwood/Rochester: No. Unnecessary if 20mph speed limit enforced. May create dangerous tailback to the Bated Road blind bend.

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
<p>c. installing pedestrian islands: Yes. Useful.</p> <p>d. Adding a chicane at the Tennis Club: No. Unnecessary if 20mph speed limit enforced. I am worried about the reference to accidents from similar on Coat of Arms Bridge Road. It will not slow traffic from Kenilworth Road end. It will not reduce the danger to pedestrians from cyclists using the pavement on the bends. I've nearly been knocked over many times and more cycling will just make it worse.</p> <p>e. upgrading the guardrail: Yes.</p> <p>f. no entry to Styvechale Avenue and Warwick: No. I am totally against this. It cuts this end of Beechwood Avenue (and Woodland and Stoneleigh Avenue) off from Earlsdon – we would no longer be part of it. To get anywhere in Earlsdon we would have to go all the way to St Barbaras, Rochester Rd and Earlsdon Street adding a huge amount to journeys and to the congestion in the heart of Earlsdon. It also cuts us off from the only safe exit onto Kenilworth Road. We use the traffic lights on Earlsdon Avenue South, and reach them via Styvechale or Warwick Avenue, so we are probably the people creating the alleged 'rat run'! We find the junction of Beechwood Avenue/ Kenilworth is unusable – turning right is immensely dangerous and turning left is held up by those waiting to turn right and at times the tailback from Earlsdon Avenue traffic lights. Services provided by Earlsdon businesses to this area would be similarly adversely affected when trying to return to base. Traffic lights at the Beechwood Ave/ Kenilworth Road junction as per Earlsdon Ave is the answer. Without this we would use the huge St Barbaras/Earlsdon St/Earlsdon Ave loop to get onto the Kenilworth Road.</p> <p>g. extra double yellow lines: No. Unnecessary if speed limit enforced, and the current parking either side on Beechwood Ave near the Styvechale junction acts as a very useful 'chicane'. Speeding up the traffic flow is the last thing we need. Reducing the parking will increase the problem of golf club members blocking driveways.</p> <p>h. Measures to limit through journeys: No. I am against all blocking off of these roads. 20 mph speed limit is sufficient.</p>
<p>Agree all improvements to Rochester and Beechwood.</p>
<p>Not sure about all colocmsure on shaftsbury ect.</p>
<p>Some suggestions are slightly unclear, but I am in favour of slowing down traffic and improving pedestrian experience</p>
<p>Sounds like it will just cause short term confusion and frustration and create unintended problems in the surrounding areas.</p>
<p>Seems sensible, but not my neck of the woods so I don't really know.</p>
<p>Do you really expect me to read all this</p>
<p>Not sure that there is enough yet to close down the traffic coming from Bates Rd towards the golf club. It has been cars travelling too fast around the double bend that has caused the two car accidents into our fence in the last two years. I live in fear now of cars coming through our fence, and panic when I hear them accelerating on Beechwood Ave,</p>
<p>My concern with blocking entrances to Warwick Ave or Styvechale Ave is that more traffic would be forced onto Beechwood Ave.</p>
<p>Ok</p>
<p>This is a terrible idea. Up there with the worst ideas! This doesn't solve the real issue of the bend on Beachwood Avenue and puts a plaster on an issue which</p>
<p>Do not agree with closing of roads. It works make moving around these streets a nightmare and would add to traffic approach to the entrance of these roads.. Plus add to problems getting out of Beechwood Avenue onto Kenilworth Road. There should be a speed limiting road adjustment at the bend on Beechwood Av to stop cars coming round the corner half way across the road there should be a crossing for the tennis club and another speed limiting chicane just before the single bend. Everything else is not needed.</p>
<p>The chicane outside the tennis club is a good idea. It's particularly dangerous down there and pedestrians are especially vulnerable. Even driving it feels dangerous. I have my concerns about the changes to Warwick road</p>

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
<p>and stivichall without also doing the same to woodland Avenue. I'd like my kids to be able to play on the street, but we get cars that drive past at up to 60mph taking a short cut. I'd like to see additional traffic calming the whole way down woodland Avenue with trees. Planters are a horrible ugly idea that's nothing but temporary. We should have trees. The road should be access only and more of a car park and playground. Same with all residential roads. I'm pro-car but also for nice multi-purpose roads.</p>
<p>The proposals for Beechwood Avenue are excellent: it has long been a hazardous road - we used to live at the far end of it some years ago and frequently experienced dangerous encounters on the bend by the Golf Club and at the junction with the Riddings. I am not entirely convinced that the measures to restrict access to both Shaftesbury and Warwick Avenue (Road??) and to eliminate access to Stoneleigh Avenue from Kenilworth Road are necessary or desirable. There are definitely times when Kenilworth Road is heavily congested in the vicinity of Memorial Park and it is highly convenient for residents to bypass the congestion by using Stoneleigh and or/ Warwick Avenue. The presence of an alternative to Kenilworth Road in these circumstances is in my view a benefit rather than a problem, but I appreciate that there may be some potential for rat-running traffic at other times. Perhaps traffic calming measures would be more appropriate than the total elimination of options.</p>
<p>Have discussed this in the extra comments section. No issue with the beechwood calming measures. The changes to the HC roundabout are welcomed - it is a nightmare and too wide. Also welcome that no speed bumps have been put in I don't agree with the change to priority around rochester and beechwood - narrowing the junction to rochester is a good idea, but not changing the priority - I can see queues backing up - but worse people missing the junction altogether - just look at the current issues with the roundabout - people don't stop because a high proportion of the time, nobodies there. Personally the guard rail is too close to the kerb on palmerston cut through, often have oncoming traffic sitting in the middle of the road. Agree to extra double yellows - if you're going to enforce it. People ignore them on the high street daily and cause visual obstructions when crossing the road Do not agree with the no entry to styvechale and warwick ave - see extra comments</p> <p>You need to put traffic lights at the beechwood junction with kenilworth road. This would deal with a lot of cut through traffic on styvechale and warwick - not one way systems. It is a really difficult and dangerous junction for cars turning right. I also do a weekly car share with two other households (to reduce car use no doubt!!), one of which is on warwick ave. I do a loop and given the direction of travel, I will no longer be able to do this due to the no entry signs and added miles.</p>
<p>Access for emergency services, will bollards and planters be a problem, slowing these vechiles further?</p>
<p>All these would help the residents of these streets who must be annoyed by inconsiderate drivers.</p>
<p>I don't feel I can comment on these proposals as don't live here or use these routes regularly.</p>
<p>Agree but can we please consider permit holders in some of the changes as the objective is to reduce through traffic and I don't think this has been clear in the messaging</p>
<p>Unsure but not wholly in favour</p>
<p>Would be worried this would result in more on earlsdon avenue n and south and main road. Worried it may be more congested.</p>
<p>There should be active speed cameras so speeding is penalised I'm not sure how narrowing the round about would improve anything The layout at Beechwood and Rochester doesn't seem to be a problem Need more details about pedestrian islands Chicane a good idea to reduce speed Guardrail does need upgrading Not sure there is much through traffic on Styvechale Ave or Warwick It is not clear where yellow line are needed Not sure there is enough traffic to limit through journeys outlined</p>
<p>With a large number of these proposals I fail to understand the logic or the data that the proposals are based on. Beechwood road is largely used by residents entering the area This will cause greater inconvenience for them otwaying any advantage.</p>

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
the difficulty here is the golf club. restricted double yellow lines would prevent parking. Again not sure how the data has arisen to make this a key issue.
Possibly good solution but might mean that more people stay away and will have negative impact on shops
These proposals are at best ridiculous at worst downright dangerous. The change over of priority route from Beechwood Ave to Rochester Rd is dangerous. Travelling on Beechwood Ave it will be impossible to see traffic coming from or towards Rochester Rd because of the high fences on properties on the cross roads . If you want to reduce speed on Beechwood why not use speed cameras, chicanes, speed humps? This must be a cheaper and more effective way of getting the same result. As for closing roads again or making them one way, all this will do is push more traffic on the main roads making them busier and more polluted for all the schoolchildren who use the roads twice a day, also making residents use more fuel than normal because of having to go further to get to their destination.
Good idea as these are currently used as rat runs. We also seem to get a lot of cars cruising down the roads looking for opportunities to steal and casing houses for later thefts This happened this week on woodland where a passing by car spotted a workers van unattended, turned around and then proceeded to steal all their tools before speeding off.
I use beechwood avenue a lot to access to take my daughter to see her friend and most times I take her friend home. It will make it more difficult to take her home.
All these are good proposals. I don't feel they go far enough to restrict the night time activities of the many joyriders we have to live with.
This sounds like more and more signage and road furniture. My experience this just makes it worse for everyone
This is a whole range of measures conveniently grouped together. There's no mention of Arden Street being no entry from either end (blocked one end and no entry from high street) I broadly agree with slowing traffic / pedestrian islands on beechwood avenue but blocking access from beechwood to virtually every other road doesn't reduce traffic it just filters it to Rochester road
Agree
Generally ok
Do not see the need to do this
No view
No view
Why do Styvechale and Warwick ave need to be no entry? These are both very wide roads and when I have driven down them there is hardly any other traffic on them
We arrange homestays at The Riddings. Slowing traffic will help our visitors walk safely across Beechwood at the top of Bates Road.
These areas seem to be fine at the moment...
A very strong "yes please" to all measures apart from the no entry elements to Styvechale & Warwick. As an Earlsdon resident I would be prepared to alter my route to avoid an unnecessary journey along these roads but if I lived along there I would feel it was rather too much of a compromise & would prefer calming measures if possible to ensure more appropriate driving by all. A great amount of traffic along Beechwood exceeds the speed limit, sometimes by a significant margin. The lack of safe crossing places has been a concern for many years. The s bend has seen numerous incidents & damage to property boundaries but I would ask that a reversal in the direction of the chicane be considered as traffic coming from the Bates Road junction will have priority & benefits from a long straight stretch of road on the approach which may encourage drivers to still drive at inappropriate speed. Also, if there is any possibility of something to calm traffic between the roundabout & the railway bridge I would urge the team to relook at that. I know that the regular community speedwatches have documented regular & persistent speeding from daytime traffic along this stretch with some vehicles travelling up to more than 45mph. The reckless & deliberate street racing which the road is plagued by is also frequent along this stretch. Footage from home security cameras confirms this.

<p>Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue</p>
<p>Proposals to Beech wood Avenue are good but something should be done about the bend near to the golf club car parks as this is dangerous because people drive too fast here and are often on the wrong side of the road. also object to no entry into into Styvechale and Warwick Avenues as this would mean if we needed to drive into Earlsdon for shopping etc we would either have to go out onto the Kenilworth road and then down Earlsdon Avenue South or go round by Beechwood Avenue. Also we tend to go down Warwick Avenue to turn right onto Earlsdon Avenue South as there are traffic lights there making it easier to get out onto the Kenilworth Rd. It is very difficult and dangerous to get onto the Kenilworth Road from Beechwood Avenue or Stoneleigh Avenue. Traffic lights at the end of Beechwood Avenue/Kenilworth Road would be a good idea.</p>
<p>None of these measures will reduce the traffic on Beechwood Avenue. By reducing the exits from Beechwood Avenue from 6 to 1 between the railway bridge and the Kenilworth Road this must mean an increase in traffic both to Beechwood Avenue and Rochester Road. I object to some of these roads being described as ‘Rat runs’ they are the normal flow of traffic around the area to allow people to access their properties. The proposals for the calming measures will see the traffic stop starting constantly rather than flowing as it does now. Preventing the access to Arden Street, Shaftesbury Road, Warwick Avenue and Styvechale Avenue just increases the traffic onto other routes making them more difficult to navigate. The closure of Arden Street at the junction with Clarendon street and the one way system proposed for the bottom of Moor Street means that anyone living on Moor Street, Warwick Street, Clarendon Street and Myrtle Grove only have one route out of the area via Arden Street thus increasing the traffic in this area. As a Moor Street resident this system increases my journeys out of my home by car in every direction which also means that returning to my home is a similar problem. Meaning more cost more time and more emissions. The ongoing theme to all this seems to be anti car. The closure of Shaftesbury Road and therefore St Andrews Road and Stoneleigh Avenue and Woodland Avenue also increases the traffic on Beechwood Avenue as they have nowhere else to go.</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None of these measures will reduce traffic on Beechwood Avenue By restricting access to the six roads quoted you will increase traffic. 2. What does this mean? Does it mean widening the pavements? I drive this route every day, it is not a problem. A better solution would be to install a physical island. That would slow traffic. 3. This is a very foolish proposal. Beechwood Avenue takes far more traffic than Rochester road and to reverse the natural flow will cause only delay, driver frustration and increased vehicle emissions. 4. Pedestrian islands should only be installed at the site of pedestrian crossings. 5. The chicane will achieve nothing on what is currently a narrow part of the road with limited forward vision. A better solution would be bigger and better signage of a dangerous(20mph) bend. 6. Please upgrade the guardrail, it has been broken for far too long. 7. Why identify these two roads to the exclusion of the six quoted roads closures below? 8. Good idea to add yellow lines to the dangerous bends by the golf club car park and the junction with Bates Road. 9. Limiting through journeys. This the worst proposal of all, leading only to increased vehicle emissions and expense and inconvenience to all the car using residents. For myself in north Moor Street and all other car users in Myrtle Grove, Clarendon St and Bell Close (I've counted more than 120), not to mention the frequent visitors to the Earlsdon Health Centre and the Jigsaw nursery, this will involve 400 metres on every journey to and from the south towards the city centre and 800 metres for every journey north towards the A45. This cannot be compatible with the councils air quality improvement initiatives.
<p>Would like to ensure cyclists can access Styvechale Ave and Warwick Road Where will the pedestrian islands be? Can vegetables for the community be planted? There are many groups who will maintain city wide but Streetpride and yourselves cannot rely on that. Will there be ongoing funding to maintain changes put in place?</p>
<p>No to all.</p>
<p>Narrowing roundabout: Yes, helpful. Changing layout at Rochester/Beechwood: No. Speed limit could solve the problem. Pedestrian islands: Yes Chicane at tennis club: No - bumps may be a safer solution added to the speed limit. Guardrail upgrade: Yes No entry to Styveschale and Warwick Aves: NO No. Simply moves traffic issues elsewhere. Extra yellow lines: No. Will lead to excessive parking on the other side, especially from the Golf Club. Limit though journeys: No. There is no indication of where the problem will move to.</p>
<p>I don't actually think this will improve anything and just cause traffic to use other roads and cause more congestion</p>

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
Have no problem with proposals for traffic calming on Beechwood Avenue. Disagree with proposal to make streets one way and specifically Warwick and Styvechale Ave one way when they are the widest streets in Earlsdon. Average speed cameras would be better.
Great
I support measures that seek to make safer the small area on Beechwood Avenue between the tennis club and golf club especially the bend by Palmerston Road which has seen some very nasty accidents over the last couple of years, the chicane and upgrades to the guardrail seem sensible.
I do not think the mini roundabout at Beechwood Ave and Hartington Cres needs narrowing but rather better signage, road markings and lighting would be beneficial.
But i DO NOT SUPPORT making Warwick Road, Styvechele Avenue no entry from Beechwood Avenue and i DO NOT SUPPORT making any roads with no entry points. I have serious safety concerns about blocking roads in relation to access by Emergency Services, lengthening time to get to properties by the Emergency Services and would request full disclosure of the Risk Assessment specifically concerning the placing of any planters to make any point of no access. Problems have been witnessed in other areas where planters have been used; https://twitter.com/Rojblake1/status/1712873807747133761?t=Mf7s_dHC51KpELASRdRMMyw&s=19 - this shows an ambulance with its lights flashing unable to gain access due to planters in the road. As an aside we have seen that without money and support planters very quickly become eyesores full of rubbish and discarded items and will very much make the area less "liveable".
All very sensible.
Road needs slowing and a very dangerous bend with pedestrian cut through next to it. Not sure why no entry into Warwick or Styvechale ? Is this currently an issue then ? Agree the roundabout in BA and Hartington is too easily driven over and as a result can be a speeding spot. Stoneleigh Ave and Woodland always seem quiet to me so what is the issue ? Why restrict access and annoy residents and delivery drivers as driving around adds journey time and traffic?
The worst part of all these proposals is making no entry points to Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Avenue, and the measures to limit through journeys on other roads. If implemented these will make my neighbourhood far less liveable and go completely against making the area better for pedestrians and cyclists. These proposals will force much more traffic onto Rochester Road, Radcliffe Road and Earlsdon Street, which is the main pedestrian route for anyone living on multiple roads (Rochester Road, Woodfield Road, Dorney Close, Bates Road, Innis Road and the Riddings) to access the shops, the library, the primary school and other local services (doctors surgeries, the theatre, etc). Earlsdon Street is already busy with delivery vehicles and other traffic at school drop off and pick up times (especially when the constant flow of pedestrians across the zebra crossing stops traffic). If these proposals are implemented the traffic will vastly increase and our children will be breathing in even more pollution as traffic waits at the pedestrian crossings at the roundabout, and waits to pass delivery vehicles.
In contrast, Warwick Avenue and Styvechale Avenue have few pedestrians, they are wide roads and most houses have parking for multiple cars (particularly Warwick Avenue). These roads should take traffic, to take the pressure off Rochester/Radcliffe/Earlsdon Street where: most of the pedestrians are; fewer houses have off road parking; and where delivery vehicles must park on the frontages as the shops mostly don't have rear access. If there are issues with speeding on Warwick and Styvechale Avenues, this could be tackled with traffic calming measures rather than limiting access. The cycle route along Warwick could even be separated from the rest of the carriageway - the road is wide enough.
I'm in favour of: narrowing the mini roundabout changing the layout at the junction of Beechwood Avenue and Rochester Road (albeit a crossing point is needed the church side) installing pedestrian islands Adding a chicane upgrading the guardrail by Palmerston Road adding extra double yellow lines My daughter and many other children I know walk along Beechwood to Finham, so I'm very happy with the proposals to calm traffic.

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
Agreed
I support this
<p>-Mini roundabout. Yes</p> <p>-My suggestion for Beechwood Avenue is to make the path dual cycle and pedestrian. This would mean ensuring property owners' hedges are cut to their boundary. Most f it is wide enough, but there are a few pinch points which would need attention.</p> <p>-Rochester/Beechwood junction. This could mean that people speed across in the opposite direct to the current flow.</p> <p>-Your colleage at the drop In said that people would not use Beechwood Avenue if Woodland and Stneleigh were blocked. I doubt they live here. Thatt is not likely to be true. Have you tried using the A45 instead?The queues are awful : Malfunction Junction aka Fatty Island aka Sainsburys turn off, lots of speeding traffic on Herald Way -even on a Sunday afternoon. The local drivers will go through Earlsdon, one way or another, what ever. eE more traffic on beechwood and Earlsdon Avenue.</p> <p>-chicane. Maybe.</p> <p>- Palmeston Road guardrail. There is something wrong about it, but not being an expert, I can't pinpoint exactly what. It actually distracts you from the oncoming traffic when you drive east....Perhaps it should not be so noticable that it makes you look...</p> <p>- No entries are not a good idea.....again funelling traffic instead of spreading it around . probably not liked by the residents either.</p> <p>-Yellow lines. These need reviewing in all the streets. it took years to get them at the Rochester Road junction, and would you believe, they are too short!! even following the recent resurfacing, it is difficult for the buses to get around. Unbelievable! Likewise on Arden Street.</p> <p>As an aside, the contractors that do road works should be maf de to clear up properly after the job and not leave thousands of little stones around to wash into all the drains (that then get blocked). With hold payment until the job has been completed!</p> <p>_ No entries should just be dropped. No bollards or planters please.</p> <p>-Traffic lights at the Kenilworth Road Junction please. This would stop people cutting through Warwick and Styvechale Avenue.</p>
I think my worry would be if implementing the changes to Spencer Ave, (which I obviously am supportive of) we still need access to get in and out of Earlsdon, and if we end up with only one or two roads that can actually be driven down, then the traffic will become unmanageable. I would like to ensure a reduction in the traffic caused by non-Earlsdon residents using our streets as shortcuts, but not make it really difficult for Earlsdon residents to be able to get around.
Leave it as it is, Arden street required some speed bumps to deter speeding
I support these.
Agree but no speed bumps
As a runner, I do feel very exposed to traffic around Earlsdon. There are blind spots and bends and people drive way to fast for the size of streets. Also having two young children we try so hard to educate them on road safety, and proposals like this would make a huge difference.
This plan is crazy, through journeys are being removed with traffic pushed on to beechwood avenue, which is planned to have a lower road speed, obstacles to slow traffic down, losing the right of way to rochester road, and hard to get out of the road on the kenilworth road. By shutting roads, people have to make longer journeys and make other roads more congested. The sheer stupidity around this scheme in it's entirety baffles me.
No comment
Not necessary, this will simply force traffic elsewhere and create havoc for other residents
Supportive. Consideration should be given to impact on local journeys as well as through traffic, e.g. access to / from Earlsdo allotments by locals
Beechwood Avenue is a rat run and needs traffic calming measures
Good but hope bicycles and pedestrians through the bollards off areas
<p>Narrowing a roundabout will have no effect on usage.</p> <p>Pedestrian islands are useful.</p> <p>Installing a chicane implies you have no faith in speed limits! It will not change traffic behaviour or volume.</p> <p>I assume you mean footpath from Palmarstone Rd to Beechwood, providing sufficient safety to children via a guardrail here shouldn't be subject to opinion - JUST DO IT.</p>

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
Restricting Warwick/Styvechale Ave will just move the problem somewhere else, these are wide roads with much off-street parking, they cannot expect to be traffic free.
Something needs to be done to slow traffic on Beechwood. I had hoped that my grandchildren living on Shaftesbury and Hartington Crescent would be cycling to Finham School but it is far too dangerous unlike on the other side of the Kenilworth Rd so they have to walk almost three miles there and back.
This will bring more traffic onto Earlsdon Avenue
Yes
All businesses should be taken into consideration whilst making any decision
Good proposal
traffic calming good - the rest is very poor. making it no entry to both Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Road from Beechwood Ave forces all traffic down Rochester road to use Earlsdon Street to cut through instead, making the shopping area less safe plus leads to more traffic risking turning onto Kenilworth Road which is already a nightmare at rush hour with all cut throughs available - why not only make one of these no entry or turn it into a one way block? And add traffic lights to Beechwood Ave/Kenilworth Road junction .Making both Arden Street and Shaftesbury Road no entry, again forces all traffic down Rochester road around the bus stops - why not only make one of these no entry or turn these roads into a one way block?
I see no need to change the mini roundabout at the junction of Beechwood Avenue and Hartington Crescent. I am COMPLETELY opposed to the proposals about the layout of the junction of Beechwood Avenue and Rochester Road. I just can't see what difference it will make. Traffic travelling along Beechwood Avenue from Kenilworth road will already be travelling slowly due to the 90 degree bend and traffic travelling in the other direction will already be slowly down either to turn into Rochester Road or continue around the 90 degree bend. I would see this as a colossal waste of money. I am not opposed to the installation of the pedestrian islands as this will slow traffic and help pedestrians cross the road. I am opposed to the chicane close to the tennis club as I thin it is unnecessary. I am in favour of upgrading the guardrail by Palmerston Road and what about adding chevron marks to indicate the sharp bend ahead. I am totally opposed to making it no entry to Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Road as I just think it is unnecessary with will make it more inconvenient for those genuinely needing to turn into these roads. I am not against adding extra double yellow lines but would point out that those using the park often park at the Kenilworth Road end of Beechwood Avenue and will have to park elsewhere. Also double yellow lines are pointless unless there is sufficient enforcement which there isn't. I am totally opposed to the changes to Arden Street, Shaftesbury Road, Warwick Avenue/ Styvechale Avenue, Stoneleigh Avenue/ Woodland Avenue through no entry points.
Ridiculous disjointed thinking. Why introduce No Entry to Warwick and Styvechale Avenues? There is little traffic flow through these streets anyway and they are an important route for local residents who want to get to their homes.
Will cause too many issues as it's a busy through road
Ideas to slow traffic on Beechwood Avenue would be welcome. Closing the ends of Warwick and Styvechale would not be a good idea. This would push more traffic up Beechwood Avenue - my access from Kenilworth direction to Berkeley Road South would be to come up Beechwood instead of Styvechale. Narrowing the mini round about may snow some traffic down however if Arden Street is closed there will be very little traffic turning out of Hartington so drivers might be more likely to take the bend at speed as they are less likely to need to stop. Pedestrian island and the chicane would be good. Changing the direction of flow of traffic at Beechwood and Rochester could be a good decision but would need to be very well signposted as some drivers would come round the corner quickly and I envisage an accident when the changes are first made. The blocking of Arden Street is going to push more traffic on to Beechwood and round. - I don't feel like this is a benefit as there will still be through traffic but just asking a different road.
Are these not just going to push even more traffic down Earlsdon Street, especially if the major traffic comes from outsiders anyway? Also don't do anything that makes it easier for drivers to speed round by the golf club and that terrible blind turn!!

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue

- Narrowing the mini roundabout: Great idea. I previously lived on xxxxxxxx and navigating the roundabout on a bicycle was always a bit annoying, not knowing whether oncoming traffic on Beechwood would yield to people turning right into Hartington Crescent.
- Beechwood Avenue/Rochester Road junction: I think it will work well, but it would be better with a side road zebra crossing across the northern arm of Beechwood Avenue.
- Pedestrian islands: They are in pointless locations, off any desire line. A zebra crossing at Rochester Road, and a humped table crossing with buildouts between Golf Clubhouse and Styvechale Avenue would be much better.
- Chicane: Probably a good idea. Anything that slows traffic down.
- Guardrail: It is a sad sign that motorway strength barriers are needed on a road that is currently 30 mph and soon hopefully 20 mph. Maybe speed enforcement with actual fines would work better? Also, I am a bit concerned on the impact of cyclists wishing to shortcut to Palmerston Road. A longer barrier would make their movement more complex.
- Extra double yellow lines: Probably good.
- Styvechale/Warwick Avenue no entry (Warwick Road is somewhere else): A good idea in my opinion. They will make these roads calmer to cycle on.
- Arden Street modal filter: A fantastic idea. I previously lived in XXXXXXX. At that time, Arden St was frustrating for active travel, with too many cars passing through. I would love to see a street tree and a bench planted in the modal filter. Make it a green spot to sit in. Or put a basketball hoop there, give children an activity space.
- Shaftesbury Road modal filter: Also a great idea. Complements the Arden St filter.
- Stoneleigh/Woodland Avenue modal filters: Again fantastic. Travelling southbound along Stoneleigh Avenue, joining up with the Kenilworth Road bike lane is always challenging, as you have to worry about drivers turning into Stoneleigh Avenue. This will be much improved by a modal filter. It would also be great if the Sustrans funding could be used to widen the pavement for footway and cycleway between Stoneleigh Avenue and Canley Ford. This bit is really too narrow for pedestrians and bidirectional cyclists.
- Planters are always nicer than bollards, and trees are even better.

Agree to traffic calming on Beechwood. Limiting traffic into Arden Street would not be a good idea

Do not have a problem with the mini roundabout or junction at Rochester Road, so money could be spent elsewhere.

Pedestrian islands are good provided traffic lanes are not too narrow as a result.

Chicane in Beechwood would be good as we have witnessed several near misses along that stretch.

Definitely not a good idea making it no entry to Styvechale Ave & Warwick Rd as this just pushes extra traffic onto other roads.

Extra double lines means cars will be parked in other local streets instead so you are just moving the problem.

Limiting journeys on various streets will just send traffic onto the streets not included in your plans which is very unfair and does not solve the problem. It will be making Earlsdon a no go area for visitors.

Agree with first six points BUT need a second chicane after the golf club entrance.

Disagree strongly with all the no entry suggestions.

Yes

As a resident, the primary issue with Beechwood Avenue and Warwick Avenue is the speed of the traffic. Traffic calming is needed.

1/ I disagree with no entry at the entrance to Warwick and Styvechale Roads. For residents of Warwick Avenue, it would add an additional 1.3k to every journey and make every return be via via Earlsdon Avenue South. How would this work when returning via Beechwood Avenue?

2/ The proposal would disconnect all residents in Stoneleigh Ave and Woodland Ave, which goes against the Liveable Neighbourhood philosophy.

3/ It is not traffic volume on Warwick which is the issue it is the speed. Traffic calming is key. Full width speed humps (otherwise SUVs can straddle) at positions 1/2 and 2/3 along the road would be sufficient. Or, and preferable, double large planter chicanes (three planters - causing car to have to drive around), as used successfully in Oxford, Brighton and other cities. These have had a great affect on bringing speeds down when installed correctly and they do not have an affect on cars driving at 20mph. (Example of double chicane: <https://tinyurl.com/5cknnfph> if unclear).

4. Further more, the no-entry gates for Warwick Ave would be ignored, (even with cameras, the number cars with

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue

fake plates in Coventry and West Midlands, is substantial. Camera would be damaged and the issue would continue. Slow the speed is key.

5/ Slowing the traffic along Beechwood Avenue is needed with speeding high performance cars in the evenings. How many accidents have there been? Double chicanes or full width speed bumps, or like those on Heath Crescent, are needed in multiple locations: before the golf club and the bends by it.; up from the tennis club before the corner of Bates Road and along stretch from Rochester to the round-about.

6/ I am not sure changing the priority of Rochester and Beechwood would work, but happy for this to be trialed. Narrowing the round-about may help, but this is unclear.

7/ There is a wider problem, as explained before, in that Earlsdon has a train line along one side of it and only has two crossing locations. Thus crossing the city through Earlsdon is an issue, e.g. traveling from Stivichall to Hearshall area and beyond. The proposal of closing roads around Earlsdon will push traffic onto Kenilworth Road, causing more queuing at the junctions for Beechwood Avenue and Earlsdon Road South, which in turn pushes up pollutions. You will need to adjust these junctions as well.

Traffic coming from the south has nowhere else to go, it is unlikely to go via Herald Ave, due to the distance. More fundamental schemes of connecting Canley and other through ways are needed.

Awful. There's no visibility down Rochester towards the high street if it changes. Please can someone check this themselves. I have stopped and cannot see cars coming from the high street so I'll be driving into the road blind. Both directions.

Dead ends at Warwick and styvechale are awful. The amount of traffic pushed into the kenilworth road is ridiculous. What is residents. Also I have clients on those roads and becomes a nightmare for me.

The Arden st road block needs to become movable as pro
Used for the festival as it blocks all the residents in when the festival is on. Who would the festival contact to do this.

Absolutely reject the route changing/blocking ideas here (the no-entries and 'limit journeys' parts) as they will force more traffic onto Rochester and Radcliffe due to reduction in options for transiting the centre of Earlsdon, and thus will make it less livable for us and many others.

Fully support the safety related traffic slowing and calming ideas. This is in the spirit of more livable.

Agree with all the plans especially those for Arden street where we continually have cars crashing into vehicles because of the speed that they drive through since it is a speedy way through from one area to another and also the difficulty with seeing on various corners. Having the one way route and the blocked off end would greatly improve safety and movement around our streets.

Yes, these are good proposals.

Approve

Traffic along Beechwood Avenue can be a problem - the bend near St Barbara's is a hazard with motorists approaching too fast. The series of bends by the guardrail needs some kind of chicane (?) to slow traffic - from both directions.

Denying access to Styvechale Avenue, Warwick Avenue and Stoneleigh Avenue seems to be penalising residents of those streets requiring lengthy detours (more time, more pollution). What benefits would result? Where does Warwick Road fit into this?

I am not in favour of all these proposals that have been bundled together. This does not improve our area as a liveable neighbourhood. This is restricting residents freedom of movement. It will impact emergency services ability to get to where they need to. Ambulance, fire, police. Every second counts when someone is in trouble, heart attack in their home, fire in the home, criminal activity. I do not want to see someone die or lose their home because a perfectly good access point has been closed due to a minority of anti-social rat runners, speedsters, and thieves. Implement the 20mph speed limit and enforce it. Then review after a suitable time period to see the results. I live directly in this area of proposals and I do not want any delays to emergency services arriving to help me, members of my family, or my neighbours!

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
The elements of the bundle that I could support would be upgrading the guard rail by Palmerston Road and the 20 mph speed limit.
I support these proposals with the exception of the no entries into roads that are otherwise two way
<p>The proposals will leave residents in Stoneleigh Avenue and Woodland Avenue isolated from the rest of Earlsdon, and will increase the traffic on Beechwood Avenue, which is what you are trying to avoid. Travelling between Woodland Avenue and Earlsdon Avenue North and Albany Road will become particularly difficult. Of particular concern is the impact which there will be on the junction between Beechwood Avenue and Kenilworth Road. This is already a difficult and dangerous junction to negotiate (in fact, when I was returning home from the Drop-In session at Hearsall Golf Club, the emergency services were in attendance at this junction), and the proposals will make this worse.</p> <p>The Council needs to do a root cause analysis of the reasons that drivers use Stoneleigh Avenue as a rat run. I suggest that this is because the Beechwood Avenue/Kenilworth Road junction is so difficult to negotiate. Measures to introduce traffic light controls at that junction (like at the end of Earlsdon Avenue) would be the most effective way of taking pressure off residential streets.</p> <p>It is unclear what problem you are trying to solve in Stoneleigh Avenue and Woodland Avenue. The volume of traffic using those roads is not high. Therefore, if the issue is speed, then some traffic calming measures would be a more appropriate solution than closing the end of the road, with all of the inconvenience that will cause to local residents.</p> <p>The case has not been made for restricting access to Warwick Avenue and Styvechale Avenue at the southern end. These are quiet roads (I use them regularly on foot, by bicycle and in my car, and they are never busy). From speaking to a Council Officer at the drop-in session, these proposals seem to be based purely on hypothetical modelling of the consequences of the other measures. As a minimum, the Council should wait and see what actually happens, and should also consider other measures. Your statement about traffic not being pushed onto Kenilworth Road and Earlsdon Avenue is false. If traffic can't use Beechwood Avenue and Warwick/Styvechale Avenue, then they WILL be pushed onto Kenilworth Road and Earlsdon Avenue. Furthermore, residents in Stoneleigh Avenue and Woodland Avenue may also be pushed onto this route, although please note my comments above about the dangerous nature of the Beechwood Avenue/Kenilworth Road junction.</p>
<p>Disagree with nearly all of this proposal. Do not block off vehicle access to Warwick Ave and Styvechale Ave (from Beechwood Ave). Do not block off access to Stoneleigh Ave/Woodland Ave.</p> <p>Additional traffic on Beechwood Avenue to/from Kenilworth Road will require traffic lights similar to where Earlsdon Ave South meets Kenilworth Road.</p> <p>Kenilworth Road near the Memorial Park (Park and Ride entrance) is extremely busy, and a right turn from Beechwood Ave on to Kenilworth Road can be impossible at times.</p> <p>Adding double yellow lines on to Beechwood Ave, would make it into an even faster race track, as parked cars (which slow the speeders) will not be there.</p> <p>Planters are an eyesore. Where and what is the budget to maintain these? Why should the residents be involved with 'the maintenance'. What is the Council Tax for? If no budget to maintain, they will become untidy and ugly, adding to the 'run-down' appearance of the area. Bollards look aggressive.</p> <p>However, I agree with - Beechwood Avenue: upgrading the guardrail by Palmerston Road, and reducing the speed on Beechwood Avenue to 20mph or 30mph AND ensure enforcement is in place to catch speeding drivers.</p>
The only one worth doing is upgrading the guard rail by Palmerston. The rest is useless.
If road was widened then yes, if new 20 mile speed limit was enforced then would not be needed anyway? I Walk down Warwick/Styvechale, Stoneleigh/Woodland at various times of the day and have never seen problems there

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
other than the people who park there to walk to station. Seems like a proposal from these residents to protect their own?
<p>There is a lot of parts to this proposal, and while some are welcome, others seem excessive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Changing the priority with Beechwood and Rochester road does not make sense. It will cause confusion as drivers round the sharp bend from Beechwood at Bates road, and will likely lead to accidents. The other changes will push more traffic on to Beechwood, and the focus should be on managing this additional traffic, not interrupting the smooth flow. - Pedestrian islands are welcome, but adding a chicane is problematic. Since vehicles are already parked on both sides in this area, there is a natural slowing/turn taking effect in this area, so the chicane is unneeded. - It is desirable to reduce and slow traffic that uses Arden street as a rat run -- vehicles come off the Beechwood roundabout, along Hartington and up Arden at excessive speed. However, I am not convinced that blocking entry is the right way to do this, and so oppose the proposed changes. <p>There are a lot of suggestions wrapped up in this proposal, and it is too much to do all of these at once. The problem here is speeding on Beechwood, and the problem would be better addressed by enforcing the existing speed limit, and some modest changes to make it more pedestrian/cycle friendly, rather than funnelling more traffic onto the road and limiting local access.</p>
The layout of Beechwood Avenue requires substantial alteration. These proposals may deal with that, but as a fundamental the road needs widening. Planters are only acceptable if fully and consistently maintained, otherwise they will become unsightly and, in any event, a target for vandalism.
<p>Roundabout: Yes Beechwood/Rochester layout: No. 20mph limit sufficient and safer. Islands: Yes Chicane: No. Speed bumps safer. Guardrail: Yes Styvechale/Warwick closure: Absolutely no. Excludes Woodland/Stoneleigh/Beechwood residents from Earlsdon itself and from the Earlsdon Avenue traffic light exit to Kenilworth Road. Double yellow lines: No. 20mph limit sufficient. Parking both sides slows the traffic and prevents dangerous overtaking. No entry points: No. 20 mph speed limit is sufficient.</p>
I strongly object to making Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Avenue no entry from Beechwood Avenue. This will add 1km to all car journeys to and from our property which is unacceptable in terms environmental impact, time being added to the journey which will be further exacerbated by worsened queues and traffic on Earlsdon Avenue South and Kenilworth Road, and cost in extra fuel consumption. Add in chicanes along Warwick these roads will do more to reduce cars speeding down the road.
Don't know well enough to have views
good
I'll thought out proposal
I would need more information on each.
Really disruptive. This will simply move traffic onto the already heavily congested Kenilworth Road. Also sounds like the planters and bollards will be potentially unsightly and restrict visibility/potentially cause issues for pedestrians with mobility issues. People living on Beechwood will be heavily affected in numerous ways.
<p>I am happy with traffic calming measures on Beechwood Avenue but as a resident onXXXXXXX, the following is not making Earlsdon more liveable and I strongly object.</p> <p>1) Double Yellows between Woodland Avenue and Kenilworth Road. This is where I sometimes park as a resident and also where visitors and delivery drivers park XXXXXXX and am the only property on this stretch on that side of the road. Around the corner in Woodland Avenue is already heavily congested with parking and emergency vehicles struggle to get through. This proposal would push more people into trying to park in Woodland and make it even more dangerous. It would also mean that people would not be able to visit or make deliveries. It's also worth noting that often the stretch of road is clear from parking in any case so I really don't understand what problem this proposal is trying to fix especially when it is making life for us as residents more unliveable. When people do park there to use the local facilities like Styvechale Common and Canley Ford, it doesn't impede passage for pedestrians because of the number of Beech trees that line the streets. This means</p>

<p>Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue</p>
<p>that the pavement remains nice and wide. What I would say is that when vehicles are parked adjacent to my property (no 1), it actually makes it more safe for vehicles pulling out of Woodland Avenue. This is because visibility is improved in that vehicles that are passing parked cars are easier to see as they are further from the kerb and it therefore makes it far more dangerous. xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p>
<p>2)No entry to Warwick Ave and Styvechale Ave. As a resident, this is making my life harder and will mean I have to travel on Kenilworth Rd and add to congestion, pollution and journey times. It's not unreasonable to expect to be able to travel on a more direct route xxxxxxxxxxxx to the bottom of Albany Road.</p>
<p>I do not agree with making Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Road no entry - these roads are very useful to use for all Earlsdon Residents and the build up of traffic on Kenilworth Road in particular when events are on at the memorial park - means that it is important for people to access Earlsdon Ave South in other ways - rather than Beechwood Av, Rochester Road and Earlsdon Street which would be used otherwise.</p> <p>Also not in favour with blocking Woodland Avenue entirely for the same reason above.</p> <p>The improvements along Beechwood otherwise are good Ideas</p>
<p>I agree with these apart from making it no entry to Styvechale and Warwick Avenue, and restricting the entry of traffic to Stoneleigh Avenue and Woodland Avenue. These measures will significantly increase traffic problems on Kenilworth Road and the centre of Earlsdon. When combined with other measure this will cause chaos for all road users, and quite possibly also pedestrians. The environmental impact of queuing traffic that will result from the proposals needs to be taken into account too. I am very strongly against restricting entry to Styvechale, Warwick, Woodland and Stoneleigh Avenues. I would not be against traffic calming measures on all the aforementioned road.</p>
<p>Not sure</p>
<p>Unnecessarily complicated. Simply introduce 20mph speed limit and ensure warning notices of sharp corners and bends are in place along Beechwood Ave</p>
<p>No comment on measures - but please ensure a full consultation has taken place with residents across the area.</p>
<p>I do not perceive there is a need to reduce traffic on Beechwood Avenue. However, I do support measures o reduce the speed of vehicles. If these were effective then t would act as a deterrent to those vehicles tempted o use it as a 'rat run'. I would support the introduction of speed bumps and cameras to enforce the current 30mph limit and the introduction of a chicane. I specifically do not support the proposals to limit entry to Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Road from Beechwood Road. The biggest impact of this would be the negative impact on the residents of Stoneleigh Avenue and Woodland Avenue who would be required to go on top Kenilworth Road or all the way along Beechwood Avenue to get to the centre of Earlsdon. This will increase journey length/times (due to increased congestion) and encourage less use of Earlsdon Street for local shopping, including use of the restaurants/takeaways. Maintaining a vibrant Earlsdon Street is more important to the neighbourhood's liveability than can be achieved through tinkering with traffic flow on the surrounding streets unless it is specifically for this purpose.</p> <p>One of the key impacts of the overall proposals, if implemented would be to further increase traffic on Kenilworth Road. This will make it even more difficult for residents to get out of Beechwood/Stoneleigh Avenue onto Kenilworth Road. Therefore, as minimum, traffic lights would be required at the junction of Kenilworth Road and Beechwood Avenue. To turn right out of Stoneleigh Avenue or Beechwood Avenue onto Kenilworth Road to access the A45/Kenilworth can already take several minutes and increasing the traffic on Kenilworth Road will only make this worse.</p>
<p>I support this proposal</p>
<p>Happy with the first 6 & 8 and something needs to be done to reduce the speed around Beechwood Ave. I'd like to think that making Styvechale Ave and Warwick Rd no entry would force more vehicles along Kenilworth Rd and Earlsdon Ave and along with the measure on Stoneleigh/Woodland would stop people using those roads as a way to cut through Earlsdon. But do worry that an unintended consequence of these and specifically changes to Arden and Shaftesbury Rd will ultimately result in more traffic on Rochester and down the (already congested) High Street.</p>

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
Yes
<p>This is all very unnecessary and unbelievably nimby. Earlsdon is a suburb which is adjacent to the city centre. Some residents want it treated like an exclusive area which prevents those who are not "local" from even accessing it. The parking restrictions already in place in much of the suburb is so unkind and speaks to a wider pervasive ethos that some residence think they are entitled to. I am for any measures which reduce speeding but to make road impassable and funnelling cars onto the already congested Earlsdon Avenues, Albany Road, Kenilworth Road and Hearsall Lane. These are thoroughly ill-conceived measures which do not serve the wider city well. Please think again on this.</p>
<p>More double yellows. A waste of time unless enforced. Cars are regularly parked on double yellows along Beechwood (also on roads off Earlsdon St)but are never ticketed. Chicanes with speed bumps needed both before the golf club and after the tennis club. 20mph speed bumps needed in run up to the traffic lights at the railway bridge to stop the speeding to beat the lights. No entries not needed. Arden St. there are two dropped kerbs close to each other about half way along. Extending double yellows over them and between them would give a good passing place. The junction of Arden St with Hartington is not mentioned. The pavements need widening so you can more safely cross from Hartington (Beechwood side) across Arden St to Hartington.</p>
<p>Strongly disagree making Styvechale Ave and Warwick Road No Entry. Silly idea. Strongly disagree making Stoneleigh Ave/ Woodland Ave no entry The rest ok.</p>
<p>And where would the traffic go to? The only problems on Beechwood is the awful state of the road and boy racers occasionally smashing up the guard rails on the corner by the golf club car park. Resurface the road and have police sort out the boy racers.</p>
<p>Supportive - but with some conditionality - namely that the junction of Beechwood Ave with Kenilworth is upgraded to traffic light control and right and left turn lanes provided - similar upgrading of the junction of Earlsdon Ave South with Kenilworth . In addition consider extension of double yellow lines at junction of Beechwood and Rochester Road - indiscriminate parking at church and nursery - make it difficult for right turning buses on a 90 degree junction. In addition - the chicane close to the tennis club needs to provide a space between it and the tennis club entrance - as vehicles have to reverse out of tennis club if drive id being used by a vehicle coming the other way. Some additional signage on nearby street furniture advising of turning traffic because of tennis club would be beneficial</p>
<p>I'm not convinced that the proposed changes to the Beechwood/Hartington roundabout will solve the problem of cars being driven straight across. I would recommend that, in addition, a raised area is placed in the centre. I believe that the entrance to Earlsdon Allotments (close to the bridge and associated traffic lights) is dangerous and would recommend attention is given to this as part of this plan. Otherwise I believe it is best to leave responding to these proposals to those who live on these streets and/or use them frequently.</p>
<p>No to mini roundabout . Absolutely NO,NO NO to a new road layout at Rochester Road & beechwood ave , change give way priority, which will slow the car speed . The give way sign on Rochester by the nursery can be reused , there isn't one on st Barbara's side yet still cars manage to stop ! What makes you think that cars won't with the change of signage?? When I took my driving test, road signs were had to be obeyed, I'm sure it's still the same! Stop unnecessarily hacking up a beautiful looking road . NO , NO ,NO to road closures on stoneleigh (I didn't buy a house in a cul-de - sac , XXXXXX . This road is NO longer a rat run post Covid with more people working from home. The traffic used to back up beyond no 70 in the mornings trying to exit onto kenilworth road , I have monitored the traffic at peak times for 1 week , we now have 4/5 cars driving through !)(closing this road & it's surrounding roads will increase traffic on beechwood ave , when trying to turn right onto kenilworth road at peak times it will be a nightmare as there are no traffic lights or road hatchings & cars from town are very reluctant to let traffic out) .closing Styvechale & Warwick Avenue, This will create more traffic on kenilworth road beechwood ave & Earlsdon street .no I wouldn't be interested in the design or maintenance of bollards or planters as I think they are both unnecessary.</p>
<p>Absolutely, the craziest thing I have seen yet. This will just extend existing journeys for the local community and push traffic onto surrounding roads. Rather than upgrade the guard rail by Palmerston road why not straighten out the road? Traffic needscalming on Earlsdon street - either place speed bumps in the road or set up a camera</p>

Comments regarding Beechwood Avenue
system to fine non residents - you can do it for the bus gate why cant you do it for Arden street i.e use cameras to detect and fine prohibited vehicles from Arden Street. As it stands above I do not support this proposal
Agree
<p>I strongly favour proposals to slow traffic and increase safety on Beechwood Avenue. However, I frequently see motorists entirely ignore the roundabout at Hartington/ Beechwood and believe that without the installation of a raised roundabout this will continue to be the case.</p>
<p>I am also concerned about the proposal to make Warwick and Styvechale Avenues 'no entry'. This will result in Earlsdon residents having to drive up to Kenilworth Road in order to re-enter Earlsdon, thus adding to pollution and fuel use. The same objection may well apply to the proposals to limit entry to Arden Street, Shaftesbury Road Stoneleigh Avenue and Woodland Avenue, although since the precise proposal in relation to these roads is not explained it is difficult to make an informed judgement about this.</p>
<p>I have an additional proposal related to the allotments entrance next to the bridge on Beechwood Avenue. As an allotmentee, I notice that many drivers do not realise that traffic may be entering or leaving the allotments, and drive dangerously fast down this stretch of road, without taking account of such traffic. I think safety would be improved, and traffic slowed, were a 'Concealed entrance' notice installed on both sides of the carriageway.</p>
Agree
<p>Welcome the mini r'about and pedestiran islands but need additional islands near the Kenilworth Rd junction to improve safety for people going to the park,or Finham School. The Rochester Rd layout change will help to slow Beechwood traffic but of itself does nothing to help the many pedestrians who cross there for church and community activities at St Barbara's and to go to/from the many houses on Woodfield Rd / Rochester loop. The tennis club chicane traffic priority should be REVERSED if the PRIMARY AIM is to slow traffic and prevent crashes at the dangerous S bend - under current plan cars will still accelerate away from the Bates Rd corner down the straight section into the S bend. It is NOT VALID to argue that Beechwood Avenue from the Stoneleigh Av junction past the golf club house to the tennis club entrance is somehow LESS built up than the road past the tennis club - far more pedestrians cross Beechwood near to the Warwick/Styvechale junctions than do between Rochester Rd and the railway bridge (other than at the Rochester Road crossroads just mentioned).</p>

Question 9

What do you think about this proposal:

Enabling a new zebra crossing by the Co-op, by rearranging parking. The short stay parking outside the Co-op would be reduced, but there will be more spaces on side streets because of the one-way system. The existing restriction on parking after 10pm would be removed. Blue badge parking bays will be introduced on Earlsdon Street, close to Providence Street and the Post Office and the Co-op.

Comments regarding a zebra crossing by the Co-op
Positive
Yes agree with all this.
Short stay parking outside the coop is really handing and brings a lot of business to the coop. Usually if there's no parking outside the coop it's pretty impossible to park anywhere else. Even on my own street I struggle to park day to day.
I don't think anymore parking will be available on side streets
Excellent plan
Yes!!!
Good idea
Great
Agree
Yes. This question was partly answered in 6
This is a good idea
Yes, 100% required
Needed
Sounds fine.
A zebra crossing has been desperately needed from the Co-op to the City Arms for years, so very good idea
Great
Very needed. Crossing the high street can be very difficult. People should be prioritised over cars.
The crossing is necessary. Monitoring of any parking and especially of Taxis needs to take place though, whatever happens. Can we also have bollards to stop all the pavement parking?
Happy with that
People live right by the co-op in flats above the shops on both sides of Earlsdon Street. Removing the parking restriction time after 10pm will increase the noise, which is already considerable.
Yes
Yes
good idea
Keep restriction on parking after 10pm.
About the pedestrian crossing between Co-op and the City Arms, consider putting it at least a car's length into Earlsdon Street so that traffic may sometimes continue to flow when a vehicle must stop for pedestrians crossing between Co-op and the City Arms, otherwise you will have many cars idling at the roundabout; that is bad for the air and will given the appearance of congestion which will make the neighbourhood feel less liveable.
There is a bus stop and a lowered kerb on Earlsdon Street near the City Arms. Placing the pedestrian crossing between those might be good. If you put it higher on the street, people won't use it (especially the tipsy from the

Comments regarding a zebra crossing by the Co-op
City Arms), if you put it lower you'll block the roundabout and create traffic.
Can the Blue Badge parking on Earlsdon street be time-limited? If so, please time limit them. Otherwise some devious residents will use illegitimate blue badges to park there.
Keep all parking, including blue badge parking, at least two car lengths away from the T-junction of Earlsdon Street and Providence Street because it protects pedestrians. With cars parked up to the junction, it is difficult to see into and turn into Providence Street, so the chance of collisions (possibly with pedestrians or vehicle doors) increases. More generally, enforce whatever you put in. People routinely park on the double yellow lines at the T-junction of Earlsdon Street and Providence Street without consequence.
Yes Sounds great
Excellent idea
That's ok
Agree
I agree with this
Good idea
Good idea
Very supportive
In favour
Great to have blue badge parking, hope the number of bays is proportionate to the number of blue badges
Excellent idea
New zebra crossing is good. Have to think about how reducing on street parking will impact on people with reduced mobility who are older (but not blue badge holders).
Good idea.
This is an excellent idea and should have been done years ago.
Good
I think the parking should not be reduced. There are always too many cars parked there and side road parking will be taken up by residents.
This needs monitoring - too many people just park where they like - no deterrent for bad parking
Great idea
sounds ok i think. warwick st increase parking? whats the net result in parking quantity? who will monitor parking? people park all over the place at the moment! they just ignore the double yellows etc.
No-one who lives in this zone should really be driving to Earlsdon Street. (unless they're disabled in which case more disabled parking is a good thing) It'll be visitors to the area/shops that are affected.
Blue badge bays are a good idea. I would use cycle parking stands by the post office and organic shop too.
Good
Yes
Good idea
Again I think the location is challenging so close to the roundabout but there does need to be a safe crossing place on the high street
No vchaos
Yes support
Leave well alone
In agreement
In favour
Why has the parking got to be changes to put a crossing in? Just put one in between the City Arms and Greggs, where the existing drop kerb is.
I would be annoyed by changes to parking outside CoOp.

Comments regarding a zebra crossing by the Co-op
In favour, provided the number of blue badge parking bays is sensible - often seems over-provide and under-used.
Good idea
Better solutions needed for parking.
Would cause congestion on roundabout, one way system will not increase parking.
Fully support the introduction of a crossing, but have concerns that the zebra crossing may not be as safe as it could be due to the on street parking/taxi ranks/bus stops very close to it. Driver behaviour is quite poor on Earlsdon Street outside the Co-op (u-turns including taxis, parking in bus stops, on double yellows, on footways etc). Would a better solution be to partly pedestrianise Earlsdon Street, making more space for people, traders, planting, seating, and other community activity? It would also remove through traffic, although impact on bus routes would need to be assessed.
A new zebra crossing would definitely make it easier to access the coop, be a parking curfew helps too as nobody shops there after 22:00.
Include Earlsdon Street and Warwick Street in a one-way system - add echelon parking on Earlsdon Street. Encourage electric cabs rather than allowing diesels to sit in ranks with engines ticking over
Make Earlsdon street one way with echelon parking
Support.
Strongly agree
Good idea.
Pedestrian crossing on Earlsdon Street - I would suggest not having it so close to the City Arms. When people come out of the pub and are hesitating at the side of the street, chatting or drunk, this causes confusion for motorists. Consider placing the crossing further up the road and keeping the bus stop near the pub. Agree with introducing blue badge parking.
Good idea
Okay but as long as there was more on street parking
Another pedestrian crossing on Earlsdon St would be welcome and I don't think that reducing the parking would have a huge effect.
I am slightly concerned by the wording of this question which says that there will be more spaces on side roads because of the one-way-system. Parking is already very tricky for residents in this area and I can't see how the one-way-system will free up new spaces for shoppers when residents are already struggling for spaces. I would hope that this isn't an assumption by the council.
Unless you provide free car parks in the area to those visiting the shopping centre it will place increasing problems for all adjacent roads for parking. therefore in principal I would disagree with the proposal. Please extend the residential parking scheme to all roads around the high street.
In favour, slightly concerned about traffic backing up and creating congestion. Could a central refuge be added as well/ instead to aid traffic flow?
I think a safe crossing for pedestrians is important here. Also the provision of more blue badge bays is a great idea. However, I cannot see an easy solution to the overall parking problem in Earlsdon - especially as the number of restaurants, bars, cafes has increased the amount of traffic especially taxis / Uber cabs.
Parking has been rearranged by the co-op many times over the years. There needs to be some non blue badge parking by the co-op pre 22.00.
Again making a road one way does not make more spaces. Cars already park on both sides of these roads. cars would have to park in already full side roads like popular road. Blue badge holders park where they bloody like already usually at the bottom of popular road blocking the pavement for disabled.
Percept
I li e on one of yge so called side streets ! Where would you suggest I park ?
A crossing here is very much needed and should help slow traffic entering Earlsdon Street.
The parking outside the coop is ignored daily, the bus stop and the pavements are used for parking every day. There won't be more spaces as the majority of this parking is resident parking.

Comments regarding a zebra crossing by the Co-op
The crossing and parking restrictions on Earlsdon high street near Providence Street are ignored and cars/vans park on both the zigzag and double yellow lines. I imagine without enforcement the same would happen to this proposal.
Not necessary
See my answer to question 6, but yes I agree with this proposal in the short term, in lieu of pedestrianising Earlsdon Street from the roundabout to Stanley Road (which I would prefer to see!)
Agree but what is the assumption that one way streets create more parking opportunities based on?
Agree
One way system will not increase parking on side roads. Pollution will be concentrated on the main roads
Agree
Sounds okay. How about a permanent traffic warden. We see countless cars parked dangerously on zigzags and double yellows and nothing is done.
Yes please.
I support this, particularly this introduction of a zebra crossing. I would like to see pavements widened at some points to prevent illegal parking on Earlsdon St.
Improving crossing points in favour of, same for blue badge , not convinced one way streets actually create any more parking though as these streets already have parking on both sides where not double yellow lines and often even then!
Agree
My parents would certainly appreciate the blue badge parking as they have to use the Warwick Street car park and walk which Mum increasingly can't. Simply removing the parking immediately outside the co-op would make it immediately safer to cross. It's those spaces so close to the roundabout combined with the bus stop that make it nightmare for both pedestrians and drivers.
People have just wandered across the road here for years without much regard for traffic as it usually very slow moving due to the volumes of cars/buses now on the high street.
Good idea
A zebra on co-op side of roundabout good but not sure a need to reduce parking outside co-op. It's useful for local residents.
Fine
Good
Agree with a zebra crossing but parking in Earlsdon needs to be addressed properly. It's nice to walk in but sometimes it is necessary to take the car in and it can be impossible to park.
Not everyone is able to walk long distances and customers will be lost if not able to park close to the co op
I think this is a good idea.
Excellent idea, this should be rolled out as soon as possible and extended to other coventry neighbourhoods, such as Stoke.
Yes all good
People will park in the blue badge places so no point
The amount of cars that park on the high street is ridiculous. Drivers take a complete liberty. The manners of people in Earlsdon could be better, in cars they don't acknowledge you have let them pass and pedestrians are just the same. They think because they live in this wonderful part of Coventry they own the roads.
Okay but will push the parking to side streets
Why bother no space to park anywhere
"There will be more spaces on side streets because of the one way system" - next you'll be telling us if we can't park there we can just fly down on our unicorns.
This zebra crossing has long been needed.
Loss of parking spaces outside Co-op not helpful .
Zebra crossing yes. Reduced parking no as strongly disagree with one way systems which of themselves will not aid parking

Comments regarding a zebra crossing by the Co-op
How can there be more parking on the side streets when every side street is already full of parked cars ! If there are more cars parked on my street I will never be able to reverse my car off the drive.
This is sensible. Personally, I would favour pedestrianisation of the high street and the provision of free short stay parking that is very proximate to the high street
No strong feelings about this. I rarely drive to there.
Good idea - people cross here all the time
Do not agree with one way system but agree with zebra crossing
no opinion
Agree. The brewery delivery lorries to City Arms should be forced to park on City Arms property instead of on the pavement where the crossing would be.
Agree about new zebra crossing and blue badge spaces, but there should be more off street parking facilities within the area. One-way system wouldn't be enough to create more parking spaces.
I think more parking, not less is needed.
Good idea
Bad
Another pedestrian crossing is a good idea but not too close to the roundabout by the city arms. It would be better to be adjacent to millsys.
Specified disabled parking is not required as blue badge holders can park on double yellow lines.
Bad idea, three zebra crossing already and at busy times it will cause a stand still at school times. People don't abide by the parking rules now and they won't when it's changed and it will cause more chaos on the roads
Zebra crossing between Greggs and City Arms is a good idea. The people who live in the side streets would suffer with the one way systemsforced to drive around and around to look for parking. Warwick Street could have had a second large car park.....but no ...flats were built.
Another attack on motorists unless they happen to have a blue badge.
I think it's a very good idea
I am against increasing traffic on sideroads and think there should be investment in creating a carpark for visiting cars instead
To resolve parking issues you need to actually have enforcement - the current measures would suffice if there were ever any parking wardens enforcing the laws there. No-one cares as they know no-one will be fined.
Supportive. Comment: illegal parking, on yellow lines, on zig zag lines, on pavements is a daily issue on Earlsdon Street and it's adjoining roads; any new measures would need to be supported by a commitment to a complimentary enforcement approach by the appropriate organisations (ie the Council and Police).
I've no objection to a crossing if the street is to remain open to traffic. Probably a good idea.
Seems a bit drastic to me. If you would regulate the existing parking regulations & enforce illegal parking eg double yellow lines perhaps it would have a better affect. Currently everybody just abandoned their car wherever they feel like it! I really see a traffic warden. If the existing parking regulations were in forced, it would make a fortune for the council and make it a nicer place to shop. The existing proposals are a bit drastic.
Zebra crossing good idea. However parking on Earlsdon Street should be maximised.
Sounds good. Needs parking enforcement.
Sounds promising
Fine
Agree
Ok
How will there be more parking? If anything there will be less. Parking outside the Co op is essential.
Further to my other comments, I don't agree with this idea as I believe it is vital for the High St. economy to maintain high levels of parking - however, I do believe that better parking monitoring (and fines) should be put in place.
I agree with this idea.

Comments regarding a zebra crossing by the Co-op
Agree this is very much needed
Good idea
Yes. No parking on pavements would need to be enforced, e.g. with planters, small bollards, higher kerbs, etc.
Blue badge parking bays definitely a good idea . Illegal parking on Earlsdon Street a constant problem now cannot see this changing .
How are you going to implement greater parking on side streets?! Reduced parking outside Co-Op is NOT helpful. The public will ignore this if implemented.
Welcomed.
Whilst broadly in support I don't think your assertion that there will be more parking on the side streets (presumably just because they are one way) stands up unless there is more parking because there are fewer cars.
no comment
Agree
Ok with that
Zebra crossing a good idea. Why do you think that by installing a one way system will increase car parking on the side streets, there is no logic there. Cars will drive round the circuit till they can park. Taxi's are a major problem in that area at night, turning around on Earlsdon street, moor street. Cars and delivery drivers already ignore where they can park, parking too close to junctions and on both sides of the street near the coop. I can't see that changing because of these measures.
Disagree. Spend this grant elsewhere
In favour
Seems Okay
We don't agree with the additional zebra crossing as mentioned above. As to our knowledge blue badge holders are allowed to park on double yellow lines we can't see the benefit on specific parking spaces for them as this reduces parking for everybody else if the specific parking is respected.
Great ideas
Zebra crossing is welcome however new one way system not so (earlier question).
Too many zebra crossings. Upgrades are just needed near the school.
You'll not stop parking outside the co-op unless you enforce it. You are also in danger of more kerbside parking in the side streets meaning poor visibility, problems for prams and wheelchairs, and a nightmare for residents.
We need access to parking to get to shops ..we need more parking and not a taxi rank for the alcoholic establishments ..support families and local needs not Alcohol places ...
Fully support.
Side streets will get busy with cars that belong to ppl who live there plus more cars stuck in a one way system looking for parking
Side street parking will still be an issue regardless of one way system...not sure what world you live in. Cars are parked illegally outside the coop now and will continue to do so. Restricting parking in an area that is crying out for footfall for retail is really shortsighted
That's fine but because you are reducing the parking bays it will cause more of a impact to the residents on Radcliffe Road, Stanley Road, Palmerston Road and Rochester Road. Could you please look into making our roads into Resident Parking only? There is not Front or Rear Drives in these properties so parking is difficult already especially with the electric car park bays you have created that reduced it even further.
Would need to see more detail
Strongly in favour of the crossing. Removal of parking restrictions after 10pm is a concern as this area is used by taxis at the weekend.
agree zebra crossing needed. Would like to know total parking spaces now compared to this plan, ie increase/decrease within close proximity of Earlsdon St. Again enforcement for parking in disabled spaces?
Good
I fully support this proposal

Comments regarding a zebra crossing by the Co-op
Zebra crossing would be very welcome!
A crossing is needed but short stay (one hour) parking outside of the Co-op is very useful for shoppers who may find carrying shopping difficult
Agree
Yes makes sense
Ok
Good
Not necessary -
Agree - much needed, this is a particular 'hot-spot' for pedestrian crossings
Parking is really difficult anyway. And side streets are always in use
OK
Reducing short stay parking outside the Co-op would be very unhelpful.
I think this is ok. It doesn't look like a great solution but then it isn't great now either. I'm keen to see a crossing in this area of the street though I'm not convinced of the proposed solution
Good idea
Ok
Why would there be more spaces on side streets due to one way system? This is flawed logic. Also don't people on those side streets need their own parking? Keep things as they are here, no one complains at present.
Yes, this is a good idea.
Fine
In favour
Yes, that would be good
A crossing is needed but the other measures will only hinder.
In favour
Agree
Big yes please.
I have no issues with this proposal
In favour.
Proposal will have little impact. Due to student bedsits and Multi Home Occupancy in a number of the terraced sidestreets of Earlsdon there is limited parking particularly in the evenings.
As a resident I consider parking in Earlsdon to be very difficult due to Taxi and out of town uber drivers taking up street spaces especially during the evenings and weekends.
A crossing on the stretch road between the roundabout and Moor Street is essential.
Add the crossing. Leave the rest as it is.
This is probably a good idea it is hard to cross. Losing parking is always tricky in Earlsdon street but I've seen too many elderly folk struggle to get across the road.
Fine.
Fine.
Agree.
This is a good proposal, however, all the side streets (Moor street, for example) are already at the capacity for parking and cannot see how those streets could accommodate extra parking.
A crossing in this location is essential and long overdue to promote safety and a better experience for pedestrians. There is a shortage of on street parking to meet demand for shoppers - reduce taxi spaces. Why are there no plans for electric car charging points?
Ok
Sounds good
New crossing has been long needed.

Comments regarding a zebra crossing by the Co-op
Fully approve
Good
Agree
Excellent
Good idea
Go for it.
Agree
The system as it is works fine.... What is a Blue badge parking bay? Parking can be a struggle at the best of times but it just about works. Your scheme would no doubt exacerbate the problem.
There is a real need for pedestrians to be able to cross safely at that end of Earlsdon High Street.
Approve
agree
Agree
DISAGREE There will NOT be more parking spaces as on a one-way route, motorists and delivery lorries will just be back on the "circular M25 of Earlsdon". All roads will be snarled up and impassable. Yes, add more Blue badge but please consider that not everyone can have a blue badge but sometimes need to park nearer the shops and amenities due to mobility and health issues.
Agree
No details given of proposal near Post Office although the proposals say the details are on Appendix 5 - how are we able to respond to an unknown which directly affect us.
Good
I'm not sure you have demonstrated the availability of extra parking very well in your proposals. The closest available street Poplar will bear the brunt of extra parking, how will this affect deliveries to the Co-op?
yes please
Acceptable.
In favour
A zebra crossing outside CoOp is an excellent idea. It is a very busy spot, used by elderly and children and young families. It will slow traffic down which is desperately needed.
The one way system wouldn't make extra parking, especially if you are going to limit parking spaces to Blue badge parking only. The one way system is only going to inconvenience residents as they will need to going out of their way to access the main Earlsdon high street.
No comment
I would prefer to see no parking outside coop besides disabled bays. The zebra crossing might improve the situation but at the moment it's a congested nightmare and it's dangerous to cross.
Crossing ok. Don't understand how a one way system increases parking.
Probably a zebra crossing by the coop would make sense
Good idea
Must retain parking outside the Co-op. The side streets are already full of parking. Most cars park for 10 minutes. I need to deliver heavy boxes to the Co-op on a regular basis
I support this proposal, but would point out the reference to additional parking on side streets is disingenous as you are already able to park on both sides of the carriageways with the exception of a short stretch of road alongside Millsys, which if I understand correctly will become a taxi feeder rank
The zebra crossing is essential so it is worth rearranging parking to get this done.
Good idea.
good
Sounds good.

Comments regarding a zebra crossing by the Co-op
Less parking outside co-op would be good as it's sometimes difficult to drive down the road.
Do away with parking by co op altogether.
Making more one way street's us unlikely to improve the parking situation. Blue badge bays are welcomed
Good
I am all in favour of doing whatever it takes to enable the zebra crossing outside the Co-op, but please note my earlier point: parking restrictions in side streets need to be monitored/enforced by cameras or traffic wardens because this is already a big problem for residents that the one-way system alone is unlikely to remedy. Surely the point of the Liveable Neighbourhood scheme is not merely to redistribute parking spaces from the high street to nearby, but to reduce the current car-dependency culture and encourage more people to walk/cycle/go by bus or taxi?
Sounds a good plan but the parking restrictions must be enforced.
Agree
I like to park and usually there are short stay spaces between the Post Office and the Organic shop please can you leave thesenot just for blue badge holders
Please do it
Agree
No comment
This is ridiculous it will not increase parking You have obviously not come up the high street on a Friday or Weekend night when up to 20 taxis are parked on the pavement with others dropping pub goers etc all over the place Again enforce what we have and there is no need for these draconian changes Early evening and later is probably the most dangerous time to walk or cycle around Earlsdon High Street
Sounds good. Happy for less car parking tbh and more bike spaces on roads for bikes - we can 10 bikes in the space of a car!
Good, crossing more important than parking
Reducing parking is ridiculous- there isn't enough as it is.
Disagree
Fully support
Yes. Useful.
Agree
Good idea
Sounds reasonable.
Amending parking on the high street will always be a problem
Ok
Sounds ok to me
Agree with blue badge parking bays. Disagree with zebra crossing for Co-op With 20mph limit it should not be difficult to cross the road safely. With 4 zebra crossings the traffic will never move through. Need parking enforcement on corner with Providence street to stop illegally parked cars blocking traffic.
As long as there's more parking in earlsdon, I'm fine with it. Parking should be easy and free.
I suspect that car use is such that it will be very hard to provide sufficient parking in Earlsdon. I always try to avoid parking in Earlsdon and only consider this when there are very strong motivations for not walking (extreme weather, heavy shopping, people to pick up). Perhaps the Liveable Neighbourhood proposals are (quite appropriately) oriented towards a time as and when Earlsdon residents are generally of a younger generation and better able to take advantage of enhanced provision for walking and cycling.
I don't park near or on the high st, I'd rather it was improved for pedestrians not cars. I can observe it is challenging to park around the high street with volumes of traffic and will see this will get worse with more traffic being created by other limitations elsewhere.
Yes this seems fine.
I approve of all these.
Yes I would support this - as a resident I regularly walk to Earlsdon High Street and crossing to the Co-op is awkward and potentially dangerous for anyone with mobility issues, children etc.

Comments regarding a zebra crossing by the Co-op
Please see comments above relating to the crossing
Mainly in favour
Think this is a good idea!!
There is a need for additional parking and not less
I agree that there is a need for a crossing outside the coop as it can be difficult otherwise
Against this, you will make already difficult parking even worse.
Agree
Bad idea, parking is so limited in Earlsdon already without taking away more opportunities to park
Perhaps consider making the car parks owned by the council free of charge or building more parking nearby
All these one way systems, you will soon not be able to go any where in Coventry. People will have to walk everywhere.
This makes sense. Good idea.
Ok in principal, but this all sounds more and more like a war on drivers.
Disagree with one way systems so not in agreement
Agree
Good idea
I do not understand why there is the need for a new zebra crossing
Crossing is needed tho if you reduce parking the shops will suffer so need to ensure parking not lost overall
Reducing parking outside the coop will drive trade away. I already rarely go due to the terrible parking. I used to go every week.
Agree with the crossing
All our families are in favour of these.
Good idea
Yes, all needed.
Good idea.
Anyone who lives in Earlsdon knows that parking is a problem. No mention has been made about the plan to move the bus stop on Earlsdon Street moving it closer to the junction with Moor Street may well block the entrance to Moor Street and therefore access to my property. Reducing the parking on Earlsdon Street and saying there will be more spaces with the one way system is unsustainable. There are no spaces now how does the one way system make it any better? The Blue Badge bays on Earlsdon Street would be ok but how often will they be occupied to the exclusion of other shoppers.
Is not the zebra crossing by the Co-op covered in point 6 above? What evidence do you have to support your strange assertion that there will be increased parking because of the one way system. Please do not remove the parking restrictions after 10 pm on Moor Street as on Friday and Saturday evenings as this is the busiest and most dangerous period.
Could blue parking bays be put closer to Coop even with reduction in short stay parking? A safer crossing opportunity is welcomed
No - not difficult to cross the road here.
Yes.
The zebra crossing is good, but reducing the parking is not helpful and I don't agree with the one way system, so wouldn't want that to be the solution
I do not understand how the one way system will increase the number of parking spaces.
Much needed - crossing there (by the pub) is horrible
Additionally, those zebras by the roundabout could/should be moves a bit further back. Drivers simply don't see them - as they are checking other traffic, not necessarily looking our for a crossing/pedestrians
Before commenting i would like to see where and how this "extra parking" on side streets would be created as i'm not convinced in the one way measures.

Comments regarding a zebra crossing by the Co-op
Looks good.
The spaces outside coop are well used. Not sure why more spaces on side streets would suddenly appear ? poplar is well used for this coop access purpose and it will be worse here I would guess. High st is already struggling from low foot flow so limiting access may make this worse. Would be good to improve the area around the coop and post office for disabled and older customers I think. Pedestrianising the high street would be good but I realise shops may need protection from the risk of discouraging visitors. Alternative measures, like parking would have to be in place before this can happen.
A crossing is definitely needed. No comment on the parking
Agreed
Good
New zebra crossing ok, but no one way please. If poeople adhered to the 'rules', traffic would flow. Some blue badge spaces -yes.
Support.
Agree
I support these.
We probably need more parking here not less
It would ease space on Earlsdon street which I feel is necessary. The convenience of CO-OP would be lost a little... but I can never find a space anyway and just usually walk.
The theory of this sounds great, but the impact will be that the bus stop will have to move, congestion will be caused with the loading bay and also car parking spaces will be lost.
Although a crossing would be helpful, I can't see that these other proposals around the Co-op are sensible or realisable.
I am not aligned with the one way system so do not agree with the idea
Great idea
Maybe okay
OK, but how does it overlap with the proposal in question 6?
A crossing here would be useful, it should be nearer to Moor St. I don't see how more spaces would be available in side streets, please share this with the community.
A crossing is needed there so this might be a good way of facilitating this.
not sure this would work
This could be good for local residents.
Good proposal
Crossing by Coop plus Blue badge bays are a good idea but I cannot see how on earth "there will be more spaces on side streets because of the one-way system" when all of those roads are already fully parked both sides when 2 way. Time changes to parking restrictions will only work if enforced.
I am not opposed to this but think that it will cause traffic to back up onto the roundabout potentially blocking the exits. I think a zebra crossing would be better situation up past Moor Street by the Oak say.
Why have Blue Badge parking? There are very few appropriate shops in Earlsdon Street to warrant this. This will reduce the availability of parking for what is already a difficult area to park in anyway.
Need to add some focus to fixing pavements for walking
A new zebra crossing would be good. I don't feel that parking in side streets would be increased. Parking in our street has been reduced more and more as shops become restaurants so people are spending longer and more likely to drive. This has especially been an issue in the evenings. Removal of any parking would need to be considered carefully. I have found it more difficult to park in my street after work so pushing parking onto side streets is not a good answer.
Parking is already difficult for local residents. Will this make it more difficult?
Blue badge parking in a priority location is a good idea. The zebra crossing must come, and maintaining parking is secondary to that. Instead of maintaining parking space I would prefer the pavement is widened, particularly on the western side, where terraces have reclaimed the space outside the shopfronts (Albany Club, Street and the restaurants opposite Providence Street). Particularly at the Albany Club and at Street, the pedestrian footfall is frequently higher than the remaining pavement supports. At Millsy's, the pavement would be widened, but the

Comments regarding a zebra crossing by the Co-op
pinch point at the Albany club remains. I would also like to note that while there is car parking all along Earlsdon street, there are no secure cycle racks south of the Co-op. By re-dedicating one non-blue badge parking space, you could make room for 5 Sheffield stands, enough space for 10 bicycles.
Terrible. It is difficult enough to park there already
Zebra crossing would be good by the Co-op but the one way system will cause chaos and will not solve the parking issues. It will deter people from visiting Earlsdon.
Agree
Yes
Good idea. Earlsdon Street is a high mare with cars parking everywhere.
Not dure
We reject the one way system ideas.
But support a zebra between the Wetherpoons and coop sides, for pedestrian safety reasons.
Agree with this plan
Yes, good proposals
Approve
Reducing parking at the Co-op and expecting more spaces to appear in side streets sounds illogical!! Where will motorists be able to park?
I am not in favour of this proposal due to the knock on effects on traffic, parking, when we already have suitable crossings for people to use. If the 20mph speed limit is introduced that should be sufficient if enforced.
Good plan but will need to be enforced
A new zebra crossing would be welcome at Earlsdon Street (between the Co-op and the City Arms). See Question 6.
This was already mentioned?
I would like this
Pipe dream of more spaces. Earlsdon food quarter has already destroyed the neighbourhood feel, and this would result in yet more non-resident parking in other roads, particularly EAS, resulting in residents not being able to park anywhere near their properties at night.
A crossing here is much needed.
The suggestion that the one-way system will increase parking spaces is a nonsense. There is precious little parking enforcement as it is, so any such proposal requires improved and regular enforcement. As stated above, it is questionable whether an additional zebra crossing is required.
Yes
A zebra cross would be beneficial; however, I disagree that additional parking will be created by extending the one way route. The cars on these roads will still need to park outside the properties they are linked with.
Need more parking with one way otherwise like crossing
good
Needs more thought and consultation
No this is not needed.
A zebra crossing by the Co-op is a good idea but would defintely need to be a pelican crossing.
Otherwise there will be long tail-backs of motor traffic as a constant stream of shoppers cross at busy times of the day.
But there is already a lack of parking on side-streets. This is unworkable.
I am not in favour of yet another Zebra crossing so close to a roundabout as it causes traffic to back up.
I agree with this proposal.
Is this linked to question 6?
I have no objection to this proposal.
I support this proposal

Comments regarding a zebra crossing by the Co-op
In favour
Yes
Illegal parking is constant on Earlsdon Street and next to nothing is done about it. Daily parking attendants like there used to be in the area at different times of the day are needed to combat both drivers and taxis from abusing the existing restrictions let alone adding to them.
Extra crossing a good idea but unless parking on the zigzags is ticketed daily (unlikely) some sort of barrier to parking on them is needed like having the crossing with a peninsula and / or installing railings adjacent to the zig zags. Parking can be increased on side streets by putting peninsulas across the one way streets with the dropped kerbs on them so inconsiderate and selfish drivers are less able to park across them and cars can be parked closer to the corners. Also make the Warwick St car park free for 30 minutes.
I live in XXXXX and parking is a nightmare this will make it impossible
Ok
Do you not understand that a one way road has the same amount of parking as a two way road? There are only two sides to any road, hence the same amount of parking.
Supportive
I support the installation of a new zebra crossing by the Co-op.
Do we need 4 crossings on the island? No to reduced parking. Taxi rank on moor street should be for motorists trying to support the local shops .there is very little parking on providence street as it is ,, parking in Warwick street is difficult as so many dropped curbs . . Moving the bus stop WILL impact the flats as they are normally double decker busses not single .
Do not agree with this proposal
I am in favour of a new crossing by the Co-op on grounds of safety and speed reduction. My only concern is that it might lead to increased congestion at the roundabout at the bottom of Earlsdon Avenue.
Agree
Welcome the crossing but not convinced by extra parking on "side streets" - actually the only spaces close to the shops freed up will be a short section of Moor St so this seems a false promise.

Question 10

What do you think about this proposal:

Widen the path at the number 11 bus stops outside Earlsdon Primary School and opposite the Methodist Church.

Comments regarding widening the path by the bus stops
The road is narrow enough with cars parked either side of the road.
Good
Excellent plan
No view
Great
Agree
Fine
Good - the road outside the primary school before the roundabout is too wide, with cars often attempting to double up.
Of the two, the bus stop outside Elsie Jones House, is the more important of the two, it is much needed
Great
Positive
This would be very welcome as a young family who still use push chairs it's so difficult to get around the bus stop and trees.
Yes please. Walking the dog past the bus stop opposite the Methodist church means walking on the road if anyone is waiting for a bus. The road is wider than it needs to be and pedestrians have no room here. Y the school is less of an issue except at school drop off/pick up.
No opinion
Wide enough already by library. Definitely needs widening at stop opposite Methodist.
Yes to opposite the Methodist church but is it needed outside the school?
Absolutely yes
unsure
Pedestrian paths? Then yes, but don't cut down that tree. It isn't nice to walk on narrow paths but it also isn't nice to walk or wait under the sun.
Yes Sounds great
Long overdue. Much safer for children coming out of school
That's ok
Agree. Will help with flow of traffic
I agree with this
Good idea
Very good idea, would be happy with this
Neutral
In favour
Yes
N/a
Good
Good idea.
Would be useful as it gets very busy at school pick up and drop off.
Good

Comments regarding widening the path by the bus stops
Good idea
No need The residents living on the street need
👍
Yes but not at the expense of the old trees.
yep sounds ok
Not sure why? If it improves the look of the area great news but I would be interested to know how it will affect traffic flow, especially at the roundabout.
Very much needed. Narrowing these roads will feel much more like our children's safety is a priority and additional greenery will be welcome too.
No opinion
Yes
Good idea
No opinion
No chaos
Ok
Not in agreement
In favour
This is a very good idea. As a parent with a child at the school, the proximity to dense traffic is a concern.
Needs to include restriction on approach to roundabout outside library as some drivers seem to think it is 2 lanes which can cause issues going round island
No views.
Pointless
No need, wide enough already.
Fully support. It would be good to improve cycling routes along Earlsdon Ave if possible
Good plan. Makes the bus more accessible for shoppers, buggies and wheelchairs.
Agree
N/A
Strongly agree
Good idea.
Agree
Don't know
Good idea
I'm not sure how this would happen. This bit of road is already really narrow meaning that cars and buses have to stop if a vehicle is coming the other way, leading to traffic jams which go from the roundabout up to the junction with Newcombe Rd and beyond. Making the path wider would surely mean narrowing the road further and causing even more traffic problems and therefore air pollution issues around the school which is not ideal?
In favour.
I have never been aware of a problem here. (And I have lived in the area for XXXXXX I had children who attended Earlsdon School and I was a regular bus user, but the current problem seems to be the shortage of parking places for people who seem reluctant to walk even the shortest distance to where they want to go.
Not needed but, if you want to.
I don't see how this is possible as it is already tight when a bus comes down
Perfect
Ok
I Support this proposal. There is very limited space by the bus stop by the city arms this should help.
This could work
This is a good suggestion.

Comments regarding widening the path by the bus stops
No comment
Yes absolutely this should happen: the road widening here has no beneficial affect on traffic aside from encouraging parents to drop their child off via car which should be as heavily discouraged as possible. A wider path will be safer and more pleasant.
Agree
Agree
Good
Agree
Can't see any need for this.....although the bus stop outside city arms on Earlsdon avenue needs widening as impossible to walk past....have to use road.
I support this when linked to 14
In favour provided thus does not involve removing the nature trees
Agree
Makes sense - I've never really understood why it goes into two lanes when the roundabout can only take one car. You get people coming up beside you and then cutting you up.
What does it help exactly?
Not sure why this is needed apart from opposite Methodist Church for wheelchair users.
Fine.
Good
Agree
Widening the path will reduce the road width. At school times the traffic is horrendously busy already when they are able to manoeuvre around the bus. A reduction in road width will mean longer traffic queues
I think this is a good idea.
Excellent idea, this should be rolled out as soon as possible and extended to other coventry neighbourhoods, such as Stoke.
Why?. Just remove some of the trees / tree routes & get people ti cut back hedges
I'm unsure that this is necessary.
Is there a need ?
Why?
Why?????? If this reduces the road width so that cars can't pass buses then no, definitely not!! The idea that roads should be reduced so that people can sit on benches is just ludicrous.
Yes, the paths here need to be wider for footfall to the school.
Unnecessary
Yes
I do not think the path needs widening. If it is widened which roads will have to be reduced ?
Sounds sensible
This is a traffic bottle neck and would only become more so under these proposals, so narrowing the road here is not a good idea.
Good idea
seems unnecessary, I can't imagine why it's seen as desireabl
Disagree.
Agree. Would help slow traffic
Yes, agree.
It seems like a good idea
Already wide enough
Bad
Ok
Bad, Think the paths are a good size already

Comments regarding widening the path by the bus stops
Agree
No comment - I don't use the bus.
Excellent and urgently needed!
I support this proposal but fear this would result in narrowing of Earlston ave north and south which, once parking is reduced elsewhere, will be even more blocked by parked cars during school dropoff and pickup times
Supportive.
I can see the point opposite the Methodist Church, but is there a problem outside the school?
Nonsense. What's the point?
Sounds good. The road doesn't need to be as wide as it is by the school, so reclaim it!;
Why ? As you are already restricting access to Earlsdon Ave by changing access to Beecheood Ave if you are driving from Tile Hill eg Sainsburys / Village gym . This is a very bad idea
Yes
Agree
Ok
A waste of money.
I can't see the pint of this as it is already pretty wide. I think the investment would be better spent on other plans.
Fine
Yes agree
Not really necessary.
Not sure of the benefits of this, but constricting the entrance to the roundabout to remove the illusion of two lanes would be beneficial.
Definitely opposite the Methodist Church . Think it's wide enough outside the library and school.
As a user of that Bus Stop, the path does not need widening...
I don't have an opinion
I support the proposal
I don't think this is needed, the path is really wide
Yes
Ok
The paths are already wide enough.
Disagree. Spend this valuable money elsewhere
In favour
Seems Okay
Not necessary in our eyes.
Great ideas. Better quality and wider pavements across the whole of Earlsdon would be great, they are in terrible condition
Very welcome- additional path space will help at busy times for pedestrians, Road is particularly wide at that location so should comfortably accommodate this with limited impact on road users
Not necessary
Isn't this already quite wide?
Unnecessary...put speed bumps along the road instead
Greatly needed!
Good idea
I agree with opposite methodist church
welcome it
Opposite the Methodist church good outside the school bad
Good idea.

Comments regarding widening the path by the bus stops
I fully support this proposal
Sounds like a good idea, my daughter is at earsdon primary and there's allways a 'crunch' by the bus stop at picking up time.
A good idea to clearly show one line of traffic approaching the island
Not necessarily
Agree
Fine
?
X
Agree
Not necessary
Agree for Opposite the Methodist Church, walking past the bus stop is impossible forcing pedestrians to use the road, the pathway is dangerous due to the tree roots. Disagree with widening the path outside the primary school/library as it's already very wide. Further, cars would not be able to pass the bus whilst at the stop due to the island on the pedestrian crossing
I think these proposed changes make sense and will be an improvement
Not sure how this can be achieved but potentially good
Disagree
Couldn't care what happens here, spend the money if you think it's worth it
A good idea. I support this. It will improve things for pedestrians especially around school start/finish times when there can be a lot of people milling around.
Not sure it will make much difference
In favour
Yes, I agree
No issues with that.
No opinion
Agree
I agree with this proposal
I strongly support-(the drainage needs fixing in this location too, predestination get splashed by vehicles speeding through floodwater on the corner)
Can only be beneficial from a safety point
If this means narrowing the roads I think that would create more congestion for traffic.
It is already very wide there. How wide does it need to be? This would be a good place for a hire bike park though as the nearest one is at Hersall Common and there are none around Earlsdon Street.
Presumably this narrows the road? Can cars still get past the bus at the stop.if so fine,if not there is already a lot of space round the stop
OK, but not vital
Agree,
This is a good proposal
Good idea.
Ok
Sounds good
Fully approve
Excellent as this is currently dangerous and unsightly
Agree
Excellent
Good idea

Comments regarding widening the path by the bus stops
Yes please
Agree
Approve
agree
Agree
UNSURE If roads are narrowed by widening the pavement, the narrow 2-way lanes will mean more queuing behind the buses then?
Unsure what is needed here or what it is trying to solve
Seems reasonable
Not sure necessary by the school but definitely opposite the Church
The path directly outside the school is woefully narrow and chaotic / dangerous at pickup / drop off. The road needs to be narrowed to one lane at the roundabout. strongly in favour.
Acceptable
In favour
Excellent It is used by all members of community. A very busy focal point of the Earlsdon Community
Makes no sense.
Sounds a good idea but how much would the road be narrowed and impede traffic flow?
In support of this
Will cause congestion on Earlsdon Avenue North
The one opposite the church makes sense. Outside the school will always be congested at certain times of day
Maybe good opposite the methodist church. In my experience outside the primary school doesn't seem like a bottle neck on the path anyway.
Good idea
Can't see any benefit in this
I support this proposal
If this can be done safely then it might help especially during school opening/closing times when the street is often completely full of parents waiting for their children. There is a similar lack of space around the bus stop by Elsie Jones House on Earlsdon Avenue South.
Very important. Yes please.
good
Seems a good idea, but wouldn't the bus be in the way of traffic flow when stationary? This would definitely impact Newcombe Rd if you had it one way the direction you suggest.
Support this.
Whenever the bus stops there the traffic is blocked. Move the stop.
Not necessary outside the school. . Would be an improvement opposite tje methodist Church.
Good
I support this proposal. The pavement is often very congested around the bus stop outside Elsie Jones House, though I do not see how it could be improved without removing at least one of the trees there. The pavement and bus stop outside the primary school/library would be less of an issue if the school permitted parents waiting to collect their children to queue in the playground rather than in the street. This seems to have become more of a problem since Covid measures were implemented which in my view may no longer be optimal, but if the school continues with this way of doing things, widening the pavement may help.
Why is this necessary?
Agree
How will this affect the traffic at busy times in particular
Yes

Comments regarding widening the path by the bus stops
Agree
No comment
Good idea stops cars going two abreast around an island that has only room for one
Sounds good. School gets busy around here.
Good
Seems reasonable
Unnecessary
Fully support
Agree
Good idea
Sounds reasonable. Having watched old people, disabled people, wheelchair users and buggy pushers attempt to navigate the hellish slalom caused by various pavement obstructions, I think it's time to stop fetishising massive, overgrown trees and make the pavements wide enough, flat enough and unobstructed enough for general ease of use. It would help if there were an overall agreement that all street furniture, like bus stops, tree, bins, cableboxes and telegraph poles, could be EITHER next to the kerbs OR as far away as possible. The mix and match approach is not ideal.
Strongly in favour. Two kids at Earlsdon school and the road is dangerous. I think the addition of street seating should be avoided though, as it will encourage anti social behaviour
Ok
Nope. Dont do this. This will make the area more difficult to navigate around
Ok
Sounds good
I quite frequently use the bus stop opposite the Methodist Church and am not convinced that there is a great need to widen the path there. There seems to be more justification for making space near Earlsdon Primary School since this can be a very crowded area with many children in the neighbourhood.
its already very wide and I don't use it personally - but it benefits the school
Fine
I find the pavements wide enough but putting extra seats and planters would enhance this place for passers by and those using the buses.
No comment
Maybe expensive for limited value
In favour
Good idea. Makes it safer
Good idea
Agree that this could work and will help taffic flow
I understand that you are trying to reduce speed by a school but you will already have put 30 mph zone in its rice. Why then do you need this proposal? What happens when you have delivery lorries , dustcarts, removal vans, sundry other large vehicles in these areas? Complete gridlock, that's what. A nightmare scenario.
No opinion
surely this would impact on the width of the road.
Yes. People waiting for the bus often block the pavement.
The main problem with the area round Earlsdon Primary school is parents parking on single and double yellow lines at the start and end of the school day
Not necessary
Yes
Do not agree
No view
No view
The path needs to widened opposite the Methodist church at the bus stop but its already wide enough at the

Comments regarding widening the path by the bus stops
library
All our families are in favour of this. Comments: "we need wider pavement all the way to kenilworth road, the road is to wide which encourages speeding"
No opinion
Very sensible, yes.
no comment
As mentioned in Point 6 this will only increase problems with the traffic flow. The bus stop opposite the Methodist Church is more of a problem but could this not be solved by moving it further up Earlsdon Avenue away from the junction.
Widening the path opposite the Methodist church is a good idea.
Agree particularly with wider pavement on Wetherspoons side but unsure how this might happen without damaging the tree at the bus stop
No.
No.
Don't think it is needed
Will this be feasible if so much traffic is getting re routed to Earlsdon Avenue?
Great
Widening the path outside the number 11 bus stops both outside Earlsdon Primary and opposite the Methodist Church seems sensible and i would support this suggestion.
Does get crowded around school opening and closing so could be good, but there is a need to ensure the road remains wide enough.
Path is awful both uneven and width. A wheelchair must have an awful time through here and so I am in favour
Good idea - the pavement by school is dangerously busy at school pick up time
Agreed
Good
Why?
Support.
No
I support this.
Agree
I'm not sure of the benefits as never paid it much attention. Traffic would have to squeeze past busses maybe
Makes sense.
This sounds like a solution to a non-existent problem
Ok with this providing the traffic is not restricted
Supportive, although traffic congestion around the school in the morning and at pick up time is bad already so there may be additional measures required to keep traffic flowing.
seems sensible enough
There appears to be plenty of pavement space by the library, but not opposite the Methodists where widening would help.
Not needed. It would impede through traffic.
this is not needed
Yes
Good.
Good proposal
That is already much wider than average pavements so how would this help? Would bus's have stop and block the traffic? As all traffic is being forced down Earlsdon avenue due to the bus gate and forcing Newcombe road traffic to be one way coming up the hill, then this is a very bad idea.
I am not opposed to these changes although they will affect traffic flow towards the roundabout.
And fix ALL pavements for walking

Comments regarding widening the path by the bus stops
Sounds good
This is an excellent and overdue idea. The footway in these locations is very narrow (and further reduced by the magnificent street trees). It should be noted that the footway is also narrow due to trees on the northern pavement of Earlsdon Avenue South, between Albany Road and Berkeley Road North. This is a key walk to school route and would also benefit from a widening.
No view
Path there is quite wide anyway so unnecessary expense for little gain.
Agree
Yes, but not if this is going to narrow the path for cars
No comment
No. It's difficult to pass that road in peak times as it is.
That sounds like a good idea. Pedestrian access is quite difficult for people with mobility challenges.
Agree with this plan
Yes it's a good proposal.
Approve
Not necessary if speed limit is changed to 20mph. Narrowing the road will lead to more congestion and greater pollution.
I support this proposal
Disagree with this proposal. The path does not need to be widened.
Yep
Also good
Why.? Does this mean that when a bus is pulled into stop (and it is a designated bus timetable catch up stop) then no-one else would be able to drive past thus increasing snarl ups on on EAN.
No opinion.
All this does is place the bus stop in what would be the main carriageway, causing a regular, long traffic queue forming behind the stationary bus. That could also prompt impatient drivers in that queue to attempt what would be dangerous overtaking of the bus, which is something that often occurs now when drivers try to get past buses and also bin lorries on collection days.
Sound's sensible
pls widen pavement on whole of Earlsdon Ave Sth, trees make it impossible to push wheelchair from Warwick Ave to City Arms
Will cause traffic tailbacks at peak times
Yes that is ok.
Definitely opposite the Methodist Church.
Good proposal
Do not have an opinion on this.
Provided this allows buses to pull in whilst vehicles can still pass to keep traffic flowing I am in favour
I am not aware that the narrowness of the path causes significant problems for users of the path. I use the path frequently, and there are numerous other measures that can be taken to help pedestrians e.g. limit tree incursion on paths, limit car parking on paths, enforce hedge and tree reduction adjacent to paths. These measures would help people with mobility and sight difficulties. I struggle to see how the widening of the path at the bus stop can be a priority relative to other pavement issues. The widening of the pavement would increase traffic and environmental problems due to increased traffic queuing. I am strongly against this proposal.
Much needed from a pedestrian standpoint. Worth noting the bus stop location as it does cause occasional tailbacks on Earlsdon Avenue as the buses seem to use this as a 'break' point in their schedule, stopping here for longer than usual. The existing road width does allow some traffic to pass so any narrowing of the road due to widening of the pavement should take this into account or/and the bus stop should be noted as an inappropriate 'break' point for bus drivers.
I do not support this proposal. From the information provided the only way to widen the path is to encroach onto and narrow the road and cars no longer being able to go past a bus when it is waiting at the bus stop for

Comments regarding widening the path by the bus stops

loading and unloading passengers. This can take several minutes. This will increase traffic queues on Earlsdon Avenue North and South and worsen air pollution from car exhausts. Only if there is a way to do this that will still allow cars space to overtake whilst buses are stationary could this be acceptable. There are many other investments that would increase the liveability and encourage walking in Earlsdon, as set out in my answer to Q16.

I strongly support this proposal. I like that it will increase the space between the road and the primary school, improving air quality for school children. Please could planting be used to further improve air quality and the local environment. I like the idea of the green wall - please could the design / species be based on the research showing how to make this as effective as possible in protecting the school from air pollution

In favour

Yes

This is a big traffic pinch point and reducing the road width would only exacerbate it.

Ok

If done properly, sounds fine.

Supportive and essential

The lane of Earlsdon Avenue North which approaches the roundabout is unsafe as it is too wide. I support action to address this.

Not necessary , will cause a backup of traffic on Earlsdon ave (at least now cars can pass a bus which has stopped) not necessary by the church .

Do not agree with this proposal

I am in favour of this proposal.

Agree

Neutral

Question 11

What do you think about this proposal:

Market gates on Earlsdon Street, so that a road closure could be implemented for trader led markets or community events. Earlsdon Street would remain open to vehicles at all other times.

Comments regarding market gates on Earlsdon Street
Positive
Great idea.
Good
Excellent plan
Good idea
Excellent idea
Agree
Yes
The market the other Sunday was fantastic. Definitely a good idea to set this up
Good
Great plan.
In favour of this
Great
Fabulous idea.
I loved the market this would make the road closure easier to maintain.
Not sure this is necessary or value for money. Temporary measures work fine.
Happy with that
Good idea
Yes
Yes. Can they be pretty? Can Earlsdon residents design them or paint them?
Agree
yes good idea some sensible
Don't do this. It seems like a poor way to spend money. It is enough to park vehicles across Earlsdon Street and use signs saying that the road is closed like the markets have done in the past. Use any money that would be spent on gates for the other measures of this program.
Yes Sounds great
Not sure what this means
Ok
In line with plans to create more community events
I do not agree with this. We and many other residents who live in XXXXXX and connecting streets wish to have some sort of peace without the issues caused by constant Earlsdon Street closures. There are mainly coffee shops, restaurant and pubs trading in the street now and we experience noise on a daily basis from this. Earlsdon Street used to have mainly retail shops selling clothes, cards, clocks/watches, paintings, music etc. but all have since gone. This should not be a decision based on just the views of Earlsdon Street traders. More importantly it should be directed at the residents who live in Earlsdon Street who are impacted by Street closures, the noise, disruption, difficulty to park, the fumes produced by vehicles who are forced to enter Providence Street or Moor Street due to the road closure.XXXXXXX, and it is us who are directly affected by this proposal. We welcome the Earlsdon Festival in May but this proposal impacts on residents daily lives.
Not a good idea! Sounds designed for traders on Earlsdon Street rather residents. The recent 'market" activity brought a lot of noise and nuisance to Earlsdon Street. It caused inconvenience to residents on the street. It certainly didn't make the street more liveable for those who actually live there!!

Comments regarding market gates on Earlsdon Street
Supportive
Great
In favour
Good idea
Very supportive
Good idea
Good idea.
This is an excellent idea and should have been done years ago.
Ok
Good idea
No need - movable barriers seem to work well. Do we need unsightly permanent gates
Love this idea.
Will vehicular access still be given to the properties and residents car park from 39- 43 earlsdon st?(between providence st and moor st) Will we be allowed priority street parking if not .will we be informed adequately of any road closures for markets or events . Will the businesses that serve that part of earlsdon st be able to get deliveries on event days ?
sounds ok
No problem with this. I assume application would still need to be applied for and advertised.
Excellent starting point. I would be happy for this section of road to be closed to motor traffic all the time to make it feel nicer to sit on benches or outside cafes and restaurants.
Good
Yes
I don't think this goes far enough. Earlsdon Street should be closed to through traffic or narrowed to one-way so that footways can be widened. The increasing number of on street eating areas currently make the footway very narrow and dangerous.
Sounds sensible with the new farmers market being more frequent than the annual earlsdon festival
No chaos
Yes please would support small business development
Ok
Good idea
Not in agreement
Strongly in favour - street markets are great for the area
A bit unnecessary as signs can do the job just as well and cost less.
Strongly in favour
Think it should be pedestrianised. Many successful variations of this across the UK and Europe bringing significant higher footfall and revenue to the street facing shops.
Is this necessary now, Earlsdon festival has managed without for years and monthly market not yet established
Market event not proven to be sustainable and viable an event to warrant development yet.
Wast of money
Waste of money if market idea has been thrown out.
Would prefer partial pedestrianisation of Earlsdon Street to make space for this activity, or using temporary traffic management. The market gates on Spon Street take up a lot of space and are ugly - especially when planters aren't maintained .
Are gates needed to close the roads? If so, yes, but I am glad that you propose keeping Earlsdon Street open to other vehicles. My only concern is ambulance accessibility in case of an emergency.
Agree
Good idea
Fantastic idea.

Comments regarding market gates on Earlsdon Street
Strongly agree
Market events most welcome but are gates really necessary? I don't think so.
Agree
Unnecessary
I don't think Earlsdon needs these! The festival once a year is fine, not a monthly one.
I don't live round this bit or regularly drive here so I have no comment on this. I support whatever the residents of these roads say as they will have to live with the restrictions
Great idea.
If the local traders think it will increase trade then I am in favour, but again it further restricts the number of places where people can park legally and safely. Where, apart from the Memorial Park, is there ?
Not sure how this would work or if it's really necessary. We've managed up to now to be able to close the Rd for events without them.
Again unnecessary. Arranged market days would be good but permanent market gates would be expensive. Temporary closer procedures such as on festival day are suffecant.
Great idea. With planters added to make it hidden when not un use.
OK
I support it. My preference would be to close Earldon street to cars.
Yes
I am not sure that the frequency of events warrant this and that monies could be better spent elsewhere.
There are not enough of these events to warrant this.
I agree with the market gates hugely, and support the full pedestrianisation of Earlsdon Street with some zeal. I hope regular event-based pedestrianisation will convince fellow residents that full-time pedestrianisation is not only possible but beneficial and preferable.
Agree
Agree
Not necessary
Not bothered either way
This would be useful as it would make it so much easier to manage community events.
Could money be used in a better way and just use barriers?
Yes - making it easier to pedestrianise the high street would be great.
I support this
In favour
Kind of makes sense but my concern it increasing road closure combined with other measure means residents in my area literally can't get out, or only very very slowly.....
Pointless. Better to close the street to two way traffic completely.
Good idea.
Yes good idea if expense is worth it.
Good idea.
Good
Agree
As long as enough notice given then no problems at all
I think this is a good idea.
Excellent idea, this should be rolled out as soon as possible and extended to other coventry neighbourhoods, such as Stoke.
Brilliant idea! The markets are great and will feel much safer with them in place!
Yes
This is OK for when there is a market on. As long as it doesn't interfere with the buses. It did last time which was troubling for those that had to walk longer and further with an ailment.
Waste of money

Comments regarding market gates on Earlsdon Street
Try getting shops and old banks rented then no need for street markets - encourage local business not over priced market stalls
I like this idea.
Okay
Yes
I do not see a problem with this, but where will these gates be stored ?
Good idea, but (whole or part) pedestrianisation would be better
No need for these. These events should be special occasions, (like the Earlsdon festival), not regular events.
neutral
Not opposed
not keen. closing of the road is really inconvenient for those of us who rely on the bus to get to work
Wouldn't they have to be where pedestrian crossing is planned? This would also involve substantial expense for rare events a couple of times a year. Temporary barriers better.
No objection
I do not support this proposal
Fine
Ok
Ok
Good idea
Agree
I don't think it's currently justified, The recent Sunday market had a very poor selection of stalls (selling mainly tat) so I don't think it will be a success in the long run.
I think it's a very good idea
Yes the Market is a good idea and really pulls the community together.
Supportive
OK
Great safety idea.
Lovely idea.
If it's for a valid reason this is ok
Yes
Agree
Ok
No comment except how much is this expected to cost and why are they needed? Who will open the gates to emergency vehicles? Who will control the gates and who will decide when they are opened or closed? Farcical
I thought we already managed this idea OK with road closures. I feel money could best be spent on other plans.
Fine for me
Yes
Good idea
Yes. Agree. Extend up as far as Arden St.
Good
Fine.
Cautiously welcomed
I am worried this just introduces yet more street furniture - I am not supportive of this proposal
not needed
Yes

Comments regarding market gates on Earlsdon Street
Yes ok with that
Ok but not really necessary
Agree. This seems like a worthwhile idea with a real aim in mind
In favour
Like a mini Earlsdon festival this proposal is fine
Agree with the above.
Brilliant
This would be helpful to allow a greater number of such events
Not necessary. We have 1 day a year at the Earlsdon festival. Waste of money.
Good idea
Ok to having that on one weekday but it's hard sky Portabello roadthink realistically before implementing I would suggest
Nice-to-have, probably not essential.
Does it need a gate for this? Just close the road like every previous event. Unnecessary street clutter
Interesting, for events could be useful
Again if parking is reduced from it it will cause an impact on our streets Please see Point 9!
Pointless
I'm in favour of this.
Good
I'm not sure it seems particularly difficult to close the road using the usual signs. I am supportive of events using the road on the high street but I don't think gates would necessarily make this any easier. Would the gates block users crossing the road when not in use?
Could be an unnecessary expense as the road can and has been closed with temporary markers / signs.
Rather pointless
Yes
Agree
Fine
Yes. Good idea
Unnecessary. The road has been successfully closed on May day for years.
Great idea
Agree
Yes ok with that
OK
This seems a sensible proposal
I'm unsure of this.
Good idea
Ok
I am strongly opposed to closure of Earlsdon Street at any time as it will become an even more important thoroughfare.
Why spend the money? If the road is close for a market/festival obviously no cars are coming down the street
I support this as long as they don't look unsightly.
Great idea and the market idea fully supported
Very much in favour
Yes. I agree
I think it is the first stage in a stealth tactic to pedestrianise Earlsdon Street which would be damaging for businesses and the infirm who rely on vehicles to get them as close as possible to Earlsdon Street.
In favour

Comments regarding market gates on Earlsdon Street
Agree
Good idea, yes please.
I have no issues with this proposal
No objections.
Not in favour. Earlsdon is already a busy thriving community without having to encourage these type of external events.
* Market Gates on Earlsdon Street are not needed.
How are gates stored when not used. The pavements are very busy so having gates on them the whole time is not helpful. Not sure of the need, temporary barriers do the trick.
Not sure it's necessary
Excellent.
Agree.
This is a good proposal
Good idea to support community events.
Not needed
Sounds good
Fully approve
Agree
No need waste of money
Very supportive, excellent.
Agree
Unnecessary. If we have events, the streets can be closed off. We don't need a gate (although your town planner told me it would most probably be an 'imaginary gate'). If it was literally a metal gate it would need to be enormous and this, unsightly.
It would certainly allow for more community events to take place.
Approve
agree
Agree
I think this is another WASTE OF MONEY considering only 2 events held per year.
Agree - a lovely place for community events.
Who decided that this would be likely - have all the treaters been directly asked by the council if they support this proposal.
Not sure
Yes, but you need to do more to convince others of alternative traffic arrangements.
Yes Please
Acceptable
In favour
Excellent
Good idea.
Actual gates? The road is already effectively closed for community events.
Supportive of this
fine
Sounds good
It's nice to have festivals / markets on the street at times. If its significantly easier with 'trader gates' than road blocks then probably a good idea.
Good idea
Seems sensible

Comments regarding market gates on Earlsdon Street
I support this proposal
I am not a big fan of these events (the noise is a problem) but if the events have to happen then market gates make sense and should mean a reduced need for stewards on such occasions.
A good idea to promote community events
One of the few positive improvements proposed.
good
Think that's crackers. Spend the money on something else.
Support this.
Foolishness
No
Ok
I am not a fan of the Earlsdon Festival or street markets or the like as these generate a lot of noise and disruption, and increase parking and congestion in the whole neighbourhood, therefore I am opposed to market gates or anything that facilitates such events. I fail to see how broadcasting loud music in the high street, often from multiple sources at the same time, makes Earlsdon more "liveable". XXXXXX
Not necessary to have gates we have closed the road on the past without permanent gates. What would the advantage be?
Waste of money. Temporary barriers do the job at a fraction of the cost.
NO! it may be initially once a month then weekly and later permanently I am Not Keen on a Street Market....probably will affect the High Street shops which will then be forced to close also I have no intention of buying from this market Plus I am concerned about the traffic being diverted and spilling onto adjacent roads
Please do it
Agree
Waste of money especially at a time when government spending is limited.
Definitely no We in XXXXXX (that's it the one you think does not exist) do not want Sunday markets ruining our Sundays Earlsdon 2 who propose this do not represent residents or traders on the street 1 trader told me she pays rent etc on a struggling high street and people pay for one day stall and undercut her . The cafes and bars get enough weekend trade anyway The only traditional community event is Mayday We have had a Christmas market on 1 or maybe 2 occasions but that could be held in the library (the only truly resident run successful enterprise in Earlsdon) church halls and schools As I said XXXXX are pushing for this and are not representative is Earlsdon (only their chair turned up at last meeting not even the invited councillor turn up He was quite angry and upset this shows the true feeling of traders etc)
Sounds great - the more pedestrian friendly the high street, the better! Happy for the high street to be pedestrians only in the centre so you can access from either end but there is a section where there's pedestrians only.
Stupid and needless, the festival etc would be better in the park anyway
Not sure it's needed but no objections
No comment
Support
Maybe. Only feasible if most of the 'end of street' closures and one way systems are abandoned as Earlsdon Street will become only point of entry/exit for many residents. See above re. the additional traffic that will be forced onto Earlsdon Street.
Agree
Excellent idea!! I think Earlsdon is at its best when main street is pedestrian-only
Sounds reasonable.
Seems sensible, however many people are up in arms about the market.
Ok
This will make the area unsightly and a maintenance issue. Retractable bollards would be a good option, but I

Comments regarding market gates on Earlsdon Street
doubt the bidget will stretch to that?
Don't think we need that don't know where those would go. Need some cycle parking in Earlsdon street which is well trafficked. I wouldn't want to leave my bike in a quiet street.
Great idea
I'm not sure whether this proposal addresses an essential need. The road has been cordoned off for such events in the past and I'm not aware that that is difficult to arrange and implement.
yes fine - all great. Just don't agree with majority of traffic coming from the eastern side now being forced down high street or beechwood due to the proposals, because when the high street is closed it will be a nightmare.
Yeah fine
This seems unnecessary to me for the few times they would be used.
Yes seems reasonable.
Agree
Mainly in favour
Think if there's a market etc then temporary structures are fine and preferable - otherwise it's an eye sore and clusters the area
Possibly high cost Vs little benefit compared to the current way of closing the road
Absolutely not necessary. A complete waste of money. They will just be in the way while not being used for 364 days a year.
Agree
Good idea
I don't think there are that many events on the Earlsdon festival once a year.
Again, I like this proposal.
ok
Seems excessive cost for a once a year festival
Excellent
Ok
Agree
Excellent idea
No view
Where do the buses go on these days?
Our families were mixed on this but all were in favour to try the scheme. Comments include: "i'd like them to close the road to motor traffic all the time". "It will be nicer to sit outside cafes with fewer cars on the road" "I look forward to events".
Good idea
Unsure.
Waste of money
I do not believe that these can be cost effective. Closing Earlsdon Street with these proposals in place would make it very difficult for any event being organised to be attended by anyone outside of Earlsdon.
Completely unnecessary and a waste of money. The existing measures work perfectly well and there is no guarantee that such events will continue on a regular basis.
Yes absolutely. Will the community have access to the gate? To constantly approach Council is a barrier for the community
Maybe - need more info.
No.
Market gates on Earlsdon Street is a good idea
Supportive of this proposal
Great
A sensible idea and i wholeheartedly support measures that will encourage and promote the economic and business enterprise and success of the locality.

Comments regarding market gates on Earlsdon Street
Not sure, seems okay as it is but could be useful.
Yes this would be good and gradually move to pedestrianising it.
I don't think this is necessary when the monthly market proposals are not approved. They will clutter the street for little benefit. The festival works fine with temporary closures.. The money saved could be used elsewhere to provide an adequate crossing at the Rochester/Beechwood junction,
Why are the gates needed as the events block the road?
Approve of this
Yes
Fully support. I used to live in XXXXX and the council pedestrianising the high street was one of the best things they did. But it only worked because you could park nearby in one of the large, purpose built car parks and then walk into town to the shops. The lack of parking facilities in Earlsdon will be an issue, we don't want to reduce footfall on road closure days. I would be supportive of fully pedestrianising Earlsdon Street!
Agree
I support this.
Agree
The gates would need to be aesthetically pleasing if spending money on the community environment as a whole.
Crazy. The road is closed every year for a festival without the need for physical gates. Unless of course the objective in the longer term is not related to street closures for fun events, but to stop people travelling.
This is an expensive sledgehammer to crack a nut.
Question the value for money case for these given the limited uptake of such markets & events; could temporary closures not be sufficient?
good
These sound unsightly/unappealing and light weight moveable barriers have been sufficient for the previous events.
Not sure how these gates would work.
this could work
Should Aim for Full Time Closure
Ok
Good
Good idea
I think this proposal is completely unnecessary so I am not in favour. The primary event on Earlsdon Street, the Earlsdon Festival takes place each year without the need for "market gate" so I can't see why they are required. I would consider them as waste of money and they would also take up valuable pavement space.
Why? This will impact on the daily lives on the many people who live in Earlsdon Street. We want normal lives where we can park outside our houses, carry about our everyday lives like other residents in Earlsdon, not suffer from the noise and people from these events, suffer from the fumes of vehicles that are forced to take alternative limited routes through with the road closure, not having the access to important bus services which is important to me because I am disabled. Has this suggestion come from theXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Have you consulted the people who live in Earlsdon Street about this proposal? It is easy for people not living here to voice their approval. I would like to see what they would say if this was proposed for the street where they live
Great idea
This would be fine with notice. This links to why Berkeley Road South need to be one way. I am not sure of the benefit of Berkeley Road South being one way to the residents though.
Absolutely against this as a resident XXXXXXXXXXXX. No need for it and will potentially close the road - which will cause a right muddle if all the other proposals go through! What happens to delivery vans, to the bus routes and we know neighbours who have elderly relatives living with them who rely on getting access through Earlsdon Street - this will make their lives more difficult not easier. A less liveable neighbourhood for them!!
I think this would be a useful addition to the High Street. I would love to see more events happening in this space, and I would welcome that this is facilitated by the market gates. As per my earlier comment, I would like to suggest some of the freed-up space is used for Sheffield stands, given there are none south of the Co-op.

Comments regarding market gates on Earlsdon Street
Maybe they could be integrated with planters and other greenery, which is currently missing from Earlsdon Street.
Ok
Yes this is a good idea.
Disagree - don't see the point of it
Not needed
Is it needed?
The market isn't going ahead so pointless. This doesn't benefit the festival (I'm the chairman) as we extend further than the gates so they are more "in the way". The festival is the only event that happens and the gates don't benefit us. No other events happen and the 2.0 market hasn't been given permission from the council yet and looks like the team are going to do it anymore. This might change but nothing has happened since August as they need council permission for an on going one which they haven't got.
Reject. Don't see why it needs permanent street furniture when it can be done perfectly well with temporary barriers. Save money.
Agree with this plan. It would make it much easier to have the market set up and have the cordoned off sections of the high street
Yes it's a good proposal.
Approve
Unnecessary - yet another restriction/irritation for residents
No problem with this proposal. I am in favour of business and community events such as the Earlsdon Festival.
Not unreasonable but a nice to have. Should not be as high priority as the safety measures above in terms of spending budget
Neither agree, nor disagree.
No thoughts
Love this idea.
Don't understand why this is necessary as this already happens without additional street furniture taking up already narrow paths.
I approve of this
It's not obvious that this is necessary as the road is satisfactorily closed on the relevant days. However, if the market gate is rendered inaccessible to vandalism it could work.
Dubious. The extra traffic forced to use Earlsdon Street if the proposals were to be implemented would make closure a serious problem for many.
It is difficult to see what benefit this will bring. Closing Earlsdon Street for markets is welcomed and I am in favour of a monthly street market, but do not see what benefit 'gates' bring to the operating and viability of the markets.
Agree
rubbish, the festival is too loud and should not be held at a time of year when many young people have to sit major exams, making it impossible to revise
Markets good idea for community
No I don't see the necessity and I fear you are trying to sneak in eventually pedestrianising Earlsdon.
yes!
Good proposal
More street furniture that is not required and will be unsightly and costly.
Good Idea
I am against this, market gates are not required to enable road closures. This is a superfluous measure.
I like it
No
Great idea - would support this and would love to see the high street used more in this way!

Comments regarding market gates on Earlsdon Street
I support the ability to close Earlsdon Street for trader-led markets or community events on a more regular basis. This is achieved currently several times a year without the use of market gates. I do not see the added benefits of installing such gates and in particular the location chosen for the gates.
I strongly support this proposal. It would help facilitate markets and community events, which would bring the community together.
In favour
No
Trader led markets are not needed on this road. This again adds to the pervasive ethos from some residents who want to make the area exclusive to them and them alone. The traders on this high street are not struggling for trade they are busy 7 days a week. Reducing my access to this thoroughfare is unnecessary and inconvenient for me.
Ok
Probably not necessary. You can cordon off the road if necessary.
Supportive - provided Traffic regulations permitted a street closure of a regular basis (once a month) rather than on individual expensive applications
I support this proposal so long as the criteria and the decision-making process for closing the gates is clear and understood.
More unnecessary street litter for the amount of times the street is closed . Less pavement are to cross the road to & from . What's wrong with the usual road closed signs , waste of money .
Agree with this proposal - Street Markets have already been held but the council has banned future events. Why is the council insistent on forcing a low traffic neighborhood on an areas that doesn't want it or need it yet refuses to let community events go ahead like a street market.
I am in favour of this proposal, although I am somewhat concerned about the possible frequency of such closures, and how they would be communicated to residents in advance of the road closure.
Agree
Unclear if this reduces the need for consultation / Council approval to make such closures possible. Support help for local business and community business but does this need to be part of Liveable Neighbourhoods?

Question 12

What do you think about this proposal:

Cycle parking on Shaftesbury Avenue, Arden Street, Warwick Street, Earlsdon Avenue South, Berkeley Road North and South.

Comments regarding cycle parking
No thank you
This would be useful however earlsdon is already targeted. One of our cars were stolen recently, someone tried to break into our neighbours house around the same time. I wouldn't trust leaving my bike outside of my property.
Again narrowing already narrow roads making road safety an issue
Do we need this much?
Good
Great
Agree
How much demand is there? Is money going to be spent on something that will rarely be used? Most people drive or walk into Earlsdon, very few cycle . If they do, will they want to park in these roads.
Good idea
More beryl stations need to be installed on the periphery of the zone. There is no point in these new measures if you can only pick up the bikes at memorial park.
Great.
Not convinced that these would be used, have they been asked for?
Great
Good.
Yes. Even better if it could tie in with hire bikes. Add some tree planting too.
Not sure what that would entail
Its Shaftesbury Road.... Who needs bike parking in any of these streets? There are no shops or businesses. Surely bike parking on Earlsdon Street where the business is would be more practical.
Yes
Yes! This would be great
Who is using these? They will never get used, just take up footpath space and look ugly, I thought this scheme was to make our streets more attractive?
Agree
some good not sure need this much cycle parking - phase it in?
Yes.
Yes sounds great
Will it be used?
Good idea
Agree
I agree withbthis
Supportive
In favour. Would be great to have bicycle parking towards the top of the high street too.
Where exactly will it go
N/a
Good idea
Good idea.

Comments regarding cycle parking
Struggle to see where cycle parking could be put on Berkeley road north and south and I'm not convinced it would get much use.
What form would this take?
Waste of time and money
Is there any demand for this? Maybe outside shops but I doubt it will be used in other roads
If its need the why not, I'd be interested to see the statistics to show the need for it.
Waste of money.
not sure. rather have spaces for car parking. any other options for this?
Where? How will it affect the road lay out?
Great. I would also like to use bike stands by the post office and we will need additional stands by the Coop as cycling increases on our safer streets. I would use cycle parking stands by the post office and organic shop too.
Good
No opinion.
I do not see the point of cycle parking in residential streets. Cycle parking needs to be close to local amenities such as Earlsdon Street and Spencer Park. The proposed cycle parking is unnecessary and will be under-utilised and the resource can be better spent elsewhere.
At a sensible quantity this sounds good
Ok
STRONGLY DISAGREE. I do not want Berkeley road north to have cycle parking and restrict an already busy road!!! Strongly disagree.
Not in favour - cycle parking on Berkeley road north would limit already difficult to find parking, especially on market days for eg
Good idea
Strongly in favour. Suggest also a hire bike rank in Earlsdon accompany this.
Sounds good.
Do not know enough about cycle usage in Earlsdon to comment
Excessive cycle lanes not needed. Follow Albany road to new funding put in at junction recently.
Is this where cyclists need to park? Would cycle parking not be more useful outside the library, the co-op, the post office and other spaces along the High Street.. outside the doctors surgeries, theatre etc etc... places cyclist might be going... cyclists tend to cycle directly to their destination - cars need car parks which invariably mean s short walk... that isn't cyclist behaviour
No need & will cut down car parking space ?
Are there really that many people wanting to park their bikes? Car parking would be reduced.
Fully support. Would like to see a combination of bike hangars and Sheffield stands. Would like to see safer cycling routes on Albany Road and Earlsdon Ave
That would be very helpful. I normally walk into Earlsdon. It's time consuming but there are not a lot of places to park my bike except for the library which can be exposed when it's raining or overcrowded. I don't like chaining it to fences or lampposts so more bicycle parking space is welcome.
Agree
Good idea
N/A
Will it be used?
Good idea.
No comment
Good idea and please if possible outside my shop on the corner of Earlsdon Street and Arden Street. Down to Earth
Good idea
A small amount of cycle parking would be good but I don't think much is needed and this shouldn't be at the expense of any resident parking spaces.

Comments regarding cycle parking
Cannot really see a need for additional cycle parking outside the high street but I'm not opposed to it so long as it does not significantly restrict car parking and traffic flow. More cycle parking is needed along the full length of the high street - currently you need to lock to street furniture which is unsightly, less secure and can be in the way of pedestrians.
Are cycle parks needed in ALL these locations ? It would obviously be good to have a safe place to lock up your bike near to the High Street but has a survey been carried out to find out how many cyclists are looking for this ? Could space be provided in Warwick Court Car Park (between Earlsdon Street and Warwick Street) ?
How many bikes / cyclists do you see around Earlsdon and where would they be going once parked up? I don't see the volume of cyclists to necessitate allocated bike parking.
I believe more cycle parking near the library and methodist hall would sufficient and maybe by the post office.
Always more cycle parking needed
Yes please. there is nowhere to lock a bike by the post office and Organic Shop.
No, ridiculous.
Nothing against these proposals in principle, however, I do not know whether or not they are needed personally believe there are other proposals which I would prioritize.
Not necessary
Cycle parking is currently in very short supply around these areas so I support this proposal and would support any further expansion of cycle parking!
Agree
Agree
They will not be used unless they are outside the. Cafes
Agree
Bloody cyclists again. Why on earth are you going cycle mad for the very few cyclists in Earlsdon.
Yes please! As a cyclist, I'm disappointed at the loss of cycle parking in other parts of Coventry. More in Earlsdon would be handy for me and good for friends who visit on their bikes when we do things in the area.
There needs to be better cycle parking on Earlsdon St to enable people to park bikes for the shops. These bike parks are not close enough. Why not add bike parks to the one way bits of Moor St?
No views.
Is this really necessary?
Sensible.
It's a start. 👍
Good idea
Yes, more cycle parking increases options for cyclists, increases profile of this form of transport.
It will make things more dangerous, because speeding electric bikes used by Deliveroo, Just Eat couriers etc will have more opportunities to kill people with their terrible, inconsistent and unregulated cycling.
Good
No opinion
Not needed
I think this is a good idea.
Excellent idea, this should be rolled out as soon as possible and extended to other coventry neighbourhoods, such as Stoke.
Great bike parking currently is a challenge
No
Mmmm!!! At their own risk!!
Why? Bike theft is rife in Earlsdon, who is mad enough to leave their bikes on the street for extended lengths of time? Not safe!
Won't get used
Never see bikes looking to park in any of those locations
No thanks

Comments regarding cycle parking
Yes please.
Not enough cyclists to warrant these measures.
Too many roads. Is there enough cycle demand for all of these?
Yes
Who will use these and it will cut down residents parking spaces which are at a premium on these roads. People who have bikes in Earlsdon keep them on their property and residents walk into Earlsdon and don't use bikes. Outside people will drive into Earlsdon.
sounds sensible if there is demand for it
Cycle parking is most necessary on Earlsdon Street, where people are visiting more often and the cycle loops could be used to help prevent vehicles parking on the wrong side of the road, obscuring the view of the road and narrowing it so only one vehicle can fit past. I wouldn't trust leaving my cycle in a public rack near to my house, as I suspect it wouldn't stay there for long without being stolen or damaged.
Would be interested to know where this would be situated? Would it take up existing parking spaces? If so don't support.
good idea
Good idea
no opinion
Too far from shops.
Disagree strongly. This is ridiculous. Many of my friends are cyclists and none of them would leave their cycles anywhere in the street apart from near Earlsdon Shops, for security reasons. Even if they were visiting people in these streets they would leave their bikes in the gardens or houses they were visiting. Keep enough parking spaces for residents' cars instead. No cycle parking should be introduced in any residential street unless a survey of ALL the residents shows that a large number would ACTUALLY USE the cycle parking bays, as opposed to just being "in favour" of them. NB I am certainly not anti-cyclist and would like to see more cycle use and cycle lanes on major routes.
Waste of space. Nobody would leave expensive bicycles lying around on side streets, even if locked.
It seems like a good idea
Fine
Bad
Ok
No, there's not enough room for the cars to park let alone taking spaces for pushbike parking. They can use the electric vehicle bays that doesn't get used that often
OKAY
No need. There are very few cyclists; they are just very vocal.
I think it's a very good idea
... As long as there is a safe way for cyclists to get there and it doesn't further reduce the available pedestrian footpaths which are very narrow already
Parking for cycles? Seriously?!
There should be more cycle parking, but would want to see more detailed proposals and how this might impact on residents affected.
Unless you erect security cameras, nobody in their right mind is going to leave a bicycle unattended!! Whats 20 wrong with you why haven't you thought about this?
Don't believe there is a demand.
Spot on.
Will it be secure ? Earlsdon is notorious for cycle theft
Yes
Agree
Not necessary. Hardly anyone uses a bike, and that is unlikely to change
Parking for cars on these roads is already diabolical. No thanks. How many people in Earlsdon own a bike BTW?

Comments regarding cycle parking
I don't see any evidence to support this idea. It seems to imply that your original survey was dominated by a small minority of cyclists.
Yes
Useful, & environmentally friendly.
No point. Not near enough to the shops to make any difference. Needs to be on Earlsdon St.
Not sure if this is necessary.
What does this mean? Who needs this?
No opinion
That will very much depend on the detailed location and form of cycle parking
these are random places to put cycle parking. cycle parking would be better put where people want to use services like outside methodist church, post office, City Arms,
Only need 1 or 2
Ok
How would this work? Is this secure parking in a box or parking stands? Seems unnecessary unless it's closer to Earlsdon street and the shops.
Disagree. No need. Spend the money elsewhere
In favour
That's okay..... Problem these days with cycle parking is like leaving cash on the streets. I'm very wary when I leave my locked bike unattended.
Perhaps cycle parking on Earlsdon High street might be useful, but not on the other roads in our opinion.
Lovely
Cycle parking will be helpful however better cycle paths / lanes are required, segregated from the main highway where possible
Good idea
I don't think there is a need as really there is not many cyclists really ...but yes a few metal structures near the church may be a good idea
Fully support.
Where - on pavements - will get in the way - on the street - full of cars that have been pushed down there for parking off earlsdon street
Car parking is surely more important
No, at the cost of less parking. Like to see figures that show how many people use these
Welcome it
Pointless
Would encourage more cycling so I'm in favour.
who would use this? for people living on these roads I assume they keep their bikes locked in their houses. I cycle to Earlsdon st regularly (3-4 times pw) and wouldn't use these
Not sure that there's enough space
No need for separate cycle parking on these roads.
If it's needed it's be good to have.
A total waste of time. Such facilities would not be used
Not needed
Agree
Very concerned about Radcliffe Road becoming an arterial road. With increase of traffic flow and implications for safety and parking for residents. Particularly with the growing number of heavy vehicles using the road.
Fine
Not necessary
Will there be a demand?

Comments regarding cycle parking
X
Agree
How many people cycle realistically?
Agree on Warwick street & Earlsdon Avenue South. Why have you not included Earlsdon Street? - this is where it is needed. Your plan still permits cars to park there, but not cycles? Personally, I don't see the requirement for cycle parking mentioned elsewhere
This would not be helpful if it reduces available space for car parking
Sounds good. Can we please ensure cycle parking is covered?
Good idea
Ok
No thanks. They encourage crime and will take up car parking spaces (which thanks to the number of HMOs that have been permitted, are already too scarce) let people store bikes on their own property
Good idea.
Don't see value
In favour. Would like one on Broadway and on the high streeto
Yes, i agree
No issues. Don't really see the need as I'm pretty sure they would be very much underused.
In favour, more cycle parking is needed on Earlsdon High Street as well if practical
Agree
Huge yes please. Especially if covered.
I agree with this proposal
I support this.
No indication of the footprint or how many cycles the area has been designed for
I'm in favour of cycle parking where there is spade - such as outside the library. If the old public toilets aren't going to be reopened they should be demolished or used for other purposes. Berkeley Road North already has a parking problem as there are not enough spaces. Taking any further road space away for cycle parking would be a terrible idea and I'm firmly against.
Do we need that much cycle parking? Will cyclists use it, non of these streets have shops to visit and experience tells me cyclists will want to park in Earlsdon Street and will continue to do so total waste of money and space.
OK
Agree, as long as it does not restrict pedestrian access.
This is a good proposal, except that both Arden Street and Warwick Street are already very congested with parking. Not sure how to accommodate cycle parking. It concerns me that this will also bring more traffic into these roads (cyclists and pedestrians) and cause noise issue.
Hard to understand why these locations were preferred. More cycle racks are needed on Earlsdon Street itself, possibly by the Post Office.
Good idea. Will there be cycles for hire if not why not I don't own a bike but would rent one for short journeys. There should be more bikes available to promote cycling and cut carbon as there are in other cities.
Comical
Maybe some
Good idea to encourage people to cycle.
Why no cycle parking on Earlsdon Street?
Good idea
Yes please!!
I disagree with this. I think the cycle parking will not be used due to bike theft being high. There is already cycle parking in the car park in Warwick street and no bikes are there because they always get stolen. I think it would be a waste of space
This is England - it rains quite a lot - and I'm going to have to tell you that the majority of people need to use their cars. Those who wish to cycle (and it's great if that's your thing) already know where to park their bikes.

Comments regarding cycle parking
We don't need a big, ugly cycle bay - plus this could prove attractive for bike thieves, unless some security is provided.
Approve
this has to be secure parking within individual bike stores
Agree
UNSURE I would like to know how many people have requested more cycle parking.
If research shows they will be used. Most cyclists I know are fearful of leaving bikes in unsupervised parking areas due to theft.
Rarely see a cyclist let alone a need to provide parking for them.
Good idea
More bikes the better. More bike parking the better.
In what are already congested streets adding special cycle only parking is not acceptable. Most cyclists I believe would rather take their bike to somewhere safe often into their own place of residence you will just be wasting parking spaces.
In favour
Excellent
This would be a waste of time and money, people won't use them because their bikes will be targeted to be stolen. It would also take up vital car parking spaces.
Where exactly? How many? Is there really a need for this? Maybe some .
Supportive of this
good idea
No point. If you come to Earlsdon on a bike you generally live here. More cycle parking on The High Street would be better
These don't sound like useful locations though I'm in favour of more cycle parking near the High Street.
I normally don't find it difficult to find space on existing cycling parking. All these locations seem too far away from the main shops to get much use.
Good idea
Fair enough
Is there really significant demand for this?
Really great idea: cycle theft seems to be a big problem in Coventry at the moment, and more sensibel places to park has to be a plus.
good
I think that's good, but maybe not all the roads suggested. I'd like the Beryl bikes to have a station somewhere near the shops.
Support more cycling parking,
To further reduce car parking! Rubbish!
Not relevant to me
Good
I am always in favour of better cycle parking, toast-rack style not butterfly racks please (it is more secure to lock the frame than just the front wheel), and it would be super amazing if they were under shelters.
I am not a cyclist as I would walk into Earlsdon. A few more may help however have the cyclists been consulted?
Agree
Oh yes please. There is never enough cycle parking and it incentives cycling
This wouldn't affect my family but seems like a good measure
No comment
This is a joke right? Where and for why do you want cycle parking in residential streets that have very narrow pavements Where are the hordes of cyclists coming from and what to? You could do with some more by the

Comments regarding cycle parking
shops but not anywhere else and I am a cyclist
Yes please!
Excellent
Will it really be used?
No comment
Support
Not sure enough people cycle.
Good idea
Not sure what this means. I can't picture it. Are we talking yet more assaults on the pavements? No thanks. What is happening to the space that was occupied by the redundant public toilets, attached to the Library next to the roundabout?
Not necessary. When did you last see a bike on Binlay road cycle lane?
As a cyclist in the area. There are few places I would leave my bike so I doubt most of these will be used.
Cycle park best in area with lots of people like outside the library or along pathway in Earlsdon street . In stands for Single bikes.
What's wrong with roads? Cycle paths are a waste of money. They're totally underused and really, if you think about it, unnecessary.
See my comments re cycling on Proposal 3. Provision for cycle parking is an excellent idea if the culture is such that cycles are habitually used by many people and I'm not sure whether this will be the case. For myself, as a once keen cyclist, I am less confident about my safety and that of my bike these days and prefer to walk to Earlsdon by default. It is not uncommon to see provision for cycles to be made at considerable expense and potential inconvenience - and then find that there is little take up. For instance, I have rarely (never?) seen a cyclist using the dedicated section of road that now runs past Canley Crematorium. The problems concerning cycling in Coventry go beyond the scope of the Living Neighbourhood scheme: for instance, the A45 presents quite a major obstacle when cycling from Earlsdon to Warwick University despite the presence of a designated route.
not sure what benefit cycle parking brings - what is the cycle parking for exactly? I doubt residents will leave their bike there permanently - even cars get broken into or stolen pretty frequently, so what business or shop are they going to that warrants lots of new cycle parking. High Street yes but not really the surrounding streets unless there are businesses/retail there. cycle parking also just blocks up pavements and reduces where pedestrians can walk. Or gives permission for cyclists to cycle on the pavement....
Yes very much needed
Good but is there space?
In principle I would support more cycle parking to encourage cycling, but in practice car parking in Earlsdon is already difficult so I would not want to see significant loss of car parking spaces.
Agree in principle but seems excessive, what data supports this recommendation
No feelings either way
Fantastic idea! Get more people on bikes!!!! Great for the earth and people
I don't know enough about this to comment
Not a bad idea but cyclists don't tend to use them and there are no penalties if using main road instead
Not necessary. How many cycles do you think there are going to be to warrant the expense on this proposal?
Good idea
There will be no where soon to park cars or even use cars.
If cycling becomes more popular then more, secure bike parking is sensible.
Cycle parking is a waste of time as cycles left unattended will get stolen, even if locked up
Not needed
Waste of money
Good idea
Do not think it is necessary

Comments regarding cycle parking
No view
No view
no opinion
Comments from our families: "we need cycle parking on Albany Road for the flats too. And can we have cycle stands outside the bike shop"
Good idea in principle, but cycle theft is already a big problem. Security would need to be considered as well.
Yes, much needed & welcomed. Thank you.
No comment
Are there really that many bikes in Earlsdon.
What is the justification for this? Please supply details.
Agree but why not in other roads? and can you add more encouragement to cycle - so help to cross the Earlsdon Roundabout up the hill?
Need more info.
No.
If the cycle parking is on the road it would reduce parking for cars, which is already a struggle
Am not averse to cycle parking
Great - most important though is to put cycle locking/parking near the shops on Earlsdon Streets
I DO NOT SUPPORT
Totally unnecessary and a waste of money. There is cycle parking outside of the library and in Warwick Street car park - both of which are currently under utilised. There appears to be some serious misguided belief about the amount of cyclists visiting Earlsdon that would necessitate this level of increased cycle parking.
Good, much better than cycles locked to railings!
Is this for council cycles or just for private bikes ? Again anything to encourage bike use is favourable.
Good idea, but I only use the cycle parking by the co-op/library, so not sure what the demand is for these
Agreed
Good idea
Great, but what happens about theft? I can't cycle anywhere unless I can take my bike inside where I'm going...
Support. But acknowledge that cycling isn't accessible to everyone and wonder how older people will have access as well.
No
I am unsure why these roads have been specifically identified for this.
Yes. It would be nice. Would it be used? Sadly im not sure.
That's fine, as long as it impeded on footpath usage or the road/car park spaces.
No room
Supportive
Definitely a good idea - even on Earlsdon Street itself.
good
Where is the proven need for this?
This might get in the way of pedestrians.
not sure
Yes
Bike thieves will know where to look
Good
Shaftesbury Avenue does not exist in Earlsdon, it's in Keresley! Some more cycle parking would be good but not at the expense of current car parking spaces for residents
I cannot see these proposals in the factsheets so am unable to comment but I am not opposed to additional cycle parking but I think it would depend on its impact on the pavement space and pedestrians and how many

Comments regarding cycle parking
parking spaces it removed.
Is it really needed - rather have better pavements
Why?
I would welcome more cycle parking in Earlsdon; however, I note that no parking is proposed where it is needed: On Earlsdon Street. I usually do my shopping in Earlsdon by bike, visiting multiple retailers in one tour, but the absence of secure bicycle storage, I have to chain my bicycle to lamp posts and road signs. To be able to do the shopping by bicycle, bicycle stands need to be distributed along the high street. Parking my bike in one of the other streets is much less attractive: I would have to remove all detachable equipment from the bike and carry the loaded pannier bags (with the shopping from previous retailers) across the high street. If the bike parking is outside the shops, I can just lock my bike, leave bags and lights on the bike and just take a shopping bag to the store. As noted earlier, there is car parking all along the high street, why is there no cycle parking? I would also suggest you try and convince the retailers to provide Sheffield stands for their customers in their part of the pavement. Particularly the Post Office and the Organic Shop feel like they should be able to offer this. Unfortunately, I could not find any further details about the proposed bicycle parking. I would like to suggest avoiding overdesigned stands and go for simple Sheffield stands. It would also be desirable if some of the spaces could accommodate cargo bikes.
Can't see any purpose to this on most of those streets
Agree
I would not use it
Cycle parking is needed everywhere around the city.
No point. Not needed
If this is cycle huts that take up parking spaces, then no.
Great idea. It would be good to encourage more cycling in the area rather than cars
Yes it's a good proposal.
Approve
What is cycle parking? How many people will this benefit? I don't see the point! More people will be inconvenienced.
Not necessary and unsightly street furniture which is not going to be utilised greatly. Especially with bicycle crime on the increase and the lack of a police force able to investigate current levels of crime within the Earlsdon area. As I know first hand having been a victim of crime in Earlsdon. Case closed, here is your crime reference number and that is that.
No opinion
Any cycle parking that I have seen, unless enclosed 'locked boxes', usually results in the cycle being stolen. I would not use 'cycle parking'. Get the crime rate down!
No
Yes!
I like your optimism regarding the number of cycle users, and certainly there needs to be some designated cycle parking. However from viewing cycle usage in other areas of the city this seems like a very big sledge hammer to crack a very small nut.
More cycle parking is welcome, but many of these are residential streets not particularly close to shops/eateries., so I don't think these are needed or wanted.
What evidence is there that there is sufficient demand for this? Additional cycle usage is commendable but the evidence from elsewhere in the city is that provision for cyclists is hugely underused.
This would be good as there is a lack of cycle parking in Earlsdon as a whole.
Agree
good
Don't see many that many people on bikes only Just Eat riders whizzing through Earlsdon dangerously
No.
It would be better to have more cycle parking on Earlsdon Street.
Good proposal

Comments regarding cycle parking
Why? This isn't going to encourage people to cycle.
Fine in principle although care should be taken not to limit residents parking.
I don't disagree with this in principle, but the devil would be in the detail. The full impact of any such parking would need to be assessed and consulted on.
Use of cycles makes this hardly useful
More cycle parking would be an improvement, as long as it does not disrupt pedestrian walkways.
I do not oppose the introduction of cycle parking but do not see any evidence that it is needed and therefore do not see that it should be a priority for investment at this time. Any proposals to introduce cycle parking would require separate detailed consultation to cover security, lighting and the mitigations of the impact for any households near the proposed cycle parking.
I support this proposal
In favour
Yes
I do not see where there is a need for parking cycles there and will only lead to an increase in bike thefts if left tethered to rails on these quieter roads.
Where? No need and would narrow the pavements
Ok
Totally unnecessary. There are unused ones already outside the library - in a much safer location!
Supportive
I think it best to leave responding to these proposals to those who live on these streets.
Wouldn't be used as not near Earlsdon street , pavements too narrow anyway. Add more to the existing ones by the library, some by the Methodist church , plenty of room .
Do not agree - parking is at premium, cycle parking is a complete waste of space. If this goes ahead make the cyclists pay the true cost of using this amenity that reflects the loss of parking for cars
I think this question is best answered by those who live on those streets and will therefore be most directly affected.
Agree
Unconvinced that the plan has seriously considered ways to increased cycling within (or to) Earlsdon, compared to the sheets of carefully mapped traffic management. I have nothing against cycle parks IF they have been thought about carefully about location, access to them on safe routes, are they secure, guarded by CCTV, not blocking pedestrians etc.

Question 13

What do you think about this proposal:

Single vehicle 24-hour taxi rank near to the Co-op. A daytime (7am to 7pm) feeder rank on Moor Street (replacing the double yellow lines), outside these times anyone can park there. Overnight feeder rank (10pm to 7am) on Earlsdon Street near Moor Street.

Comments regarding a taxi rank
No!
Regardless of a rank the taxis park where they like.
Good idea! The taxi drivers don't drive very well and take up much of the road at the weekend. Would be better if they were on moor street.
Not great for those of us that want to use the high street for shopping but great for anyone who wants to have a drink I guess
Excellent plan
No view either way
Great
The current taxi arrangements are fine, apart from when they sit waiting for fares with their engines running. A new byelaw banning being stationary with an engine running would cut pollution
Do we need 7-7 taxi parking most need is from 18.00 onwards
Fine
If that makes the taxis less of an obstacle then great!
Yes, as long as taxis are kept well away from other areas and are prevented from parking on the pavements
Great
Needed. Taxis take up the whole high street at weekends.
Too complicated and will be ignored. We need a taxi rank monitor at busy times. They currently park along the pavement and always will unless made not to.
Not sure
People live right by the co-op in flats above the shops on both sides of Earlsdon Street and in Moor Street. Allowing taxis 24 hours will increase the noise, which is already considerable. They leave their engines running at all times.
Think the residents of Moor St need to answer that one!
Hmm I don't know. I hate the stinking diesel taxis that queue all along the high street and chug all Friday and Saturday night. They will definitely find another place if you only give them one slot!
seems sensible
Yes.
Great idea
Ok if the taxis turn there engines off
Unnecessary. Uber is the main taxi in the area and unless this is done with uber and only for black cabs, makes no sense
I agree with this. As long as the taxis do not park or drive on the pavements.
Taxis very often leave their engines running. Is it possible for the council to address this? How will residents in Moor St feel about this?
Taxis will park where ever they like if there is no enforcement. They will still park on the path up the curb if there is no enforcement
Supportive
In favour. I would also like a strict No Taxi Dropoff zone opposite the CoOp as well as this often causes congestion at the roundabout.
Yes

Comments regarding a taxi rank
Nothing to add
Ok
Good idea.
Ok
Ok
Not necessarily. Most people use Uber now
👍
not sure about this. taxi rank only needed Friday/saturday nights between 6pm-11pm. the taxi rank would be facing the wrong direction. one way system would work better entry onto arden then onto warwick st then moor st
Which Moor St? Big or Little Moor?
I hope all taxis will electric soon.
Good
No opinion.
Good idea
Support
No chaos
Ok
NOT in agreement.
no opinion
Some better organisation of the taxis would be very good.
Yes provided that there is effective monitoring and enforcement of limits - currently, taxis clog Earlsdon Street, including pavements, in the evening.
Pedestrianise the whole area.
Does Earlsdon need an overnight taxi rank.
Not good for Moor Street residents. Taxis largely ignore rank system and park on curbs regardless.
Will there be a stipulation that engines shouldn't be idling? Sometimes, the air is unbreathable when there are several taxis sat idling...
Bad idea to put taxis in Moor St it would cause traffic problems
Not good for residents on Moor Street.
Taxi driver behaviour is poor on Earlsdon Street in the evenings. Suspect ranking arrangement would not be respected. If ranks are best response to problem they should be full time not part time to reduce confusion
Taxis exclusively? I don't know what you mean by this. Due to lack of overnight bus services, I do. Sometimes, people need them, even if they cost more.
Layout should encourage electric cabs vs diesels or discourage idling engines - pollution is very high in this area.
Ideally for electric vehicles only with charging points, otherwise potential problems with diesel emissions
A taxi rank somewhere would be good as taxis just park on any kerb currently.
Agree
Ok they need somewhere to go so fair enough.
Agree
Good idea
Good idea
Yes as long as taxis don't sit with their engines on.
In favour but the taxi drivers may not be.
Again, a good idea if there is space! How does this fit in with the proposals for Blue Badge spaces and more pedestrian crossings ?
Absolute no to a feeder rank on Moor St.

Comments regarding a taxi rank
Yes maybe but get them to turn the engine off when waiting. Earlsdon st has far too many taxis in the evenings mounting pavements with the engines running. There are residents above the shops I am sure who dread Friday and Saturday nights.
Perfect
Stop taking away parking for shoppers and using it for taxis. In the evenings at weekends it's nearly impossible to turn in or out or moor st due to taxis stopping and parking up to the junction. If you allow taxis to park up to the junction it forces traffic turning out of moor st into oncoming traffic, it's so dangerous.
Anything that improves the current arrangement of how taxis queue along the high street would be an improvement.
Should not be encouraging taxis. They disturb people living on the high street
With a view to eventually pedestrianising Earlsdon Street, I think we should start looking for alternative accessible locations for these taxi ranks, if indeed they are necessary to preserve at all, but I'm familiar with their level of usage, to be honest.
Will this free up the area and make the coming and going if taxis more manageable or move the issue around the corner?
Taxis will ignore this and park on the pavement as they do now
Agree
Nightmare. It will back to the chaos pre pandemic...taxis everywherejust for MILLSY'S and oak. People call Uber now so no need.
If you have a taxi rank on Moor Street, you should also have bike parking on Moor St too
Not sure what this involves or how can be accommodated along side other proposals . You need to provide visuals and examples .
Agree
I get it although I wonder how for Moor Street residents will feel about listening to those running diesel engines? Maybe less of an issue though as more taxis switch to electric?
Anything to control the Friday/Saturday mayhem.
Don't ever take taxi, not sure this is needed, taxis will always pick up wherever they can?
No taxi ranks should be allowed. People should call them if they want them. Currently, taxis park all over the place, with total disregard for pedestrians and other road users, so why would they care about any new ranks?
Good
As long as parking is addressed.
Engines running all night not acceptable
No comment
Excellent idea, this should be rolled out as soon as possible and extended to other coventry neighbourhoods, such as Stoke.
Maybe
Drivers seem to ignore the double yellow lines anyway. The roads are too narrow for the amount of parking that goes on. There are so many lazy drivers.
Again up the people affected
Heard of Uber - no Cov Council has not all come from Dudley - do not need
Taxi ranks are outdated. People should be encouraged to order Ubers on demand. We don't need taxis sitting waiting for custom. If they have to sit and wait somewhere it should be at the park and ride in the memorial park and they can then be called to come to the high street as needed. Moor St is not big enough for a taxi rank and since it is being made one way they'd all be facing the wrong way? Also, if we are having taxis, why are they still diesel? They should all be hybrid or electric by now.
Do not think 24hr taxi rank is required
Do we really need 24 hour taxi ranks clogging up the main trading area of Earlsdon?
Yes
Yes I agree with this.
sounds sensible
No strong feelings either way, as I rairly use taxis and walk to the Co-op. I realise that people from outside the

Comments regarding a taxi rank
area do when visiting the pubs and restaurants though.
no opinion
Taxi engine running would be polluting in these areas
no opinion
No opinion,
Possibly.
I do not support this proposal
Fine but it must be one taxi only and this must be enforced, not taxis all over the place like now, doing u-turns everywhere
Ok
Terrible idea. No preference should be given to taxis.
No as that will take up parking spaces for people visiting the high street
OKAY
Sounds complicated.
No just enforce current parking regs and there will be space
No comment
No! You're just bringing more traffic into the area. It doesn't affect me, but I'm sure the residents of the said roads don't want to hear taxis ticking over outside their house!
Very bad idea. Why give taxis more right to park than local residents or persons visiting area by car.
I'm not sure I entirely understand, but some taxi management is a brill idea.
Historically residents who live near there have been subjected to noise particularly at weekends
Fine
Agree
Ok
Good idea
I feel that the existing arrangements are perfectly OK assuming taxi operators comply. We need adequate taxi facilities to support the High Street economy.
No. Taxis already blocking Earlsdon St and parking on pavements.
I do not like the taxis on Earlsdon Street . I do not want feeder taxis parking on Moor Street . The vehicles are sat with the engines idling waiting for fares . Maybe a weekend taxi rank proposal with a condition that engines are not left running .
If this stops the current practice of parking up on the left, on the path, by drivers and taxi drivers next to the City Arms across from the Co-Op I am all for that, as it blocks traffic from flowing up Earlsdon High Street
No opinion
Based on the number of Taxis present on Friday night you cannot provides sufficient parking for a feeder rank without taking spaces from Infront of residents homes. It is a pain on certain nights but overall it might be better for taxis to carry on parking illegally on Earlsdon St
no comment
No
If it means only one taxi can park then great but that is not going to happen. Because of the pubs and restaurants on Earlsdon street there are too many taxis already ignoring existing traffic/ parking laws.
Disagree if there is no proven issue to solve. Agree if there is a proven issue to fresolve
In favour
That would hopefully improve the current chaos that ensues when taxis try to pick people up from Earlsdon Street on a night out.
Overly complex in terms of locations and times, likely to confuse road users
Totally complicated and confusing. Most people book a taxi from their phones nowadays!!!!
Terrible idea.
I detest the taxis ranks ..they are so rude and only facilitate alcoholism in the area and fume and noise pollution

Comments regarding a taxi rank
.doesn't fit in with the areas identit of being nice ...
Against. Unless preference is given to newer EV-type taxis.
Taxi's have to be moved off the pavements. I thought you want to put car parking on Moor street and a one way system? Congestion?
Taxo drivers will ignore this as they do restrictions now
Taxis causes the road to become congested so if it can be designed to reduce this then i welcome it
Moor Street too narrow
No strong opinion either way with this proposal.
Good
No strong views either way.
Sounds fine.
Probably very wise
Agree
Fine
Is this needed?
How will this affect residents at night?
Seems to work ok as it is
Agree on moving taxi rank away from Earlsdon Street. But if this means even less short-stay parking at the Co-op, that could be an issue. And considering parking will already be reduced by the proposed zebra crossing, this needs more careful consideration.
Ok
OK
Sounds good
No opinion
Ok
Just make sure they have engines off more importantly
I don't really have an opinion on this proposal, my main concern is that it improves life for people who live on Earlsdon Street.
Not sure if this reduce the taxi situation at weekends
No onion on
Yes, that's fine
No issues
No opinion
Agree
Reducing the number of idling taxis around Earlsdon Street would be a better outcome from this project. This proposal would be more likely to cause an increase.
No objections.
Taking the taxis off Earlsdon High street is a good , however no indication as to the footprint /no of taxis that will be allowed on Moor Street and what inconvenience (resident parking and noise) this will have on the neighbourhood overnight.
* Having feeder taxi ranks on Moor Street will increase traffic along Warwick Street and Providence Street, particularly at night, increasing disturbance, noise for residents * Earlsdon High Street will seemingly be open for Cycles and Taxi's only!
Not sure, we need car parking for Earlsdon Street shops/cafes.... This seems to minimise the space used on Earlsdon St, so may be ok.
What happens between 7pm and 10pm ? Plus different arrangements at day / night seems like a recipe for confusion.
No Opinion
Which side of Moor Street will the feeder rank be installed? The concern would be the idling cars on the streets

Comments regarding a taxi rank
and cause more air pollution.
What evidence is there that this many taxi spaces are needed .? I mainly user Ubers as do my neighbours. The priority should be shopper's parking and residents parking.
No
No taxi ranks at anytime!! Especially on Earlsdon street which always blocks and narrows the road.
Not keen on this unless for electric taxis. They are polluting the air
Well they park n anyway
Yes please.
Agree but make allocated parking for them and not too big otherwise it would cause too much traffic
It seems a sensible solution for containing the taxis that can be a nuisance to residence.
Approve
no strong feelings
Agree. Taxis need organising
VERY UNDECIDED All proposals overlap. There is not room to provide parking for residents, shoppers, traders and taxis. Why should excess taxis from Coventry station be parked in Earlsdon.
Suggest someone visits Earlsdon Street around 11pm on weekends to see the real issue around taxis.
Better if this means fewer taxis going up the street on Earlsdon St. Not sure how well it will work on Moor Steet though as will be a lot of taxis turning
No Parking outside the co-op will shunt parking onto the lower part of Poplar which is already shared with delivery lorries. Currently their are Busses parking and taxis sharing the parking area which does need improvement so overall would be an improvement.
Is it necessary to have both a taxi rank and feeder rank? What is the usage of taxis? If there are no spots for taxis in the rank they should go elsewhere.
Taxi parking, especially on pavements, slows traffic flow and causes hindrance to pedestrians. Remove taxi parking to Albany road.
Excellent
Not needed.
No comment
Fine
Will cause mor congestion on Moor Street
There are always too many taxis!
No opinion
Good idea
Taxi rank not needed during the day. Normal parking much more preferable
I support this proposal
I have noticed that taxis often ignore the law on engine idling and I would be concerned about this, so if this is going ot happen please try to put up some signs instructing taxis to switch off their engines while waiting (signs would be great throughout Earlsdon and would surely help with air quality).
Would this reduce the number of taxis waiting with engines running?
dont know
I don't really have an opinion on this.
Absolutely opposed to a feeder rank on moor street. Yellow lines are enough for only two vehicles.
Taxi rank only needed during the evenings
Ok
Fine, this does not seem to me to be controversial in any way.
Would a single vehicle 24 hour taxi rank mean that Ubers and Taxi's could use that as a pick up spot? Do we need a feeder taxi rank in the daytime? Taxis are only in demand at night.
Personally I think the taxi rank should be removed from Earlsdon street completely. Move it to the Memorial

Comments regarding a taxi rank
Park
Please do it
This would be very good for less able bodied members of the community heading to that end of Earlsdon
No comment
Something needs to be done about taxis Ubers and private cars behaving irresponsibly but this will not meet the criteria The poor residents on Moor Street and Earlsdon Street will have non stop traffic with engines running causing environmental pollution of various kinds
Who cares?
moor st taxi rank ok. Need to reduce congestion at night and safer places to get taxi but this is not the answer. Awful idea reducing parking
Daytime taxi tanks unnecessary and will remove limited parking
Support
Agree. I would like to see the taxis gone from outside my house on the yellow lines on moorstreet and earlsdon street corner on evening as they leave their engines running and encourages noisy people at night.
No strong feelings
Sounds reasonable but would probably need cameras in place to record breaches/trigger fines, in order to manage the pretty inevitably selfish behaviour of taxi drivers, if left to their own devices.
Okk
Nope. Hate this. Leave it as is and use a side street to park the Taxis
Taxi rank only needed in evening. Daytime needed for people shopping in Earlsdon. The daytime taxi rank would be detrimental to the business in Earlsdon
Not fussed
A good idea to improve provision for taxis as car use is clearly favoured where supermarket shopping is concerned.
taxis are a real issue at night time often mounting the kerb, blocking junctions, suddenly making manoeuvres without signalling
Yep fine
This does not affect me and I do not know if these changes are needed.
No comment
This needs to be planned carefully to avoid taxis turning round in the street and idling near residential homes.
In favour
Good idea. Safer for people to get home and would boost revenue for earlsdon high st
Good idea
my question here is enforcement. How will you do it! currently taxis blatantly ignore ALL parking restrictions
I think this will have a negative impact, specially removing the double yellow lines
Again, this will just result in worsening the parking in Earlsdon .
Prefer to keep this as public parking
I think this will make it even more busy.
No opinion.
more restrictions for people wishing to visit the high street by car. Dont need a taxi rank. most people use Uber now
No
Excellent
Ok
Do not agree
Agree
See my comments on parking outside the coop
no opinion

Comments regarding a taxi rank
Our families did not comment on this.
Idling Taxis are not very environmentally friendly.
Yes, but can anything be done about taxi engines running all the time- polluting & noisy.
good idea
Taxis are a constant problem especially at weekends. Will these proposals for an overnight feeder rank mean that spaces needed by residents will be occupied.
Taxis on Earlsdon Street are a problem especially evenings at weekends. Probably a taxi rank outside the Co-op is the best solution (although the taxi operators are unlikely to take much notice of any rules) but to put a feeder line on Moor Street and remove the yellow lines is a very bad idea (See 3 above)
Parking restrictions are all various - resident schemes and electric parking spaces and now these restrictions on times. Could all parking schemes be set as the same time?
No - do not need taxis taking up space.
No.
Not sure about this and what impact it would have
Not if this is going to increase the number of taxis as they are likely to drive up Broadway to get on to Warwick Road if Spencer Road access is closed from Albany Road.
Great
Whilst i tend to agree there is an issue over the amount of taxis and safe parking of them this tends to be night time but i have concerns for the residents of Moor Street near Earlsdon Ereet as moving a taxi rank there would be noisy and disruptive.
Not sure.
Not sure on this difference but for sure taxis can be an issue around Millsys but they are well used and needed. How would this improve it Im not sure as taxis seem to turn and wait in moor st already ?
no comment. What's more important is to stop taxis making dangerous u-turns in the Arden Street junction
Agreed
Good
Given that taxis just pile up all over the place and nothing is done about it, I'm not sure how this plan would work.
No real opinion on this.
Won't change anything as you can't control them
I support this.
Disagree taxi rank should not be on this road move to Earlsdon avenue
As long as it doesn't effect residents or there's a plan in place for increased parking elsewhere.
Not sure.
Okay
As long as there is no increase in noise levels and disruption in this area
I don't think taxi rank is need in the area
Yes
Good
Changing the position of the rank at different times of day didn't work last time you tried it in Earlsdon street so why would this work now?
I am not necessarily opposed to these proposals but would like to see taxis stopped from parking on the pavements and from conducting U turns on Earlsdon Street impacting other traffic.
I am against moving the taxi rank to Moor Street. I don't think the taxis will use the feeder rank on Moor Street as they compete with Uber drivers they will continue to park on the curb as more likely to get business that being in a side street. They would also have to drive the loop round Providence Street and then Berkeley Road South. This would massively increase the traffic past our houses, especially at night, making the area less livable. At the moment taxis drive up and down Earlsdon Street, where less people live, so the noise is less of an issue.
Will this make parking more difficult for residents?

Comments regarding a taxi rank
The intended location of the taxi rank on Earlsdon Street is at the busiest and narrowest section of pavement outside Albany Club. Pedestrians would really benefit from more space in this location. Maybe another location could be found for the taxi rank. I would also like to raise the issue of deliveries to the City Arms Public House. Currently they are done by HGV mounting the footpath and unloading from there. This is causing damage to the footway outside the public house and a more sustainable solution should be sought for deliveries to the pub.
Bad idea. Would create more parking issues
Not a good idea.
Disagree
Not needed
Not needed.
No. Takes up a valuable day time parking spaces for street trade that ar beneficial to support street trade. Black cab taxi noise has always been a problem....think more about planning permission and licensing as a council, to look at root causes of excessive black cab traffic, rather than slightly moving the problem around by a few metres and making things worse for short visit shoppers.
Agree to this plan. Would also be good to have some way to stop taxis going up on the pavements so maybe an elevated brick lip along sections of the road to minimise taxis queuing along the high street
Yes it's a good proposal.
Please put up signs instructing taxi drivers to turn off engines whilst stationary and not to execute U-turns
Taxi drivers and parking seem to be law unto themselves. May be beneficial if rigorously enforced. Which part of Moor Street?
I do not support this proposal. We already have taxi rank. Taxi drivers often abuse this rank by parking with engines running at all hours and outside residents homes. This proposal does not improve the situation. It will increase traffic on Moor Street and make residential living worse for those residents, noise and pollution.
Nice idea but it will need to be heavily enforced. What about non black cabs? Will there be a designated waiting area for people using ubers/bolts etc
I pity the residents in Moor Street.
No
Ambivalent. Unsure about the overnight rank on Earlsdon street
You mean make what taxi drivers already do constantly now - legal?? How many cars will this feeder rank service. Does this apply to Uber drivers too, who blatantly ignore any road/parking/turning rules?
No opinion.
Presumably "near to the Co-op" means where other drivers are now able to park, thus reducing parking spaces. Improved facilities for taxis are to be welcomed, but currently taxi drivers, particularly Uber drivers, abuse the Highway Code on a regular basis.
It is difficult to see how this will be implemented and work in reality. it is unlikely taxis will work with this proposal unless it is manned.
I think ok
whatever
Not necessary people use uber
No.
Not sure why. Taxi use is dwindling. The amount of Uber vehicles trawling Earlsdon at all hours aren't subject to the same restrictions anyway.
Not necessary - most people use Ubers
I do not have a strong view on this.
No. Only encourages inordinate number of taxis on Earlsdon Street.
Unsure about changes.
I support proposals that limit the number of taxis waiting on Earlsdon Street before 10pm.

Comments regarding a taxi rank
I support this proposal. It will allow taxi ranking to be better regulated. I would not want taxis to be idling in this area as it would significantly impact air quality so I hope this could be regulated.
No view
Yes
This is irrelevant unless it is policed in a meaningful way. Both black cabs and ubers ignore the existing restrictions and using Moor Street will only make things worse for the residents of that road in the evenings especially
Huh! Will it be enforced?
Stop cars and taxis parking at bottom of moor street and near the corner of earlsdon Street and moor street can't see when approaching earlsdon street lots of accidents waiting to happen
No
Is this really making Moor Street more livable to the residents on that street? Terrible idea.
Supportive - but it needs to be policed - taxi drivers will not respect it unless enforced
I think it best to leave responding to these proposals to those who live on these streets
7pm too late , should be 5 pm then space could be used for people wanting to park to use the pubs/ restaurants . No to the feeder rank , this should be for the general public as parking is so difficult , supposed extra parking in Warwick street won't make much difference as so many dropped curbs . Most people don't need a taxi !
Do not agree - nothing wrong with the existing arrangements
I think this question is best answered by those who live on those streets and will therefore be most directly affected.
Agree
The proposal for the zebra crossing by Co-op claimed that more parking would be available nearby (eg Moor St?) as a result of one way - but is the taxi feeder rank taking up some of this parking?

Question 14

What do you think about this proposal:

Improving the area by the library and Earlsdon Primary School with planting and seating, creating a shared community space.

Comments regarding the area by the school and the library
Positive
Not sure people would want to sit by a busy road.
Excellent
Excellent plan
Good
Great
Agree
Who wants to sit by a polluted noisy junction. This is something else that will not be maintained and will become a mess. After having wasted a lot of money.
Lovely
Good idea
Good
Lovely.
Sounds ok, but less important than the road safety proposals
Great
Lovely.
Sounds wonderful
Good idea. More trees for shade/cooling and some planters for visuals.
Yes great idea
Good idea
Yes
Yes sounds wonderful
Definitely agree
yes would be lovely - planters need maintaining and sadly the council is underfunded so should asked the local community or businesses to maintain
Yes. But the success or failure of this depends on how much traffic is calmed around the roundabout. If the roundabout traffic isn't calmed, I won't want to sit there. Also, if you plant, plant trees that will give shade. Potted flowers or shrubs won't make me want to use that space.
Yes sounds great
Lovely
Ok
Agree
I agree with this
Good idea
Good idea
Supportive- Earlsdon lacks any communal space and any improvement here will go a long way.
Nice
In favour
Yes

Comments regarding the area by the school and the library
Would be good to see
Great
Good idea.
This is an excellent idea and should have been done years ago.
Good
Good idea
Good idea
There is already seating here??
A nice idea if the budget is there to do it.
maybe - very busy at school pick up times so need to be careful on space and what is there. maybe some play equipment? pop up park?
Nice idea. I assume it would compliment the random tree that has been recently planted in the middle of the pavement there.
This will make a much nicer area, more green space will be very welcome.
Good
Yes
Good idea. I would also like to see a similar proposal for the full length of Earlsdon Street but this would require its closure to through traffic.
It's a busy corner but with a good design would be well used
Go to Spencer Park
Yes please
Ok
Good idea
In agreement.
strongly in favour
Sounds good.
Neutral - I would rather effort were focused on Earlsdon Street as this area isn't ever going to be a place to hang out being as it is right by a roundabout!
Like it
Area needs improving.
Good proposal.
Great
Okay but who is paying for it, council tax is already high.
Ok.
Fully support
I support it, as it makes it more accessible to people with small children or mobility issues.
Agree
Good idea
N/A
Agree
Of course. Very good idea.
Agree as long as maintenance is factored in.
Definitely
Good idea
In theory, this would be nice but I repeat my answer to question 10:

Comments regarding the area by the school and the library
I'm not sure how this would happen. This bit of road is already really narrow meaning that cars and buses have to stop if a vehicle is coming the other way, leading to traffic jams which go from the roundabout up to the junction with Newcombe Rd and beyond. Making the path wider would surely mean narrowing the road further and causing even more traffic problems and therefore air pollution issues around the school which is not ideal?
Lovely idea.
Sounds nice !
Could work.
Good idea but I don't know how practical it is. Perhaps knock down the run down and disused toilets to create more space for bike parking seating. Move the bus stop maybe towards the school and completely stop cars stopping outside the school. There's some think there above the law but would be the first to complain if there little angel was run over. I do like it when they have the music/ bands outside the methodist hall. That's quite a big area and could be useful for seating planters as such. Are you going to tell the potato man to do one? The thing about seating at night thou it does attract the youth in the evenings, who in turn cannot walk 2 feet to the bin to put there big mac box's in the bin. Have you seen the pavilion area in Spencer park first thing? Bottles and burger king box's, you name it. Perhaps more of a campaign to encourage young ones to bin it or take it home?
More planting. Seating and give the school a safer more community feel
Ok
Great idea. Also somewhere for WM cycle hire bikes please.
Will just get trashed
This would improve the area identified.
Not necessary
This would be lovely and has my full support.
Agree
Agree
Provided there is maintenance, a good idea
Not bothered either way
What? Waste of time and money. Who wants to sit and breathe in car fumes and bus fumes?
This sounds lovely.
I support this
Unless the congestion and air pollution is reduced these measures shouldn't go ahead - sounds nice but the air quality at busy times is terrible around this area .
Agree
Sounds nice.
Meh
Good idea
Yes nice idea, volunteers have put a lot into local library so nice idea.
What's the point. Waste of money and will attract damage and graffiti.
Sounds good
Good
Agree
Waste of money. There is a huge grassed area at Hearsall common that can be used
I think this is a good idea.
Excellent idea, this should be rolled out as soon as possible and extended to other coventry neighbourhoods, such as Stoke.
That sounds good more opportunities for people to have a natter, helps with loneliness.
We have two lovely parks near by that are much safer for community events spend the money on Spencer pstk

Comments regarding the area by the school and the library
Try picking litter and dog waste up first then making pavements flat - good luck
No thanks - have you seen the local parks? Why would we want to sit here?!
Sounds good.
Okay
Yes, why not
Yes
Yes I agree with this.
Good idea
....and sit and stare at the traffic jams...
good idea
Sounds nice
no opinion
Not really worth the expense. Who would want to sit on a bench next to a busy road inhaling traffic fumes? Perhaps useful for parents waiting to collect children from school but doubt there would be much use, especially in our climate. Even in the beautiful environment of Memorial Park most benches are not used most of the time so why think that a bench here would be used?
Who would want to sit by a busy roundabout inhaling exhaust fumes? New plants by all means, but benches would just attract drinkers after pubs' closing times.
It seems like a good idea.
Fine
Indifferent
Yes good idea.
Seems good as long as it doesn't congest the paths for pedestrians
Great.
Nice
Excellent and urgently needed!
I support this proposal but am concerned that other measures will increase traffic to this area thus increase pollution levels at the roadside where the seating is planned
yes thats fine
No comment
OK
Very nice idea. Would make the area look very pretty.
Why would you want to sit next to a busy road. Waste of money.
Sounds good
I like the way the Library looks now , this could affect access for parents / children walking to school
Definitely
Agree
Ok
Good idea but who will maintain it?
I don' t have a problem with this idea as long as it is policed properly. Evidence from other parts of the City would suggest that they quickly become areas for unsocial gatherings unless adequate policing is in place.
Sounds good
Lovely idea
OK but not really necessary.
Yes, yes, yes.
Personally I wouldn't want to sit next to the main road .

Comments regarding the area by the school and the library
Yes, please do this.
No opinion
no comment
Lovely
Yes good idea
This will benefit the parents and children at the school, will improve the look of the area,
That space is already being used effectively by the library. Addind some seating would be a cheap and worthwhile addition. Nothing more fancy is needed
In favour
If you were to manage to make it a pleasant space, why not
This sounds amazing!
Very welcome - see also answer to q14
Waste of money
Good idea although this is already a very busy space
Good idea
Fully support. Furthermore, please increase enforcement for school gates parking during busy times.
Good idea to make it nicer, but unless streets look cleaner and traffic reduced, who will want to sit out there?
Good
I agree
Could be good or bad dependent on what type of people it would attract considering its near the bars, pub and near an area where drugs are taken
Do not see the need its ok as it is
Strongly in favour.
agree
Good
Strongly support this proposal.
Good idea! The area in question is used heavily at drop off / pick up time. Some planters, seating and nicer upkeep near the alley would be visually appealing and would see quite considrable use.
Planting sounds good if it is maintained but seating is not going to be used. Who sits to watch traffic at a crossroads?
Yes
Good for day time use, but would it lead to an evening/nighttime focus for undesirable behavior?
Fine
Yes. Great idea
Sounds nice
Agree
Won't be really pleasant with increased traffic on earlsdon av north due to other proposed road closures or one ways.
OK
This is a good proposal
Sound nice
I really like it
Yes
Ok
I am opposed to this as I am concerned that it will encroach on a vital traffic route. This area needs to be prioritised for transport and is net suitable for seating.
Yes why not

Comments regarding the area by the school and the library
Great idea.
Great idea
Very much in favour
Yes, agreed
Good idea for parents waiting to pick up children from school
No issues. Do something with the disused public toilets too.
Yes please, this would improve the area
Agree
Yes. This would be lovely.
I agree with this proposal
No objections.
A good proposal but has noise and traffic pollution been considered in the siting of these seating areas and community spaces.
* Laudable but we don't need a Liveable Neighbourhood for this to happen
This sounds a good idea. Please add a cycle park.
Please don't clutter the space too much. Visit at school pick up time and see how busy it is. The existing seating is fine a few more planters would be ok and look nice.
Not sure there's enough room to do anything significant
This would be very welcome.
Agree, as long as seating cannot be used for sleeping
Not sure if people will make use of these seating areas as this is by the busy road. If introducing the seating space, shouldn't it be on the high street?
Good idea. I am a runner and would like to see better quality pavements. As a relative newcomer to Earlsdon I find pavements of poor quality with too many overhanging trees and bushes. Please tackle this.
Yes
Agree
Good idea
Fully approve
Fantastic idea. There are many lonely people in our community who would really benefit from a community space, especially one linked to green space and reading. Great to bring the community together and allow young people to meet with the wider community in a safe space. This area needs to be improved as it is unwelcoming and a waste of land currently. The proposal would also encourage greater use of the fantastic community library. This could be a central hub in our community.
Agree
Good
That would be lovely.
Agree
Definitely NOT. I really mean this. Earlsdon already looks a mess and we don't need junk everywhere. If you want to sit down, sit in a coffee shop, pub or in the library. Why in the street? Plus, it's England, as I said before, and it's often raining. These benches will just attract graffiti.
Any planting and greenery is welcomed
Approve
strongly agree
Agree
DISAGREE More planters and seating a WASTE OF MONEY. Earlsdon Primary school have a better garden and window boxes that what the council provide.

Comments regarding the area by the school and the library
Why don't the council REPAIR ALL THE PAVEMENTS IN EARLSDON instead of wasting money on these ludicrous proposals. They are a trip hazard.
Agree - the library is a community hub and one of the few places with space for seating etc
Would seem a good idea if contingency plans are in place to maintain the area long term. Cleaning Earlsdon Street itself would be a good start.
Sure
This area deserves any love and attention it can reasonably achieve in consultation with the school and library. It already is a community space of sorts. Sorting the toilet block would be welcome as part of it but i imagine this would suck in much of the available funding.
Yes Please
Acceptable but do people want to sit on a bench next to a busy road. Bench's in Earlsdon street are good but others may be underused.
In favour
Excellent It would make such a difference to the area and bring positive vibes
Good idea, but this would take up pathways.
Waste of time and money. Who wants to sit by a busy road and socialise?
Great
Not really required
Fine
Not enough space to do this, unnecessary expense
Sounds nice
Good idea
Unnecessary
I support this proposal
Sounds good.
This is a very cheerful idea and it will improve the neighbourhood and our air quality.
This is adjacent to a busy part of the road and I would be concerned of the potential for accidents if this was not set out and planned extremely carefully
Who would want to sit here?
good
So long as benches are vagrant proof and there are more litter bins please.
Support this.
Will go unused. Put it outside the church
No. Its already difficult for pedestrians using the path at certain times if the day without this
Good
This area is perfectly pleasant already, therefore I think resources would be put to better use implementing the other proposals in the scheme.
How are you going to manage this without narrowing the road and causing issues for cyclists?
Good one
Not at All interested who are these people who want to sit in a busy (probably polluted) area? can someone make a list so the people on it can maintain the planters and the seating
Please
Seating is really needed. Anyone who has difficulty standing or walking for long only really has the perch seats at the bus stop to use to rest. This will improve accessibility
Waste of public money. The community would not benefit. It is a sufficiently charming and natural urban space as it is. The primary school is often decorated with nice planters. Who is going to want to sit in that area of the high street to just watch cars go round and round?

Comments regarding the area by the school and the library
The library is a jewel in Earlsdon Crown and improving this area is a good idea YOU SHOULD LET THE COMMITTEE THAT RUNS THE LIBRARY COME UP WITH PROPOSALS NOT SOME OUT OF TOWN PLANNERS THAT DO NOT UNDERSTAND HOW THE COMMUNITY NEEDS AS THIS SUCCESSFUL VENTURE AS PROVEN (and I am not a member of that community but have seen how it has grown into a true community hub)
Lovely. Let's see it happen.
? I don't see the point of wasting money on it
No one will use it - fact is people use cars to get to places in the city and by a busy roundabout isn't a good place for a community space
No comment
Support
Maybe. But the increased traffic and pollution in that area will not be conducive to a community space.
Agree
Excellent idea
For the love of God! PLEASE don't obstruct the one bit of pavement that is actually fairly easily navigable on foot, despite the bus stop, bench, bins, Library book sales etc. PLEASE keep in mind that the PRIMARY purpose of pavements is for people all kinds to use them to WALK from A to B. Prettifying should NEVER trump functionality.
I worry that seating makes street drinking/smoking areas
Ok
I like the idea, but this is a congested area and this could only be achieved by taking space from the highway which I am opposed to
A small area outside school and library would be a good idea but not sure there is much of a demand for a larger area
Sounds great
I find it hard to reconcile that vision with the area as it is now, where traffic on Earlsdon Ave is relatively heavy and buses regularly pass through the roundabout. Space also seem quite limited especially in view of proposal 10.
there is already planting and seating here?
Less cars near the school would be best, and a lot more trees.
Lovely, but the planters that the council provide already make that area pleasant and I appreciate all the planters in Earlsdon
Yes sounds reasonable.
Agree
In favour
Amazing idea - pollinator friendly plants please and edible fruit bushes!
Nice idea
very nice idea.
Good idea, would have to see how often it could be used
Why would anyone want to sit in the middle of a busy roadway breathing in fumes? Ridiculous idea.
Agree
Good idea
It may brighten the area.
No opinion.
ok
Not needed
Excellent
Ok

Comments regarding the area by the school and the library
Do not agree
Lovely idea but not essential if funds limited
Nice idea
We've got 4 or 5 large green spaces within walking distance, why do we need a community space beside a road?
All our families are in favour of this. Comments: "Remember the footpath/cycle way alongside from Newcome Road to Earlsdon Ave crosses the pavement between the school and the library - can bikes easily access the road in the new layout?" "This will improve the whole area." "Can we have e-bike hire near Earlsdon Library?"
Good idea.
Yes, much needed, good location.
Good idea
Does anyone really want to sit on a bench at what will be the busiest junction in Earlsdon if these proposals go ahead. Air quality will certainly deteriorate. We now seem to have a cafe society in Earlsdon and a very welcoming library do we really need to sit at the side of the road to have a conversation!
A good idea but if it means removing the bus parking space this will cause congestion and increased vehicle emissions right outside the school!
Yes. Would like to see more than seats and plants to make a community space. What about opportunities for local art? Incentives to be active such as hopscotch on pavement? or ideas for stretching and exercising/music/art?
Sounds nice.
No. Given the pollution and noise how can this be a community space.
The area is already nice, so funding should be spent on more important things
Preference would be for the disused public toilets to be prioritised. Not averse improvements but it is not really somewhere you want to sit for an extended period of time.
Lovely
Perhaps a better use of the money and a more community spirited idea would be to reopen the public toilets by the side of the library. There are already seating areas; inside the library, churches, inside / outside many of our amazing businesses and several picnic benches within the two parks we are lucky to have in our relatively small locality. We already have a problems with beggars and homeless people outside the COOP & One Stop - i fear that creating these shared spaces will just become new bases for them which would be problematic for the school and library.
Not sure, not really a place for a picnic. Maybe better to spend the money on the parks on the area?
Yes fantastic, more green areas and space to sit
As long as the benches/planters don't stop pedestrian flow at the busiest times. I understand the area immediately in front of the library belongs to the library (old photos show a garden wall and railings) and I think it's important to leave enough space for the library to put out their trolleys of second hand books for sale and have a stall on Earlsdon Festival days. Second hand book sales and the festival are major sources of income for the library, which help keep the doors open
Agreed
Yes agree with this
Not really necessary...There is too much traffic to make it 'a space'...
Fully support.
Yes
I support this.
Agree
It would be nice to have a communal space within Earlsdon like this. My kids would love it being so close to the library as they are there often.
Sounds good.
It's fine as it is. With all the traffic, it is not a healthy area to encourage people to sit in the day and will encourage drunks etc to congregate in the evening

Comments regarding the area by the school and the library
Supportive
Okay
fine
I feel it will not be used as a community space, but improved planting is worthwhile.
Good idea as long as the library can still display books for sale outside.
not needed
Yes
Good
OK
I'm not opposed to this proposal and although the shared community space sounds attractive I do wonder who will actually use it at the end of the day. Also planters need to be maintained each year and we have seen the number of roadside planters reduce significantly over recent years no doubt due to budget cuts. these could end up being another set of scruffy planter that are ill maintained.
This may be a good idea
And better paving across the whole area
Sounds good
The reduction in width of the road outside the library is a positive - currently cars are using this space to create two lane traffic towards the roundabout. I also like the idea of using this area for a WMCH dock. I would also like to see a couple more Sheffield stands there, and more greenery and seating is also a good idea. With the tree there growing it could be a nice space.
Good idea
This space is not really big enough for a shared community space. Planters always look good if they are maintained properly
Agree
Yes
Will it be used. With a high vehicle route is not a nice area to be in due to the car emissions and the other proposal in the scheme would make it worse.
No point. Who will maintain it.
Fully agree. More livable.
Agree
Yes it's a good proposal.
Approve
What maintenance budget provisions are in place for the lifetime of these benches and planters. They will become unsightly in short period of time and possibly be attacked by graffiti artists. Earlsdon will become more unattractive as a result. An unintended consequence of benches and planters will be beggars and the homeless being attracted to this location. The streets often feel unsafe at certain times of the day as it is, this could make it worse.
I support this proposal
Not needed. There is already seating and planters. Who pays for the maintenance of those?
No
Yes, good idea
No opinion one way or another, see comments above about widening pavement area, it would seem that those seated will be exposed to additional idling fumes.
Approve
Do you really think this will be used for its intended purpose? More likely open to vandalism and the ravages of the weather.
This is a nice idea in theory; the question remains as to how planting will be maintained. However, it will be beneficial when community events and street markets take place.
Good idea currently an empty apce

Comments regarding the area by the school and the library
not sure what the point would be
Is seating next to a main road a good idea?
This is fine so long as you aren't taking over the road.
agree.
Good proposal
Good idea. I like this providing it doesn't create a navigation issue for people with poor mobility.
Fine with planting - seating feels unnecessary.
I do not see this as a priority given the pressure on Council resources. I would ask, why this area rather than other areas. When combined with the proposal to widen the path close to the bus stop it does seem like special pleading. I am against this proposal
No. A rather busy area, at times & would further restrict amount of space for pedestrian
Great stuff - it would be useful to see planted areas used in place of existing traffic barriers if at all possible!
I do not oppose this proposal but would question the priority of the investment given the current financial position faced by local government.
I strongly support this proposal. It would make the area more pleasant to spend time in.
In favour
Yes
If this relates to the top of the footpath between the two then this would be a pleasant addition.
Not needed. Already crowded at beginning and end of school and would leave little room for the library sales.
Yes...plus reopen toilets
Already exists. Not needed.
Supportive
I support this proposal.
Should have increased cycle racks instead . Who would want to sit on a bench near a busy road junction. Waste of money.
Agree, this would be a good idea. Knock down the out of use public conveniences
I am in favour of this proposal, but only if the School and Library do not object to it, and it does not reduce space on the footpath needed by people with disabilities or buggies/ prams.
Agree - please consider wildlife friendly planting and use sustainable materials where possible
No one can object to this sort of environmental improvement - just a shame that this short stretch is about the only element in the whole plan to do so.

Question 15

What do you think about this proposal:

Benches on Earlsdon Street and around the roundabout. There will also be opportunities for you to tell us how you would like some of the smaller details to be decided, for example where you might want more planting or seating.

Comments regarding benches on Earlsdon Street
Positive
Great idea. Encouraging social interaction.
Same as above.
Great
Excellent plan
Good
Great
Agree
See 15 above
Lovely
Good
Lovely.
Earlsdon Street yes, I don't imagine that many folks would want to sit around the roundabout, either in the middle! or on the bits of pavement between the various roads
Great
Lovely.
If there is room. If they get in the way of pedestrians it's not worth it. Maybe widen the pavement (removing a parking space) where the benches are placed?
Yes great idea
Whose property frontage are you going to take over to provide safe seating away from the pavement so pushchairs and wheelchairs have unencumbered access?
Yes
Yes
Definitely agree
great idea, places for people to rest and watch the world go by.
Who wants to sit facing a roundabout? This seems like a gimmick to me. It also seems like an invitation to rough sleepers and panhandlers. I'm against this.
Lovely idea
Good idea
This will be lovely
I do not agree with this. There is little space at the moment for pedestrians and especially for disabled people and the residents from the local blind school.
Not sure - will this make it more difficult for pedestrians to navigate the pavements? It might make life more difficult for those in wheelchairs, with pushchairs, or those with walking difficulties. It would be good to do something about the eyesore area around the post office/ convenience store Rotherham house area. It is filthy, ugly and neglected.
Supportive
I can't imagine sitting near the roundabout as the fumes are horrible.
Not seating
Not sure

Comments regarding benches on Earlsdon Street
Good for Earlsdon steet. Is anyone going to want to sit on a bench looking at a round about?
Good idea.
Good
Good idea
👍
use roundabout as advertising space - limit who can access it. people are terrible for removing charity stuff.
Unless this plan significantly reduces traffic and improves air quality I'm not sure I'd want to sit on a bench round the round about. But a nice idea to improve the look of the area. There used to be benches outside the Methodist Church where the potato man is now Not sure why they were removed.
Yes please, I can't wait for seating and more planting on Earlsdon street.
Good
Yes
An enhancement of the roundabout is long overdue. Seating around this area is a good idea. Also something is needed to discourage parking on the wide pavements around the roundabout. This is an increasing problem, especially on Friday and Saturday nights.
I don't see how this would fit safely with volume of traffic
Get poisoned
Yes
Good idea
Will these be kept tidy? What if they go grotty?
strongly in favour
I don't think this is needed in addition to the community space outside the library. I think there could be better uses of the money.
Broadly in favour but would need traffic calming to be significantly impactful to make them usable.
Like it
No thoughts
Do not understand how and why this would work.
There were trees on the original plans for the new shops on Albany Road - these haven't been included in the finished project - will the planning office be making sure this happens? More planting and trees much welcomed
Who wants to sit and stare at the roundabout ? Benches on Earlsdon Street okay.
Don't object to benches but don't think needed.
Fully support
More planting to screen the area from particulate pollution.
Extending the one way system to include Earlsdon Street and Warwick Street and adding echelon parking on one side of each road interspersed with pedestrian islands for seating etc
Good idea
N/A
Agree
Good idea.
Unclear where benches around the roundabout would be positioned. I'm assuming these would not be on the roundabout as it would be dangerous to get to them. What about wildflowers on the round about and native plants?
Good idea
Good idea
I'm not sure that the roundabout is a particularly nice place to sit so I don't know if benches would be used. I would also worry that benches would be used by the beggars who already use Earlsdon St to intimidate people into giving money, and encourage anti-social behaviour. Maybe it wouldn't but I hope this might be

Comments regarding benches on Earlsdon Street
considered.
Many of the roads around this area are already quite narrow and so I would hope this extra street furniture wouldn't affect wheelchair or buggy access to the street/s.
Very much in favour. Some concerns over ASB due to closeness to pub. Could be removed if this were to occur?
Not sure where they could be fitted in 'around the roundabout' without restricting passage for pedestrians, e.g. a parent picking up two or three children from school while managing a baby buggy. It sounds like a nice idea but if it restricts space for pedestrians carrying shopping, then maybe not !
Benches around the roundabout? How would that work? Again, there have been benches (and planters) on Earlsdon Street before, these are not new ideas.
I love benches near shops. Great to just rest and people watch. Great for elderly to rest. And an opportunity to chat to a friend or stranger (soon to be new friend) it's good to slow life down sometimes and give people the chance to chat and make friends or receive a smile or a nod. That's the essence of community living. Something I am lucky to experience in Newcombe Road where I have lived for 30 years and have very good helpful neighbours, we even have a WhatsApp group we use for needs and wants, giving away unwanted items and as a neighbourhood watch tool.
Would love this
Ok
good idea. I agree with it.
Yes, people will need somewhere to rest on the trek to their car.
The principle is fine, the details would determine how impactful and used these would be. Do people actually want to sit and look at the roundabout for example?
Superfluous to requirements . We don't need more communal spaces, there are 2 parks and a common in Earlsdon.
I think a combination of seating and planting would be lovely here. However, as with any plan to encourage usage of a space, we should also ensure there's plenty of accessible bins to ensure it doesn't just end up covered in Greggs' packaging.
Agree
Agree
Benches by the more polluted areas???
Not bothered either way
Not sure there will be enough space.
This sounds lovely. Let's keep them non-hostile.
You should link this to 14
As above - great on festival days and quiet weekends but road congestion and air pollution would not make this a safe area to linger
We do have some issues with rough sleepers. So nice idea but I have some reservations including overflow from the City Arms.....
Meh
Good idea
Yes
What's the point. Waste of money and will attract damage and graffiti.
Good
Agree
Again not needed as Hearsall common is around the corner. Benches there maybe an idea
I think this is a good idea.
Excellent idea, this should be rolled out as soon as possible and extended to other Coventry neighbourhoods, such as Stoke.
Why?
See above. Thanks.

Comments regarding benches on Earlsdon Street
As long as they are maintained
Sit and inhale traffic fumes - go to Spencer Park
No thanks
Sounds good too.
No need for benches around the roundabout.
Yes, why not
Yes
Yes I agree with this
good idea - particularly in conjunction with pedestrianisation
Why would you want to sit and stare at a roundabout?? Any planting should be used to prevent people parking in a dangerous way, on Earlsdon street for example.
Support more places to sit
good idea
Impractical
not keen, and no idea why this is seen as desirable. the pavements are already thin from cafe seating and obstacle-ridden by signage etc. it can be hard to walk two abreast in order to pass people in some places, so benches seem to be another hazard
Disagree.
Not really worth the expense. Who would want to sit on a bench next to a busy road inhaling traffic fumes? Even in the beautiful environment of Memorial Park most benches are not used most of the time so why think that a bench here would be used? In any case, there is no spare space on pavements as they are obstructed enough as it is.
As above
I'm not sure about this proposal
Fine
Indifferent
Yes good idea
No, that's a daft idea
More benches around Earlsdon Street would be great for people to interact and for some people who have limited mobility/energy levels.
I think it's a very good idea
yes thats fine
No comment
Have you in mind something like the arrangement along the High Street in the City Centre? But for an ageing population the chance to sit for a while would be welcome.
Benches around the roundabout!! It's a death trap.
Waste of money.
Great.
This needs to be explained am I would like to see the plans
Great
Agree
Ok
No thanks. Earlsdon Street is already full of beggars, junkies and tramps. Benches mean they'll be there at nighttime too.
I would reiterate my comments from 14 above. The principles are OK but the reality may prove very different.
Not a priority
Yes, yes, yes.
Benches further up Earlsdon Street would be of benefit.

Comments regarding benches on Earlsdon Street
Yes sounds good.
No opinion
Benches on Hearsall Cmmon
28
no comment
Agree
Yes like it
Don't think these are necessary, Earlsdon street will experience more traffic because of the calming measures elsewhere, why would you want to sit with cars going passed.
Depends on how many and what they will obstruct. Families with pushchairs and those with disabilities need full pavement access. If you increase the benches do you need then to widen pavements etc etc? Beware of unintended consequences in making something look more community-friendly when in fact it creates more issues.
In favour
Not needed for us
Lovely
Welcome but pavement is narrow in most places so may be impractical along Earlsdon Street
Good idea
Good idea
Nice-to-have.
Unless streets look cleaner and traffic reduced, who will want to sit out there? Air pollution high. IS there a demand or need? Will they not get in the way?
Good
May attract trouble of sorts.
Could be good or bad dependent on what type of people it would attract considering its near the bars, pub and near an area where drugs are taken
This would restrict pavement access. If you want to sit on Earlsdon St there are plenty of cafes
In favour.
agree
Great
Support this proposal
Not sure about this, could make the area seem a bit crowded?
Pointless by the roundabout and is there room for seating on quite narrow pathways?
Yes
Planting yes BUT the see my response to Question 14
Would prefer more green space /flowers first
Good
Will this encourage antisocial behaviour?
Who would want to sit by the roundabout ?
Not sure about benches... why would anyone want to sit near a roundabout?
Ok with that
More seating on Earlsdon St. The space between The City Arms and Gonzo is not well utilised. Not sure how this would work around the roundabout.
More seating is definitely needed so I fully support this.
Good idea
Ok
I am opposed to this as Earlsdon Street will be an essential thoroughfare and not suitable for seating or planting. Who would want to sit next to a vital traffic route? If seating and planting is established, the next step

Comments regarding benches on Earlsdon Street
will be to pedestrianise the road which would cause traffic chaos to the area.
Yea why not
Good idea.
Have to be careful how benches used as may cone a space for drug users or homeless to gather
In favour
Yes, agreed
The issue of the shocking state of pedestrian surfaces needs addressing first. Heavy goods vehicles mounting the kerb to park has wrecked the surfaces creating trip hazards and impossible surfaces for wheelchair users, under these circumstances benches a cosmetic nonsense.
The odd bench for people to take a break and rest is reasonable. Benches around the roundabout though?
In favour
Agree
Yes please.
I have no issues with this proposal
I can't belief benches on the roundabout will work successfully - too busy.
A good proposal but has noise and traffic pollution been considered in the siting of these seating areas.
Ditto
Unnecessary street clutter in a busy area and generally they wouldn't be used. The only spaces for benches would be outside the library
How are people getting on Roundabout to sit? That is daft and dangerous. Equally pavement in Earlsdon street is busy enough, no room for benches. Why would people want to sit? Possibly room for one outside Coop, Cafes already have some on pavement seating and you can see how that jams up the space
OK if it's only a couple.
Agree, as long as seating cannot be used for sleeping
Again, not sure if people want to sit next to busy roundabout. Seating could be provided further up the high street.
Noy sure people will want to sit around the roundabout? Yes to more plants. we need better rain quality. Could we have a local artist do a sculpture? Could you involve Warwickshire Open Studios who are in contact and promote local artists.
Yes
Yes to benches on Earlsdon street. Not on roundabout. That sounds dangerous!
Good idea
Fully approve
Good
Really nice, go for it.
Agree
No!
I'm not totally convinced that benches would add much to the area and there is always the possibility that they become congregation points for anti social behavior.
Approve
agree
Agree, but seating should be away from residential property
DISAGREE Why would anyone want to sit on a bench practically on a roundabout with increased traffic and queuing to look at and suffer congestion from the fumes?
Not sure - it's busy and sitting next to Wetherspoons car park is not appealing.
See answer to q14
Sounds nice but I don't think this will be good in practice

Comments regarding benches on Earlsdon Street
Yes, although this area at the roundabout is very busy at school pickup and drop off - have you reviewed these proposals at say 3.15pm on a Friday?
Seating on Earlsdon Street - Agree
See above.
In favour
More benches would be great used by all sections of community, elderly from route sheltered accomodation to shops to young families, It would encourage community cohesion and would lift the surrounding environment. More planting would be nice around the seating areas and on the corners of Providence street from Earlsdon Steet and on Moor Street Break up the feel of concrete and cars!
This would take up pathways.
Again, why would anyone sit in the midst of busy roads?
Great
Waste of money.
Fine
Benches don't seem necessary or practical
No opinion
Vreat
Benches are a good idea
I support this proposal
I am not sure what the point of this would be unless people actively enjoy breathing in exhaust fumes!
I think this is a lovely idea.
Potentially frightening. the pavement area is currently very busy, benches could well just add to the chaos.
Is there space for benches with all the retail outlets taking up the pavements?
good
Don't understand how they can be around the roundabout?
Support this.
No, too much foot traffic for that.
.The roundabout is an area where there is often traffic congestion and does not seem a suitable place for people to sit and congregate. (Eg air quality). It would be best to wait to see if the other measures proposed reduce traffic before placing benches
Good
Pointless, I cannot imagine wanting to sit and watch traffic/breathe in exhaust fumes. This would only be worthwhile if the high street was fully pedestrianized.
Extra seating can be an asset as long as it is well maintained.
Yes
Important Who is going to be responsible for cleaning these seats and planters and maintaining them? Will the Council be able to take it on? Have you thought of making a list of those people who want this spacesign them up to clean and maintain the area perhaps?
Yes please. Make it more liveable
As above. Also seating at the other end of the high street I.e near the post office
Waste of public money.
Personally I am not against this but in neighbouring areas like Nuneaton the council are removing benches to try to stop anti social behaviour as the police seem to be unable to do anything about behaviour and think it's a good idea
Yes.

Comments regarding benches on Earlsdon Street
Ditto, stupid idea, waste of money and space
Benches will be helpful. Not sure how these will be used - lots of homeless people or people begging, antisocial behaviour?
No comment
Support
Maybe. But the increased traffic and pollution in that area will not be conducive to a community space.
Agree
Excellent idea
Don't put benches where people need to WALK! By all means explore hanging baskets and vertical planting etc but keep in mind that pavements are not public spaces in the way that parks etc. There must be unused/neglected spaces that could take benches and plants without taking up our limited pavement spaces.
Ok
Nope. Why do people want to stop and watch a roundabout? I would only use it when I cant get served at the weatherspoons so go to coop to get a few beers to drink off it
Can't see space for benches without using private land.. Plenty of space outside coffee shops and this ensures that those socialising are doing so responsibly.
Sounds great
As for Proposal 14: the roundabout area does not seem to me to be the ideal place to site benches etc - unless there is some way in which the density and impact of traffic is dramatically reduced. As I see it, Earlsdon Avenue will necessarily continue to be one of the most significant routes to and through Earlsdon (indeed many of the proposals for restricting access to smaller roads promote this conception).
again, there are already seating here, or at least used to be. Few people hang around here, it would be better to find space around the high street and reduce the traffic travelling down it (i.e. not increase traffic down there through these proposals!)
More trees
There are many old people with mobility problems who would surely like to be able to sit down for a rest without needing to buy a drink at a cafe with seating.
Yes sounds a good idea, as long as doesn't impact wheelchair, pushchair users.
Does the data confirm the library bench is actually used to support this?
In favour
Good idea but I don't like idea of it being an anti social behaviour area. Would need to implement youth club etc.
Good idea
This might make people congregate or use a meet up point making it more difficult for other pedestrians to walk and having to use the roads instead
Ditto above comment.
Agree
No opinion
I don't agree.
No opinion.
ok
Not needed. We're in an area with lots of cafes and open spaces. People don't need a bench on the high street
Excellent
Ok
Really ?...
Lovely idea
Nice idea but not a priority if funding is limited.
Why do you need benches around the roundabout?
All our families are in favour of this. Comments "we need more bike stands outside the coop too". "Please can we plant more trees down Albany Road to stop cars parking on the pavement?"

Comments regarding benches on Earlsdon Street
Terrible idea! Who wants to sit on a roundabout and watch traffic go by?!?
Yes please. Some planting welcome, but perhaps not at the expense of too much seating. Also, maintenance of planting needs to be planned for.
Benches on Earlsdon Street a good idea. Do you mean benches on the roundabout? if so sounds dangerous
The planting we already have in Earlsdon is lovely and very welcome but do we need any more. Surely the cost of installing and the upkeep of these could be spent on other ways of improving the area. Dealing with the empty premises and the general decline of Earlsdon Street would surely be money well spent. XX. We are already very lucky to live in Earlsdon.
Again, what is the justification for this? How many people have made it known that they want to sit near to, and breath the fumes from, the busiest traffic junction in Earlsdon?
Yes and maybe more greenery so sitting at the roundabout is more pleasant. To offer more opportunities for ongoing engagement is welcomed. I think you have had much criticism but further engagement opportunities will be welcomed into the future
Maybe.
No.
I do not think benches are needed
Not sure benches near a very congested roundabout would be particularly pleasant.
Great
As above - There are already seating areas; inside the library, churches, inside / outside many of our amazing businesses and several picnic benches within the two parks we are lucky to have in our relatively small locality.
Also seems like it would be better to have more benches in Spencer Park?
As above but lets not go from hardly any..... to way too many
More benches would be good, but not sure people will want to sit near the roundabout with all the extra traffic that the plans will force onto Earlsdon Street and Earlsdon Avenue!
Agreed
Yes that's good
As above, but tree planting on Earlsdon St to make it an avenue and prevent cars from parking on the path, would be brilliant!
Support. But will need to be additional social care input/provision for homeless people otherwise the homeless cohort outside the co-op/greggs in Earlsdon will grow and the benches won't end up being used by the general public.
Agree
I support this.
Yes
If it makes the area more attractive - it will attract more businesses and diversify the community which can only be a good thing.
Sounds good, though I can't see where there will be available space for seating to be added, bar the potentially widened footpath area by the library.
See above. More benches in the local parks would be better.
Supportive
fine
Seating on Earlsdon St may help those with mobility issues, but on the roundabout seems rather strange!
Using the roundabout would be a really bad idea.
Yes
Good community spirit
Given that the bus gate and all the no entries and one way changes will force so much more traffic through Earlsdon Avenue, why would anyone want to sit by the roundabout breathing in poisonous fumes? With current traffic levels seating might be pleasant enough as long as it doesn't end up as an overspill to the City arms tables
I'm not really sure who would use them or want to sit watching traffic on the roundabout. I think this is a waste

Comments regarding benches on Earlsdon Street
of money.
There is not enough space on the pavements in Earlsdon Street for this to happen. The shop frontages are owned by vendors of the premises, and this would only leave a 2m pavement space to do this. which would impact on pedestrians using the pavements and indeed disabled people and residents of the nearby blind school.
Pavements included???
Where on earth will they go on Earlsdon Street without making life difficult for prams and wheelchairs and people with limited mobility.
Good idea. Maybe you can convince a few owners along the High Street to also provide benches (and bicycle stands).
Good idea
Not sure there is enough room for benches on the pavements/roundabout area. Earlsdon is a very busy & thriving area at the moment.
Agree
Yes
Again, will they be used? With a high vehicle route is not a nice area to be in due to the car emissions and the other proposal in the scheme would make it worse. All for planters and trees
Not the best place. There are places around I could suggest better. With nicer views
Fully agree....more livable
Agree
Yes it's a good proposal.
Approve
I do not support this proposal. Reasons already stated in proposal 14.
I support this proposal
Benches on Earlsdon Street would be welcome, if you can find space between all of the outside cafe seating spaces.
Yes!
No opinion.
This will be nice, if there is room to fit it all in.
As above. Unnecessary
The theory behind this ideas is nice; however, the amount of traffic coming into this junction means it will not be a nice place to sit. Traffic approaching the roundabout cannot be reduced unless there is a major redesign of the road network in the area and additional crossing points over the railway line are created.
Good idea
no point
There are bigger issues than this for the community as this seems to be just a cosmetic makeover, what about lighting and pavements
Why on earth would people want to sit in on the roundabout? Benches on the pavement in Earlsdon Street is fine
Planters in Earlsdon Street have always been a great success.
Think idea of sitting adjacent to traffic unhealthy,
Not sure. I'm in favour of planting providing it doesn't create clutter and is done in a way that is easy to maintain and doesn't encourage litter. I don't think benches are necessarily a good idea in an already busy area.
It seems odd that seating is proposed around a busy roundabout - is this a good use of public funds?
I am not against this proposal.
NO. As above
Great idea, see above comment on point 14
I do not oppose this proposal but would question the priority of the investment given the current financial position faced by local government.
I strongly support this proposal. It would make the area more pleasant and I would be more likely to visit

Comments regarding benches on Earlsdon Street
Earlsdon Street
In favour
Why?
There is not enough seating throughout the area including Spencer Park (not the Bowling Green)
Not in favour. Would lead to people hanging around and vandalism.
TOILETS PLEASE
Not necessary.
Supportive
I support this proposal.
Pavements on Earlsdon street too narrow for benches . who would want to sit inhaling car fumes ?
Could be a good idea -would need to see the proposals
I am not sure what 'benches around the roundabout' implies. In general, though, I support the provision of seating as it benefits elderly and infirm people. However, I would not favour their installation were they to reduce space on the footpath needed by people with disabilities or buggies/ prams.
Agree - please consider wildlife friendly planting and use sustainable materials where possible
Sensible

Question 16

Is there anything else you want to tell us about the proposals for the Liveable Neighbourhood for Earlsdon?

Anything else you want to tell us?
Slightly unclear as to the sign on the map for Arden Street- it suggests no entry? So not one way but a dead end- I must have that wrong as this would cause chaos!
All these measures are not geared towards young families and communities but more to making earlsdon isolated
Please include Southleigh Ave. We come off Stoneleigh so therefore will be included in the 20mph plan, however we don't feature on the map.
Good plans overall - better traffic flow and management, improved safety
If you do not restrict access at dalton and Spencer then you need to put an island in the middle of the dalton and morningside to stop this dangerous (and illegal) driving manoeuvre . My kids have nearly been hit several times
Quite frankly, most of it is just moving problems from one area to another. Reducing the speed limit with enforcement measures will improve safety and quality of life at minimum capital cost, without permanently increase journey distances and without making some people's lives worse , eg those who live near the Kenilworth Road / Beechwood Avenue. Earlsdon is already a pleasant area to live. We do not need money being wasted on us. There are many areas of the city that are polluted, with great social need. Please spend any spare money on them. I am not in favour of community maintained planters. They may be maintained initially but once people move away, die or lose interest, planters will become an eyesore.
See point regarding more beryl stations. Currently I use the train a lot. Often I take Uber, however I would use beryl if there were stations closer to my home
Overall, I'm very impressed with this proposal, and I'll do my best to attend one of the drop in sessions, as I'm not able to get to the public meeting.
Great
Brilliant proposals.
I think the plans need to be careful not to make living in Earlsdon a nightmare of loops and cycle lanes. Speed limits do make sense as many do zoom around, however completely blocking roads and having one way systems to this scale will only increase traffic on other roads causing more problems. So please just leave it be.
Currently people block the dropped kerbs at the entrance/exit of alleyways from Beechwood Ave to Providence Street and from Earlsdon Ave South to Spencer Road. It can be hard just walking between parked cars even without a pushchair or wheelchair. White lines won't stop this but bring the kerb line out at these crossing points to prevent parking and allow pedestrians better view when crossing the roads. You could also use these wider spots for planters/benches.
Can we upgrade our street signs? Styvechale avenue doesn't even have one. Clarendon Street is all rusty, but they just need painting. Why don't we have have black writing on a gold background? Could it be a community drive to get these done? Email me
great ideas. thank you
Focus on protecting pedestrians; cut the gimmicks.
The measures now focus on the wealthier streets of earlsdon and roads like Kennington and Broomfield that have different kinds of issues e.g. heavy traffic, too narrow pavements etc. Accessibility and safety issues have not been considered. All proposals otherwise can add value and create a calmer neighbourhood
Traffic is a problem - too many vehicles, too much speeding, lots of emissions. Parking is a real problem for residents. Shops all closing - rents too high. Too many food outlets and no variety in the shops.
There is a car park near the cobblers on moor street. No one seems to use it. Maybe a more prominent sign to put up so that drivers can see it. You only notice it if you already know it's there.
Nothing else but reiterate my absolute opposition to making my road no entry from Beechwood.
Interested to know why the one way on Spencer Ave will stop at mayfield. From mayfield to dalton becomes gridlock on many occasions. Once traffic comes down Spencer Av it will have to turn left onto mayfield, once traffic comes along mayfield to Spencer Av it will have to turn right. That junction is going to be extremely busy and dangerous. There's no street lighting there. I feel the yellow lines on those corners will need extending to

Anything else you want to tell us?
accommodate this.
Graf work thanks
All good ideas.
Working in areas such as Cambridge and Oxford, and knowing people who live in both areas I would suggest there is substantial evidence that closing off some roads just doesn't work. Tailbacks on by pass roads and main routes in and out of the area.
more pop parks - space for community? unused areas/shops discussions? quality of paths not considered
I know the funding is external funding, but Earlsdon is a pretty affluent area compared to other areas of the city. I hope there are plan to role out similar schemes across the city, particularly in those areas where inequalities really impact on health. I also can't see anything specific to reduce speeds on Albany Rd - this is a real issue, particularly in the evening when there is less traffic.
I am very happy to see Albany Road, Spencer and Broadway included in these plans. This is a very good plan and I support all the changes. I would like to see more safety measures like moving give-way lines back at junctions, an inexpensive way to help drivers be aware that pedestrians have priority following the recent change in the law, ideally they could be raised areas too.
I think the proposals are generally positive. I am disappointed that the opportunity has not been taken to close Earlsdon Street to traffic and enhance the street as community space. This would also resolve the issue of speeding in Earlsdon Street, the parading of custom cars on weekend evenings and the growing problem of weekend evening on-pavement parking around the local pubs. I very much welcome the 20mph speed limit but I have concerns about how this will be enforced as there is currently no enforcement of the existing speed limit (I say this as someone whose car has suffered several thousands of pound worth of damage caused by a speeding car on Earlsdon Avenue South). Unless some form of physical speed restriction is introduced this will continue to be a problem. Similarly the existing zebra crossings in Earlsdon are dangerous and new ones, especially on Albany Road will experience similar problems. Some form of speed table or raised crossing should be introduced to slow traffic at existing and new crossings. Finally, the biggest problem for pedestrians in Earlsdon Street is currently the narrowness of the footway on both sides of the road. This has been caused in recent years by cafes and restaurants extending their outdoor eating areas into the footways. In some ways this is to be welcomed as it adds to the ambience of the street, however it needs to be accommodated in some way by a widening of the footways. This can only happen if Earlsdon Street is closed to traffic or narrowed and made one-way. I do have concerns about the increasing reliance on local volunteers who are already called upon to run local amenities such as the library and local parks, not to mention numerous other local services and voluntary groups. I'm not sure that this is a sustainable strategy in the long run.
Get cars out and people to walk
If Warwick Avenue isn't blocked off it needs traffic calming measures. So does beachwood Avenue corner where there have been multiple accidents by the golf course on that tight corner.
Lots of cost Other areas of the city far more deserving
Main concern is speeding traffic. Albany Road has issues as does Spencer Avenue. People like to race
Thank you for hard work and efforts.
Overall looks really well thought out and a very welcome development for Earlsdon. Two additional suggestions (also mentioned above): 1. I also suggest an additional zebra crossing on Earlsdon Avenue North to mirror that on Beechwood as there is limited enhanced crossing between the Earlsdon Roundabout and the Memorial Park. 2. Suggest also a hire bike rank in Earlsdon accompany this.
Why not go the full distance and make it like they do in Holland and make the whole area car free apart from residents only. This will welcome all pedestrians and cyclists to the area without fear of being hurt from cars

Anything else you want to tell us?
with an overall cleaner air environment.
Consider the implication for other residents. A lot of this is at the detriment to Broadway residents. The market gates far too premature - 1st market event not a massive success so doesn't warrant development. The 20mph speed limit, improved area outside library and some traffic calming measure only sensible proposals here.
I had heard rumours of more planting trees on street - this would create shading and enhance the environment- could these be included in the one-way street planning?
Make sure it's all voted on because some of the proposals are ludicrous.
Totally over the top ideas for the area. I understand what you are trying to do in principle but don't agree with some of the ideas. I am very against all the one way routes, it would be very inconvenient for residents constantly driving around to get to and from their homes. Surely it would create more pollution and exhaust fumes too. If it ain't broke don't fix it springs to mind.
Great scheme which I strongly support. Believe proposals could go further in some places, with side road closures and Earlsdon Street partial pedestrianisation. I would also like to see better provision for cycling along Albany Road and Earlsdon Ave to better link to other cycle routes
We could do with a more joined up, segregated cycle lane.
Lots of good ideas here, however I'm concerned that no entry proposals for Stoneleigh, Warwick and Styvechale Avenues only address symptomatic issues and not the underlying problem which is rat-run speeding and quick getaways for criminals. Integrated traffic calming including trees, planters, seating, echelon parking and chicanes (as in Netherlands) would be far more effective in my opinion.
Some good ideas but I strongly disagree with some No entry proposals. Alternative schemes with traffic calming offers a much better solution (Can't upload pics) Very concerned about congestion on beechwood Ave onto kenilworth rd caused by proposed road closures http://www.thinkstreetsmart.org/uploads/1/2/7/4/127450599/editor/chicane.jpg?1597346644
No thank you.
Overall I love the plans, but I'm concerned about how all roads have traffic calming or one-way measures, other than Broadway, Huntingdon, Mickleton, Stanway. What will be done about measures elsewhere redirecting traffic onto these roads?
Please do not close roads, it reduces access around the local community. Going on a journey to visit a friend in Earlsdon. will mean going a long way round and the roads will be more congested. I have arthritis and can't walk very far. These changes will make my life a misery.
On the initial maps of the liveable neighbourhood Spencer Avenue was not included. I would have paid more attention before now had I know how much my road would have been affected!
Information sheet 7 - I would like to see extra space used for a combination of additional parking and other uses. There will likely be an increase in electric vehicles in the future and having additional parking spaces which could be used for these in the future may be helpful. I would not want to see additional streets converted to one-way system as this would impact on accessibility for residents getting to and from home. I would like to see parking arrangements for residents on Albany Road reviewed. Since Covid and the move towards more people working from home; the current measures are no longer fit for purpose and disadvantage employees who work from home, but in doing so reduce traffic and pollution by not using their cars. Improving provision for parking for Albany Road residents and their visitors would also reduce the need for those people to move their cars on to surrounding streets thus reducing unnecessary traffic and pollution in surrounding streets and freeing up parking spaces for residents who live on surrounding streets.
Would like cycle rack outside XXXXXX Down to Earth
I strongly object to the proposal concerning Styvechale Avenue. Having to circle all the way around Earlsdon to reach destinations like Sainsbury's and The Village will increase pollution and traffic congestion.
I appreciate the effort by the council to try and improve the area, however I do feel that many of these proposals make the area less 'Liveable'. By creating one-way-roads, it will increase traffic jams at junctions and lead to more pollution for residents as cars have to queue to exit roads and are also funnelled up specific roads rather than using roads across the whole area. Reducing traffic on roads and making sections quieter

Anything else you want to tell us?
(especially the Spencer Road proposal) will also affect the perceived safety of lone women (like myself) feeling able to walk when dusk or dark and will lead to more traffic as we choose to drive instead.
The increase in pedestrian crossings are great idea and I fully support these proposals as long as they are done sensibly.
In order to make the area more 'Liveable' I feel that the money would be better spent on more community resources such as increased funding for the library and other community hubs as well as more work to stop ant-social behaviour such as aggressive begging on Earlsdon Street and crime in general. This would make living here much more pleasant.
You do not address the parking issues in your proposals to local residents. It would appear that those of us who live near XXXXXX are the victims of your proposals with continued disruption to our lives with increased parking issues from those who travel to the night street or work in and around it. This feels like a wholly unsatisfactory situation.
Generally I am very much in favour. I am however concerned the culmination of this will increase traffic on Earlsdon Ave south and that cars wanting to avoid a congested roundabout will use Mayfield/Belvedere as a shortcut to the Albany Rd via Broadway. Could this be avoided with additional one way systems or no r/l turns?
I am delighted that this has become a project which involves the community. That says a lot about Earlsdon. The character of the High Street has changed a great deal over the last 4 decades and much of this is to do with the number of cars on the road as well as the changes in retail habits (e.g. people shopping in large retail parks) but still needing local shops which are within walking distance of their homes.
With respect, this just all sounds like an influx of 'new' ideas by people that are new to Earlsdon. In the XX years that I've lived here, things have changed, some things for the better, some not so. Parking is and always will be a problem as cars weren't a thing when Earlsdon was built, if you move here, you should accept that. It is not a modern development with traffic systems, shared road spaces and cul-de-sacs. Stick a few planters and benches around if you want to spend some money but a better use for it would be subsidising rents on shops so that a video variety of independent retailers are attracted to move into the street.
Having lived here for XX years I think this area is very livable already and feel lucky to live here so close to parks, a bus route and shops, pubs and cafes. I think there's other areas in Coventry more broken but a few extra touches would be good/welcome but you have to admit Earlsdon is a pretty desirable area to live already.
More green
Please consider the residents who do not have a driveway for parking a car. We are struggling now to park our cars. Please do not push the existing problems somewhere else !
I Walk, Cycle and drive. I don't drive around the Earlsdon area. Would it be possible to do something different with the give way road markings to make it more obvious that cars should give way to pedestrians that are crossing junctions of side streets. I'm aware that the highway code has been changed but driver behavior hasn't changed yet.
Stop limiting the parking. There's not enough space for residents to park, so stop pushing people further away from the high street then closing all of the access routes out of Earlsdon. By closing Spencer Rd, Arden st, Styvechale, Shaftesbury and Warwick the congestion on the 3 remaining routes in and out will be horrendous especially at peak times.
More patrols at school time to prevent arrogant parents thinking they can park where they like and block the roads. Particularly by King Henry's school
In general, if you can't tell already, I am extremely supportive of any Liveable Neighbourhood proposal. My only concern is that we might not be going far enough, but I also understand the need to take other, car-hungrier, residents "along with us". I still think pedestrianising Earlsdon Street should remain a medium- to long-term priority and we should make sure none of the more immediate measures (I hope they're immediate, anyway!) will act as barriers to that bigger goal.
No
Agree
Mostly written by non Earlsdon residents
I agree wholeheartedly with the idea of restricting the use of 'rat-runs' in the area and the encouragement of safer cycling routes.
We are angry that the meeting on 14 September was cancelled due to too many people wanting to attend! Seems bonkers! Or was it that you were afraid of any negative comments? The barriers between tennis club and gold club on Beechwood avenue really need sorting out and signage

Anything else you want to tell us?
warning drivers of the sharp bend. The 20MPH limit will help.
I'm really pleased to be living in the area. I hope it goes well and more of Coventry becomes liveable. It's a great initiative.
No mention of address dog fouling . Doesn't feel like you have thought through where the traffic will flow with all the proposals in place. As a whole it's too much and will make Earlsdon feel like an Inaccessible Neighbourhood with more congestion at the main junctions in and our. Less is often more.
I'm glad these proposals have been put forward and they go a long way to address the issues, but I would just like to see less reduction of viable routes to balance transport options for local residents. It doesn't help to remove driving routes and say we are all going walk and cycle as that does not take into account distance, topography, climate and demographics. My neighbour to the left is 80 and the other in his 70s. They aren't going to cycle uphill in the rain. I always walk to the High Street and often to town but it's just too far from where I am for some, and public transport too poor. Also if you really are going to do this please can I make the plea to do it sensibly so the whole area is not at a standstill because of roadworks? I stopped going down Albany Road after years of constant closures for the retirement village, the student villlage and then the Spon end works. There were literally works going on in Spon end, the London Road and Warwick Road all at the same time at some points this year bringing the entire ring road to a halt for the south side of the city. Thank you for listening!
Don't listen to the anti LTN brigade. Take bold action towards a car free future for Earlsdon. It's being strangled by cars and has become an unpleasant place to live over the last 10 years.
Rubbish is always a problem in the area. More prominent creative signage to influence people to use bins or take there litter home with them.
Not one single proposal addresses the current dangerous scourge of speeding (30 - 40mph) electric bike couriers working for the food delivery companies around Earlsdon (often without the most basic saftey gear such as lights at night), or the large numbers of electric scooters about. Unless there is *active* legislation to deal with this followed up by constant enforcement, many of the proposals suggested with regards to cycle paths will make matters considerably worse not better.
As a Coventry resident and tax payer please consider people that go through Earlsdon not just Earlsdon residents. I also visit Earlsdon regularly and need to park and navigate through.
The amount of junction and road entrance closures is not what I thought this plan was about. Some of it seems excessive. Traffic calming and lower speed limits were more what I was expecting. As well as more, trees benches etc..
The proposals you have suggested will detrimentally affect drivers and residents. Why is there a continued war on drivers in Coventry? These proposals have not been sufficiently advertised except on social media and not everyone who lives local has access to it. I am only aware after speaking to people
Need thinking through in more detail to understand how people who live there will use the roads & if the 'main' roads can hold more traffic as a result of the proposed changes
I think you have covered most and I have answered honestly.
I am appalled by these proposals. Hurting local residents.
No another way of cutting off traffic moving
Encourage more cars to use the car park with free parking for first 30 minutes and much better signage
The WhatsApp gp in my street (Clarendon St) mainly seem to think the proposals are "ludicrous" and "absolutely awful." I've read through them all carefully tonight and can't see what they are worried about. the plans seem very carefully considered and a major improvement.
These plans will cause traffic chaos for very little perceivable benefit
Strongly disappointed Ruth the cancelling of the public meeting need to hear views.
Some ideas are good, more benches and planters, less taxis on the High Street, more crossings. However the traffic plans are not taking into account resident parking on streets ad there are few houses in Earlsdon with off street parking and the plans are just creating more traffic on already busy roads and making life very inconvenient for many resident's It is also creating more unnecessary driving and creating more pollution.
Funding has been secured from Sustrans for improvements to promote cycle and pedestrian transport outside the liveable neighbourhood area. An effective change would be to provide a staircase on the footbridge from Spencer Park to Central Six immediately after the rial line crossing. It would link directly with the new bus hub

Anything else you want to tell us?
and station entrance and benefit everyone in Earlsdon. It doesn't look feasible to add a wheelchair accessible ramp at the same point, and if that is true, we should not let that stop pedestrians and cyclists benefitting - a simple narrow ramp or gully can be incorporated at the outer edge of stairs down which one can wheel a bicycle. The direct link would join up rail, bus and cycle routes and encourage the use of sustainable transport by Earlsdon residents by making access to the station and transport hub much more direct. Happy to discuss, email below. Thank you.
Why is there no large public meeting? The two that were proposed have both been dropped, leaving only small scale "drop-ins" and online meetings. Are you afraid to meet your voters? I have a strong suspicion that the most extreme version of any suggestions made will be adopted, as there is a strong anti car attitude in the council and this will taint any decision made.
Public Toilets to be re-provided Plans for traffic measures seem to assume that there will be a reduction in numbers of cars. This is not the case now and won't be for a long time yet; If you visit Earlsdon on an evening the majority of cars parked are owned by people living in Earlsdon, all of which need easy access to and from their homes. Not all people can cycle or walk much of a distance, and buses aren't always an option, especially as services to parts of the City Centre have been changed and don't provide easy access for those who need it. Coventry may be a young City however the older or less mobile don't seem to be being considered here. Question below on whether you consider yourself to be disabled; please consider rewording as people can have limited mobility without considering themselves disabled, and they would possibly have more difficulty getting about than others.
too much local traffic will be pushed onto Rochester/Radcliffe and Beechwood. This makes walking to school/shops/library dangerous and polluted. Warwick Ave should be open to through traffic. There needs to be a safe crossing on Beechwood by St Barbaras! (Paper survey - has been inputted as wriiten.)
Parking has become worse with electric filling points and proposals further impact negatively on parking experience in atea
I thought the impetus for this came from traffic calming due to resident concern over speeding traffic. The imposition of a 20mph zone should solve that, and adding multiple zebra crossings and longer double yellow would ensure better vision for both pedestrians and drivers. I can't see the need for closing off roads like Shaftesbury and Arden, nor for changing the road priority at Rochester which seems like a sledgehammer to crack a walnut.
Overall it is an inconvenience.
Apart from a few problem areas and issues, such as the speeding on Beechwood Avenue, and Spencer Avenue traffic, most roads in the area are fine as they are and there is not much traffic except at rush hour. Many of the proposals here would just funnel traffic onto main roads and other side roads causing congestion and making it more difficult for pedestrians to cross.
Not at the moment
It seems like a major project. Would the funding not be better spent on alternative projects where the outcomes would have a more positive impact on the local community?
A heated open air pool at the war memorial park would be nice
Overall it's a joke
Where is this funding coming from and who is deciding on these plans?
Don't bother it seems a waste of money and will cause more problems on the roads
Stop cars/lorries/taxis parking up on the pavement. This happens on mainly Earlsdon Street. Obstructing pushchair/mobility scooters/wheelchair users. It also damages the pavement....which in turn is poorly repaired/maintained.
These plans constitute an attack on motorists when what Earlsdon really needs is better shops and better policing. Earlsdon Street doesn't have a butcher or hardware shop any more. The smell of cannabis is everywhere. There are too many hairdressers and coffee shops.
Thanks for all your hard work on this important and valuable project!
The road I live on (XXXX) is likely to become the only easy access into earlsdon from the station side of the city. I think I will experience a busier rather than safer earlsdon as a result of some of the flow changes
Enforce parking laws. Slow down traffic on Beechwood avenue. 9/10 its usually kids speeding down there to get to and from The Farmhouse restaurant - they then chuck their waste along the road so we can tell!!
Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
Given the scope of these proposals, the Liveable Neighbourhood Scheme has been mis-sold and now encompasses a much wider area. This should be recognised. Either the proposals go forward for just the area

Anything else you want to tell us?
in blue (the original) or start again with the broader remit. This is just annoying.
Rather than close off the entry to Styvechale ave Warwick Avenue from Beechwood consider reducing the traffic speed. Think about bumps in the road or cameras. Otherwise all you gonna do is move the traffic to Earlsdon Avenue South. Why don't you send a mail shot out asking for ideas from the people that live there. Existing proposal seems very drastic.
Improved crossings on Earlsdon Street and Beechwood are only good proposals. Not sure what objective of the proposals are. First I've heard of proposals. If you didn't have social media you would have no idea of consultation. Majority of proposals are not needed and a waste of money. Proposal will put off people visiting Earlsdon and damage businesses. Having lived on XXXXXX don't see the problem with the roads. Only exception is speeding drivers. Speed bumps would slow drivers down on Beechwood. The busiest junction is Beechwood / Kenilworth road which will get busier and increase potential for accidents at this tricky junction.
Could we make the carpark by the post office free for 30mins to encourage people to use it, rather than clog up high street?
Kenilworth road reduce to 30 mph? Cleaner air, less noise. Outside the area of this plan though?
Sadly I have only really just heard about this
Inevitably, the use of no entries and bus gates will shift traffic on to other roads, principally Earlsdon Avenue South. Enforcing speed limits and parking regulations is the only way to control traffic. If you don't do that, and there's already a widespread view in Earlsdon that you don't, nothing will change.
No
I am a lifelong Earlsdon resident. Most of the proposals are absurd and some are potentially dangerous. If I have a heart attack I want an ambulance as quickly as possible. So do neighbours on the streets you propose to make one way.
I think that, overall, you are trying to crack a nut with a sledge hammer. The proposals seem to be far more biased in terms of cyclists to the detriment of the majority of Earlsdon residents. I assumed that the main reason for this project was to reduce speed in the area and make it a better place to live for us all. This could have been mainly achieved through speed reductions and speed cameras in appropriate places but you have gone so far that you will not make it a better place to live but one that is disjointed and not user friendly to the vast majority of Earlsdon residents. If you were to implement the vast majority of your proposals you would damage the High St. economy, cause resentment between cyclists and car owners and, potentially, encourage residents to look for other places to live. I doubt if that was your original objective but by allowing a small vociferous minority to dominate your plans you are in danger of alienating the vast majority of Earlsdon residents.
Great proposal, this could really change the area and make it fair more safe. Keep up the good work!
A pedestrian crossing is also required at the exit of the footpath adjacent to the railway line on EA North next to the butchers. This would make it easier for pedestrians to cross busy EA North and slow traffic down approaching Earlsdon centre.
I am a resident of Beechwood Avenue between Hartington Crescent mini roundabout and the railway bridge . Without something in place this stretch will continue to be plagued by cars travelling at excessive speeds . The 20mph speed limit will be ignored by these drivers as this isn't a simple case of vehicles mildly exceeding the speed limit .This is a flagrant disregard of the law . Alarming footage of one such incident obtained by Earlsdon speed watch has been presented to Colin Knight .Both directions from the mini roundabout to the railway bridge, and Rochester road are prime for speeding as evidenced by data from the Earlsdon Speedwatch campaign. I understand the reluctance for speed bumps and maybe a Chcane is unworkable but could a pedestrian refuge be considered ?
I plan to attend the drop in session on Monday 25th September where I hope I will have a chance to discuss my concerns with the team.
Nothing
I am surprised that Earlsdon St is not being made one way with City bound traffic going via Arden st (One way lower end) Warwick St one way and Moor St one way This would be safer for pedestrians and would allow parking both sides in some parts. It would allow the city bound bus top to be in Moor St relieving the congestion near the Coop. A bus stop city bound could also be made in Warwick St if thought necessary
Do not do anything that increases traffics in beechwood Avenue which is already a race track

Anything else you want to tell us?
I am generally against all the changes as they are too complex and create lots of difficulties in the area. I am in favour of promoting cycling and walking but don't feel this is the way to go about it. I would prefer that the area is left as it is and you do not implement the Liveable Neighbourhood in Earlsdon
No thanks
The reasons for some of the proposals seem very sketchy, I was told that the Warwick Ave and Styvechale Ave no entry from Beechwood was down to black box data recovered from 2% of cars travelling down those roads, this doesn't seem reason enough to make this decision. A lot of the proposals may make life nicer for some residents on some roads but at the cost of neighbouring roads.
I hope this is a genuine consultation. Using Earlsdon as an experiment and a way to spend a grant, the getting of which, no doubt, someone is celebrating, is a dysfunctional way to approach neighbourhood improvements. Using a sledgehammer to crack a nut when really, all that is happening is that it is a busy area is crazy. Traffic calming is a cost-effective and proven way to increase safety so someone somewhere is just trying to spend money. There are areas of the city desperate for those funds. Spend them where a real - and positive - difference can be made
Please please don't attempt to tackle problems that don't exist. The main issue everywhere is speed. An enforceable 20mph limit would vastly improve all our lives. Slow the traffic with planters on all the main roads, which would be effective and attractive (sleeping policemen where the roads are too narrow). Rat-running is a very minor issue and blocking roads would only create inconvenience, and force traffic on to already-busy roads. And irritated drivers tend to speed up.
Agreeable with all the proposals
Try to stop parents of Henry the 8th primary school park down the Firs and Boradwater if they were to open the school again.
Wider pavements, more investment in small businesses to make the high street better.
A number of beneficial points however several that will worsen travel and the living environment for residents and visitors to Earlsdon. Funds would be better spent elsewhere in those cases. Introduction of no entry points are a particular concern.
Someone is trying to ruin Earlsdon. As I have said above, I was told years ago re the 1way system by people who don't even live in Earlsdon. This is not a neighbourhood initiative which is so sad it is being portrayed as such. Local council should stand up and speak the truth. I have also been made aware of the proposal to put barriers at the end of some roads, unfortunately this was not given discussion time at one of the meetings!!!!!!
Unless you enforce the ideas regarding parking, this won't make any difference. How about creating a bigger carpark to reduce traffic parking on streets?
It is so noisy from the pubs in the summer mixed with the speed of the traffic considering leaving anyway
Please increase (already decent) number of EV charging spaces and increase enforcement for regular cars parking in the EV charging bays. Support transition to clean vehicles and support reduction in vehicle ownership and use that comes with it.
Biggest issue is dog mess and litter - need to fix this. Other big issue is illegal parking - by taxis, delivery drivers and ignorant people. Stop the illegal parking, makes the place a lot safer. No parking on pavements, street corners, zebra crossings. Make the streets look clean and cared for. Don't see much of this in the plans.
Please don't spoil the effects of widening pavements by recklessly cluttering them with massive planters. Space is good, especially of an evening when late nighters are heading home. Planters are the street-architectural equivalent of scatter cushions: too many scatter cushions means that you have bought the wrong sofa. Have confidence in your design and don't spoil it.
Street lighting is generally very poor. Any improvements to lighting would be beneficial
My general feeling is some of these proposals do NOT help everyone and merely move the issues to another part of Earlsdon.
Please take consideration of the residents that are affected by these changes especially Radcliffe Road
No
2 new pedestrian crossings are urgently needed on Earlsdon Avenue South near the junction with Styvechale Avenue; also on the junction of Spencer Road and Warwick Road. These are dangerous areas for school children and people walking to the station.
Main concern is increased traffic on Kenilworth rd which is already bumper to bumper at busy times, increased pollution due to traffic jams and difficulty emerging from Beechwood Ave on to Kenilworth Rd, would this then

Anything else you want to tell us?
require lights.
If implemented can it then be reversed?
Earlsdon has different issues on different streets. Where I live it's speeding / dangerous driving. Traffic calming measures are welcome by me.
The fact you had six months to organise a public meeting then had to cancel at a few days notice as it was not fit for purpose does not fill one with confidence that this plan is workable. Very much would like a public review of the plan say three months after it has been put into place. And that measures that do not work are reversed/ removed.
Repairing damaged pavements would really make the neighbourhood more liveable and that includes dealing with obstructions like overgrown hedges and trees. Regular sweeping to clear away rubbish and leaves (I know the Council has a vastly reduced amenities budget) Some areas need better lighting especially with the current state of some pathways and one or two dark areas like entries to communal drives
To much and to severe. Go to 20 and provide better crossings and more seats. Better disabled access around the area. That's all
I broadly agree with all the proposals outlined. I would however like to see more scope for biodiversity improvements, for example planters and urban gardens. I am concerned over (a) potential loss of car parking spaces, as you know this is at a premium in the area (b) potential loss of trees, there is reference to trees on EA North/South blocking the footpath - any tree removal should be avoided at all costs. I also wonder how all the new restrictions will be policed
Will the 20 mph limit be reversed by recent government pronouncements?
I don't think there is a traffic issue near our road- all that is needed is traffic calming and a crossing on beechwood
I don't think that road closures will benefit the neighborhood. Fixing the roads and more importantly the pavements would be more beneficial. The pavements are a trip hazard. Trying to get the streets clean, and stop the dog poo would be more useful. Beechwood needs to have some traffic calming to deter people using it as a shortcut from tile hill to town. They need to find it an inconvenience and use the A45. If that was sorted the other roads would not be used as a rat race either! The only thing road closures will do and one way systems is make it more difficult for the residents, and make them have to take longer more convoluted journeys, sit in traffic for longer and cause more pollution. A crossing on beechwood would be beneficial, and more yellow lines to stop golfers parking on the road when they have ample parking spaces.
Earlsdon is already considered an excellent place to live. Apart from the traffic on Beechwood Avenue which could easily be sorted I imagine other areas in the city would better benefit from the funds.
I would like to be clear how concerns will be considered and if any changes are likely based on resident concern ?
Thanks for the further consultation. These improvements have been a long-time coming.
I think I've said most. Would parking permits still be used. That reduces parking ?
Although I signed up for emails, I am not receiving any. I speak for many on this topic. Further, at Hollybank we have received no information through the doors on the scheme except for the original letter last year.
Open the public toilets again, or ask the local shops to open these up to non-customers so that everyone can be comfortable whilst out and about
Could you install traffic lights at the junction of Beechwood Avenue and Kenilworth Road to enable safe right turns out of Beechwood Avenue.
Why try to implement so much? Try 20mph first and see how it goes. The cost of doing everything is obscene if a speed restriction will do the job (again, I'm unsure who has complained about what in this area. Traffic flows well and pedestrians are safe- what is the aim in all this? The plans in full are disproportionate to whatever problem you're trying to solve, I suspect you'll create more issues than before.
I am really pleased that so much thought, effort and consultation has gone into the proposals and support the proposals.
No
Just that I don't agree with one way system on spencer avenue.
I'm not sure many of the proposals would have a positive impact and potentially make Earlsdon a less liveable neighbourhood.
Nothing to add. Thank you very much for all your detailed planning, the proposals will transform our

Anything else you want to tell us?
environment if implemented
Agree
There's a lot of noise going on, but I hope the survey results are showing a less noisy majority in favour.
I had hoped for more radical proposals for reducing traffic on earsldon high street such as making it a "shared space".
The proposals does not address the speeding (25-35mph) practice of electric couriers working for food delivery companies. Many of the proposals regarding the cycle paths will make matters worse. There is legislation to deal with this but no enforcement.
Firefighters and ambulances will be slower getting to their destinations as the surrounding roads will be full of slow moving traffic.
There appears to be a number of inconsistencies from earlier consultations. During the initial consultation made in February council reps were reported as saying no roads would be blocked off but the current proposals indicate that roads will be blocked off
A 20 mph speed limit in the whole area would go a long way to improving the environment and far less cost and inconvenience.
<p>* Residents should have had the opportunity to attend a public meeting at a larger venue. The drop in sessions were no substitute. Council officers were unwilling to take on board any views objecting to the proposals and from my experience, anyone asking challenging questions was quickly told their time was up.</p> <p>* Proposals for traffic control are too far reaching. At the initial consultation meeting a Council representative assured residents that that there would be no road blocks but have dishonestly gone back on their word. The new measures are too restrictive and by the Council's own admission, traffic will be pushed outwards creating other pinch points needing additional measures not considered in the initial plan</p> <p>* Many people rely on their car to access shops, businesses in Earlsdon. Making journeys more difficult and no provision for additional parking, is likely to deter people from visiting and reduce footfall for businesses</p> <p>* Cyclists, particularly electric bikes (increasingly used for food delivery) and scooters should not be exempt from traffic restrictions and allowed to travel both directions on a one way street eg, Berkeley Road, Moor Street.</p> <p>* No researched evidence / hard data has been provided to support the need for Earlsdon becoming a Liveable Neighbourhood.</p> <p>*They have proved unpopular in other parts of the country for good reason and I am against these proposals.</p>
I'm not sure who is pushing these (in some cases) quite drastic changes - particularly the one-way systems but there needs to be more consultation. I suspect a lot of residents do not want one ways systems which make accessing their homes even more difficult for no apparent benefit at all. I'm strongly against the one-way proposal for Berkeley Road North and surrounding streets.
Most of this is a waste of money. The car drivers who currently cause problems will continue to do so, more important things for council to spend money on. But this is a different pot of money, but I'm sure some will be council funds which I would rather were spent on people who need it, homeless, child support...
<p>1. The community needs to buy-in to these plans for them to be successful, therefore a vote of some sort is necessary. This should not be all or nothing, as disagreeing with a single proposal could lead to a NO vote. The above measures could be packaged up a little to give maybe ten proposals.</p> <p>2. Many of these proposals become unnecessary if the 20mph limit is implemented, and there is enforcement to assure compliance. Arrangements in place for enforcement will help make the scheme affective,. If enforcement is put in place, many of the other road design changes may be unnecessary and a staggered approach to their implementation could be adopted.</p> <p>3. Double Yellow Lines - there is a significant increase in the number and length of double yellow lines. This will place further limits on parking, when one of the main issues in Earlsdon is parking. In many places extra double lines will just mean more illegal parking, or less visits to the shopping centre, where footfall is already an issue.</p>

Anything else you want to tell us?
Less double yellow lines will give more parking spaces, and more informal traffic calming, as the roadway will be effectively narrowed, and force traffic to proceed more slowly.
The plan is too complex and ambitious. There are many elements. It is taken for granted that all the elements must be done at the same time. It would be more sensible to introduce one at a time, and learn from experience which elements may or may not fit together and may or may not generate excess costs for residents as well as visitors.
I understand that the plan as a whole is backed by modelling, but models are only as good as the ideas and data that go into them. And people have a habit of confounding them.
It would be better to introduce the 20mph zone, and enforce it properly. Proper enforcement can be funded using the resources freed by postponing other elements. Then, observe the effects on traffic around the neighbourhood. It will become evident which further measures would best complement the 20mph zone, or whether the community should stop there, or go back.
Pleased to see them overall, would like to see a clearer link with better air quality, lower carbon...better pavements, more cycle hire, more enforcement of parking on double yellow lines. I find pedestrians in Earlsdon are currently well below motorists and this needs to change.
Don't over interfere...
Don't know how they decided on som of the proposals. Definitely people's views, ideas and problems taken into account.
Can we have some enforcement cameras for the 20 mph streets - just where they are needed most (e.g Albany Road)?
I think it should be permit holders only down the busy streets do avoid people parking there for the highstreet or events at the memorial. This would reduce the traffic a lot
All of these proposals are a waste of money - Earlsdon is fine as it is. Please focus your attention on areas of Coventry that genuinely need it. In addition, I'd like to draw your attention to Coundon. Look how much money was spent on that cycle lane which narrowed the roads for motorists yet is barely used. Seriously, if you count 3 bikes in an hour you're lucky. To me, this whole agenda is an anti-motorist, pro-cycling, pro-green agenda and I am heartily sick of it. As for Sustrans, don't get me started! I asked one of your Town Planners (a rather large gentleman) at St Barbara's if he cycled everywhere. He simpered at me and said... well, I'd like to... but..... Exactly!!
These are sensible, imaginative proposals to manage a very real problem with traffic management .
disappointed that the council was unwilling to hold a public meeting to discuss the proposals; the excuse given did not stand up to scrutiny; public felt let down. the subsequent drop in sessions were poorly organised and the organisers had misjudged the level of feeling with the residents that the public meeting was cancelled. when these proposals go ahead enforcement must be strong
They are necessary, but let's hope Mr Sunak decides not to interfere
I fail to understand why Coventry City council have chosen Earlsdon for this Liveable Pilot scheme. We do not live in a rat run as rumour has labelled it. I know exactly how many cars travel along our roads and neighboring roads and it's under 10 at peak time. The proposed scheme will cause misery to residents in this area. The council ARE NOT thinking of the people who live and work in Earlsdon and I question what it might due to house prices also with such limited parking. Most of these measures are not idealistic.
My main feedback is that it seems as though there are too many changes proposed without fully understanding the knock-on effects - potential unintended consequences. Increased pedestrian crossings and traffic slowing measures for Beechwood Avenue and Albany Road are priority. More important is the deterioration of Earlsdon Street with small local businesses being driven out by high rents reducing the variety of establishments on the street and the local community feel of the neighbourhood. Also, the anti-social activity in the flats on Albany Road - in particular drug dealing.
I think the bus gate should allow permit holders through EA permit holders
Look again at traffic flow around the Warwick Street, Clarendon Street, Moor Street, Arden Street area. The filter at the bottom of Arden Street seems to preclude any flow of traffic from the area. Why is no mention made of residents and their parking needs - not catering for residents is hardly a "liveable neighbourhood".
I don't think all these proposals are necessary- especially the 1-way roads as people already get confused by the 1-way systems in place already. I want to see fewer people, from out of Earlsdon, parking inconsiderately (and illegally) on Earlsdon St and

Anything else you want to tell us?
Providence St and seeming to get away with it.
The proposals are brave and I applaud any radical approach to reduce traffic and increase use of alternatives. Less and slower traffic should be the aim, a dedicated safe route through Earlsdon for Bikes would be ideal, currently not well served by Earlsdon Ave North / South. More planting would be lovely, and i'd love to help with that. Check out the bridge on Earlsdon Ave North - that's mostly me :)
Four EV charging points placed on Beechwood Ave. near Rochester Rd. I have yet to see anyone using these charging points. I believe they have been positioned incorrectly need to be moved. Asking about what profile people who answer this survey are coming from should not be necessary as those who answering are all concerned residents who have an opinion. Profiling could prejudice the results. I have completed the profile.
Erection of bollards on Earlsdon Street to prevent vans, trucks and cars from parking on the pedestrian walkway. They are a nuisance and a danger.
Yes I just cant wait for it to happen! I love the whole concept and feel very sad that it is now being used as a political tool by politicians and those with more powerful influences to try and crush the idea. I live in XXXXXXXX The area has become more blighted with cars parking anywhere. This has to change I think people will accept the ideas with time when they see the improvement on our environment We all just need to stick together to make it happen!
No.
Some of these proposals do not make sense and would make congestion in some areas worse. The road entry restrictions and illogical bus gates would make journeys longer in some instances and therefore add to pollution and delay.
Broadly supportive of the entire scheme. It's not a bad thing to try and make things safer, but a lot of the focus seems to be on directing any and all through traffic (and residents) onto earlsdon avenue south and Albany road. These are already the most congested parts of Earlsdon and it'll have knock on effects on to Kenilworth Road. I think this would be a mistake and end up being at odds with the reason for the scheme.
There is a significant risk that the one way systems will create more problems than they solve.
Overall it feels quite NIMBYish and like a lot of time and expense potentially going into making most people's lives more difficult.
There must be transparency in the decision making process Channeling traffic on to the Kenilworth Rd and Earlsdon Ave will make these roads even busier
I'm afraid the consultation process appears to have been chaotic and poorly managed. I assume the Council are monitoring social media and are aware of the concerns and strength of local feeling these proposal have stirred up. I would like to think that the Council are listening and acting in the best interests of residents, despite the initial mis-steps in the communication process
Please do what you can to stop engine idling, parking on double-yellow lines and dropped kerbs, blocking garages and driveways. Having a traffic warden to patrol Earlsdon for these offences would surely more than pay for itself and would boost air quality and make Earlsdon a much nicer place for residents.
Thank you for working so hard on this scheme. It is very difficult to please everybody but I think we have to give way to progress towards road safety and the environment.
Seems an awful lot of new ideas that would introduce more chaos to Earlsdon rather than less. These ideas might seem clever on paper, but residents with local knowledge seem to be wary of them as they seem to limit residents, there doesn't seem to be much gain with a view to better traffic flow.
It would be helpful to publish the analysis of the comments that led to these proposals being drawn up. My perception is the majority of the proposals relating to traffic flow are resisted by a large number of Earlsdon residents. I am therefore surprised they have been put forward. It would also be helpful to know how the 'open' comments in this survey will be collated and summarised to effectively inform the next steps.
I'd like lots more litter bins please. Earlsdon Ave North is bad for litter. I'd like all bins off the pavements.
Consideration should be given to new traffic lights at the Beechwood Ave/Kenilworth Rd junction. This could be combined with the adjacent pelican crossing. Frustration at delays at this junction at busy times causes drivers to use Styvechale Ave and Stoneleigh Ave. So these new traffic lights together with the proposed closure of Stoneleigh Ave/Kenilworth Rd could remove the need to introduce no entry points on Styvechale

Anything else you want to tell us?
Ave/Warwick Ave.
This area is very popular and densely populated. You aren't doing enough to keep the place clean given the heavy use the high street gets. There are three private car parks on Moor Street which would take residents cars off the road but go unused make a deal with the owners allowing residents to pay for use.
Please remember that residents need easy access to their homes. Not all residents are mobile and rely on their cars to get around. Making roads one way, installing bus gates etc is not only going to be an inconvenience to them but will increase traffic on other residential streets and also increase pollution and use of fossil fuels. (Electric vehicles are a problem for many Earlsdon residents who do not have e drives for home chargers)
Enforcing current laws such as fines for engine idling would in my view go a long way to making Earlsdon much more liveable, so if anything I think the proposals do not go far enough. To make a real difference to air quality and congestion, the scheme needs to come with significantly increased enforcement of speeding fines and parking tickets.
The original proposals for the Liveable area did not include our road, Stoneleigh Avenue, this also applies other roads outside the original footprint. Therefore there has not been a full consultation with everyone. Some of those who did check out the first proposals have no idea of the changes. How much difference will it make to Climate change if you are sending traffic on a longer route and longer queueing with engines running? Has that been considered? Earlsdon is already a liveable neighbourhood if you make it too difficult to get to people won't visit which will change the dynamics of the neighbourhood. It would help if current parking rules were enforced. When was the traffic survey done? In non school holidays you have a very long wait already to get onto the Kenilworth road from Beechwood and Stoneleigh Avenue.
You need to rethink the proposed road closures (especially one near Henry's) as these are just plain stupid
I have lived here for more than 40 years and with increasing age and arthritis am no longer able to cycle or walk with heavy shopping so I need to drive a car and have easy parking (I do not have a blue badge pass at present) There is obviously a Fund given to the Council for the proposed developments Question what is being allocated for Senior Citizens like myself who are not blue badge holders and just want and need to drive places and park easily and safely near shops during the day? The proposed scheme will help cyclists and people living down certain roads and stop speeding (speed bumps preferred) and also those who want to socialise and chat on the high street BUT We pay Council Tax too
Everything here is great
Please think about the post office crossing
The force behind these ideas seems to have come from higher government offering funds to improve urban areas. Similar initiatives in Birmingham Kings Heath and Lozells claim success. I know these areas especially Kings Heath and can see why such actions have been of benefit. These measures do not apply to the area of Earlsdon I live in. "IF ITS NOT BROKE DON'T FIX IT"
Frankly I think the whole scheme is a farce and will not enhance the area at all I feel certain groups have an agenda that they are forcing on residents here The proposal below sums it up We pay taxes etc for our area but it seems the money we pay is not used on the community as it should be eg on enhancing the streets, cleaning drains; supporting young people. The list is endless due to government and council cuts so asking for

Anything else you want to tell us?
us to “ take ownership “ of communal spaces and look after them is like a slap to the face . Do you wish us to form a private police force to enforce all these changes as well?
<p>Happy for more streets to be made one way or for planters to be placed midway down so cars can drive down the streets. And please, more bike parking on all the roads! It's hard living in a terraced house and wanting to own a bike.</p> <p>But more importantly, this only stretches to the more affluent area of Earlsdon. What about Melbourne and Broomfield Road? They're an absolute rat race and need to be made one way or not available to cut through. The speeds people drove down both of those was ridiculous. If you only put a block/planters on the end of Melbourne by Broomfield and also on Broomfield, you'd prevent people tearing down them. Please think of extending your LTN area to these roads, they desperately need them!</p>
It is bound to be unpopular with drivers but imho Earlsdon would be much better with less traffic
They seem very impractical
At a time of financial crisis any changes should be restricted improvements in road safety.
I have seen a number of people in social media opposing the changes. I have seen no relational reasons why they oppose it. I have also seen an unofficial group of residents engage a councillor from outside the area to gather opposition. This same group have been extremely dismissive of views opposed to their opinions. I would urge the council to not see this group as representative of opinion particularly with them being advised by a councillor not from earlsdon ward
<p>Apart from the 20mph speed limit and a few crossing points I think the whole scheme should be abandoned. Forcing people to drive round in circles, some of them very lengthy, adds to congestion, pollution, cost and frustration. It does not make for 'livability' and promotes divisiveness not neighbourliness.</p> <p>A liveable neighbourhood needs accessible facilities and services. It needs support for Libraries, health facilities, community activities. Businesses need to be able to thrive, but this scheme will reduce their customers, add to their costs. If you want to reduce car journeys then a shuttle bus would help. To promote walking you need clean pavements.</p> <p>Earlsdon is one of the best parts of Coventry to live, but this would make it much less so. There must be many areas much more in need of investment and improvement. Why not help them?</p>
Too many people parking on yellow lines and they don't care about getting a fine. They should increase charges to discourage those parking on them.
I think these are mostly great ideas. I would even take some ideas further, such as make Earlsdon street pedestrian-only
Make a point of talking SPECIFICALLY to older people, mobility-disabled people, visually impaired people, people with small children etc. Don't create human traffic jams in the name of liveable neighbourhoods! Remember that the saplings of today become the monster trees with pavement exploding root systems of the future.
Actually invest in the neighbourhood. Earlsdon High St could be like a Shoreditch, but the plans are focused on traffic and not improving Earlsdon
I don't think closing the roads is a good idea. Lowering the traffic speed is but there needs to be something in plan to make sure this happens. Beechwood avenue is used as a rat run with cars accelerating once they come round the bend after Rochester Road especially at night. Needs some enforcement cameras
You should come up with a blueprint for all residential roads that's makes them less about cars and more about living there. The amount of unusable space directly outside our houses is enormous and kids should be able to play there. They should be greener and healthier. They should and can accommodate cars, but they shouldn't be exclusively for cars.
I appreciate the hard work and thought that has gone into this proposal. I hope that it will lead to a significant improvement in the living environment for pedestrians and children in particular.
<p>90% of the proposals being discussed are related to traffic, and not necessarily improving conditions for pedestrians. Many of the matters discussed during the site walk related to the experience of moving around Earlsdon on foot – narrow pavements, places to cross, cars mounting pavements etc, and in reality very few have been addressed here.</p> <p>Whilst the traffic calming measures on Beechwood are welcomed, and particularly the narrowing of the roundabout, and avoidance of using speedbumps to slow traffic, from a wider traffic movement perspective however, it is evident the majority of traffic from the Beechwood side (the entire eastern side here) is being pushed either down the High St, or Beechwood Ave to Kenilworth Road, when its necessary to travel across</p>

Anything else you want to tell us?

Earlsdon. And believe me people do need to travel across

This is problematic.

As a pedestrian, travelling down the High St is challenging. Pavements aren't wide enough. There is too much activity happening down that street (vehicles mounting kerbs, blocking junctions when crossing). It is unsafe as a pedestrian crossing that street daily (commute to work) due to heavy traffic flow, cars parking on double yellows at junctions, and the pavement frequently being far too narrow for volume of people.

As a driver, it is challenging navigating around illegally parked vehicles, those trying to park or generally just a tight road which always has a high volume of traffic.

Whilst I agree with the ability to close off the high st, and some of the other elements being proposed down here. I feel that the location of a new crossing at the bottom of the street opposite Co-Op is actually not the best location. It would be better further up the street where the majority of people are naturally crossing the street. Whilst I generally avoid the high street as a driver because of the frequent chaos, the roundabout is also very difficult to navigate as a driver due to having to look in the opposite direction to see if people are crossing when looking if there is oncoming traffic. Even if you're stationary.

- However as drivers, we will now have to drive down this street MORE as a result of the proposals. So it cannot be avoided.

The other issue is the Beechwood junction with Kenilworth Road. This junction is quite frankly a nightmare and is dangerous for anyone turning right in or out of it.

PLEASE ADD TRAFFIC LIGHTS TO THE BEECHWOOD AVE JUNCTION WITH KENILWORTH ROAD :-)

There is frequently traffic build up on this junction down Beechwood – which would be exacerbated as a result of the proposals.

Many folk actually cut down Styvechale or Warwick to go to the traffic lights at Earlsdon Ave S, even if going back on themselves – just to avoid the Beechwood junction. By implementing no entry signs on both streets at the same end will force more to take this junction and more hazards created. Serious accidents have occurred here over the years, and countless near misses.

It would actually help much of the issues being stated around Styvechale and Warwick Aves if the Beechwood junction had traffic lights, and then the no entry signs could be alternated to opposite ends. Other traffic calming measures could be used down these streets as well.

It is very concerning that all traffic is now being forced down either an already very chaotic street, or to a dangerous junction with lights.

I'd like to see more measures are being explored to improve conditions for pedestrians, because at present these are unclear.

When walking at night, many folk take the streets which have cars travelling down them because it feels more safe. Removing all cars where possible will make some streets feel less safe. It's a balance sure, but better (sustainable) lighting measures, or reducing trip hazards, widening pavements etc would be money better spent in some locations.

E.g. warwick ave is a trip hazard due to the trees - which are lovely - but a wider pedestrian path would narrow the road. People already walk in the road to avoid the pavement, and there is a lot of people walking down there - its a pleasant street to walk down.

Extend it to slow 30mph on Kenilworth. More frees rather than hideous council planters. Extend the double yellow lines from Kenilworth road to woodland Ave/stoneleigh junction because the cars block sight of cars coming off Kenilworth road, and block the sight for the cars coming round the corner off Kenilworth road. The bush on the corner also makes it very dangerous for cycle path/ people walkers. It's bloody dangerous all around there.

In principle I support proposals to slow traffic and reduce "through" traffic in residential areas E.g. 20mph and one way streets where there are clear "grid" patterns as there are in Earlsdon. I did not comment on the original proposals for the liveable neighbourhood as I don't live in the affected streets, so I was then surprised to find

Anything else you want to tell us?
the bus gate proposal for Spencer Road, as this impacts me negatively without any of the benefits of slower traffic/one way streets in my part of Earlsdon. So I will strongly object to the bus gate proposal if it is taken forward as planned.
<p>Agree largely in principle. As we are directly affected by changes to Spencer Ave which are significant, I think the first communication was poor, there was insufficient information on the context / why of the proposals, road names impacted were confused e.g. Newcombe / Spencer Ave. The supporting detail on the website has more context which I appreciated. Maybe these should also of been distributed through letterboxes to directly impacted households, particularly the demographic I suspect will complain more will not always have access to this material as I think this would of headed off some of the resistance with accurate information. At this point, it is unclear however how we will access our households and I would greatly support the bus gate being extended to allow the area permit holders.</p> <p>I support any measures that will reduce the traffic and associated noise on Spencer Ave. We have recently moved here (8 months) and we have had a car damaged, road rage incidents including family visitors, antisocial beeping in the early hours of the morning, vehicles too large using this road, speeding in the night. You'll appreciate the frontings to the houses aren't deep and so the noise really carries.</p> <p>I'm concerned that due to communications and the local resistance these issues will not be appropriately addressed, the emphasis needs to be placed upon stopping earlsdon being a cut through for out of area traffic.</p>
I am extremely concerned with the effect on the BROADWAY / MAYFIELD crossing if the one way system is activated in Spencer Avenue.already the vision is restricted by parked cars etc.
<p>I really feel that this as far as traffic is concerned an enormously over engineered proposal. the twenty mile an hour limit if enforced would solve the vast majority of problems. This is very likely to stop all casual "cut through" traffic</p> <p>All your proposals are not going to stop Traffic heading to King Henry's of to other attractions such as Golf and tennis</p>
No
I am extremely worried that these proposals if carried out will ruin the atmosphere in Earlsdon. I agree that speed needs to be reduced in certain roads but these proposals are a sledgehammer to crack a nut. So many cheaper perfectly effective ways of reducing speed are available to put in place without ruining Earlsdon and making it an area where no one will want to come to because of confusing road signage, no parking, inconvenient one way roads and closures.
I think you are closing off Earlsdon to the rest of the city.
I am concerned that the pressure from the so-called freedom lobby might cause the livable neighbourhood proposals to be watered down. This would be a tragedy. I have considered leaving Earlsdon after living here since 1991 and before that as a student. My primary concern is noise (mainly traffic noise) and the unpleasantness of being a pedestrian in Coventry. I think the benefits of low-traffic environments could be communicated better than they have been and certainly not enough to counter the propaganda in many parts of the public press and social media.
<p>Something to dissuade "boy racers" using Albany road as a drag race strip</p> <p>Noise levels of these cars, particularly late at night</p>
I don't see how any of the proposals reduce traffic, just change it to different roads and casue confusion. Local journeys potentially longer because of one way systems, bus gates and no entry routes
There has been insufficient consultation (public meeting cancelled) and a number of people I've mentioned it to had no idea this was even proposed
Bus gates don't work. They will lead to more traffic on the road and larger distances travelled which is bad for the environment and stress levels.
Instead of shutting roads and implementing a whole range of one way systems why do you not just implement a 20 miles speed limit across earlsdon
You need to listen to what people in earlsdon want and not just go ahead with what you want to do. A lot of people are angry about something they don't want being imposed on them. You need to calm traffic on the roads that are a problem, not everywhere
We welcome many visitors to Earlsdon and the scheme is very well thought out. We look forward to the changes.
A much better use of money would be traffic calming measures in the area. Eg speed bumps or average speed

Anything else you want to tell us?
cameras on Spencer and similar 'rat runs'
I appreciate all the work that has gone into this & sincerely believe that the overall scheme-despite my personal reservations about one or two measures- is a well considered step towards increased liveability by improving road safety etc & looking to provide a more balanced access for all types of road users. Thank you.
Some of the ideas are good others make no sense.
Other than a single page of information about these proposals sometime at the end of last year nothing has arrived through my letter box to inform me of the Liveable Neighbourhood Scheme. I was only made aware of it when my daughter (who does not live in Earlsdon) saw it mentioned on Facebook. I think that the council's cancellation of the public meeting and the reliance of social media and the council's own web site has been a very dubious way of 'getting the information out there' . Many of the people I have spoken to had no idea of these proposals. If you don't know things are changing how can you object to them. I have seen no evidence that any of these changes have valid statistics to make them necessary. It feels every much is if Earlsdon is saying we don't need this but the council is saying yes you do.Earlsdon is already a very liveable neighbourhood these proposals will make it less so.
<p>The lack of supporting evidence for any of these changes is very alarming. I have been an Earlsdon resident for nearly 50 years and cannot recall a serious motor traffic accident so please before proceeding supply full accident data.</p> <p>I was informed at a recent drop in session that the traffic density maps provided, which have a completely meaningless legend, were compiled from insurance companies data from those motorists with a fitted 'black box'. These motorists comprise less than 2% of the total. Again before proceeding we must have much better and auditable data.</p> <p>Many of the local residents I have spoken to seem resigned to the fact that this is a 'done deal' and will happen regardless of this survey or consultation. The comments in some of the above proposals regarding our opinions on the style and maintenance of the road closing planters etc (as opposed to whether or not they should be there at all) would tend to confirm this.</p> <p>The cancellation of a recent public meeting would also tend to confirm this. The very poor communication, I was made aware of this only a few weeks ago and surely should not every Earlsdon resident have been individually notified of this, would also tend to confirm this.</p> <p>I very much hope this is not the case.</p> <p>Recent press speculation has suggested that our council may well be forced to declare itself insolvent in the near future. It would be scandalous if that were the case and to happen at the same time as a cosmetic exercise to what is already a popular and liveable area costing several hundred thousand pounds.</p>
<p>please make cycling more attractive and the cycling routes better sign posted.</p> <p>Encouraging more art in area and opportunity for music would be good</p> <p>Ongoing money needs identifying for upkeep of planters/trees and any road safety measures. Is it available?</p> <p>Concern about disruption as changes are made.</p> <p>Can you provide more rubbish bins around area?</p> <p>Can support be given to plant up wider alleyways with fruit, flowers or vegetables eg alley behind Berkeley Rd North and beside Gilbert Richard Centre?</p> <p>Q 17 seems to want a 1 word answer - in answer to that; agree that this would create a more cohesive community and is an opportunity for physical activity worth pursuing but support is harder to ensure.</p>
Some good bits but most should be scrapped - definitely no bus gate.
This scheme seems bent on moving problems elsewhere. Apart from speed limits and crossings it should be abandoned. Simplistic solutions implied in this will not provide liveability or improve the lives of residents. Spend the money on areas which may need more care and there must be many areas in Coventry that deserve more consideration.
I have found out about these plans at a very late stage and no consultation was given to me. I had to find out second hand and some of the ideas are good, but I do not think the one way system will improve anything, if anything I think it will just move the traffic further out and create more congestion for all
<p>Most important would just to get cars off the road, and get them to slow down. The driver-culture, speeding and hostility to cyclists is awful.</p> <p>I do feel very luck living in Earlsdon, but I must also say (not to you guys, but to our council) that the decision to ignore Spon End residents and tarmac over their green space... despite months of protesting and chaining themselves to trees... was fucking abominable. It feels like those in cheaper/local authority housing were sacrificed for the "greater good" of ignorant, selfish car drivers, who don't seem to realise that private car</p>

Anything else you want to tell us?

ownership is incompatible with a healthy population of 10 bn people on planet Earth. However, we in Earsdon are listened to and valued (older homeowners with more power, capital and a tendency to vote). Leaves a very, very sour taste. I hope they get their chance next (even though it's arguably too late).

I have several problems with the "Liveable Neighbourhood" scheme being dis-ingenuousness - i believe that a very high proportion of the residents of Earlsdon are already more than aware & appreciative that we are lucky enough to live in probably the most "Liveable Neighbourhood" in Coventry - indeed it has featured in The Times as one of the most desirable places to live - <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/coventry-earlsdon-west-midlands-best-places-to-live-in-the-uk-2020-2kk3zb2nv> plus locally featuring in the Coventry Telegraph recently <https://www.coventrytelegraph.net/news/coventry-news/went-place-readers-say-best-27129916> & <https://warks.muddystilettos.co.uk/best-places-to-live/best-places-to-live-west-midlands-earlsdon/> . Many of us enjoy a premium on our house value which reflects just how much of a "liveable neighbourhood" Earlsdon is.

Therefore please be authentic about what this proposal actually is - a series traffic management schemes, a Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN). Many of the proposals really do not take into account the traveling needs of our diverse community many of whom depend on their cars either to travel; to and from work, elderly residents with limited mobility that drive or have carers, parents with children who school and leisure far & wide...Many of these possibly will initially reduce some traffic that travels through Earlsdon but the greater cost will be the increased stress and time of residents trying to get in or leave "fortress" Earlsdon. In addition by seeking to make it as difficult or as uncomfortable as possible to navigate through Earlsdon it may well be the final nail in the coffin for the already struggling Earlsdon High Street. Shoppers will just go somewhere else where they do not need to navigate pointless one way systems, never ending cyclist / pedestrian crossings and frustrating no entry roads.

As already noted above i have serious concerns over no entry roads and access for the Emergency Services - at the drop in session i was advised by the Community Engagement Consultant that conversations had been had with Emergency Services representatives but that at this point no formal Risk Assessment has been completed. I was advised to email to request further details but prior to any funds being allocated this must be a priority and made publicly available.

I am conscious that Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) are becoming more numerous however there are real issues with their introduction and many report that they simply "push the problems elsewhere". That by creating longer journeys it makes drivers create more emissions from being pushed elsewhere and having to spend more time in traffic to get around the measures - local residents just trying to go about their everyday lives included! The very people you seek to improve their locality ultimately being the most disadvantaged and challenged from the measures implemented.

Benn waiting years for this. Earlsdon had so much potential to be a nice area to live rather than just a rat run.

I do think that if we can reduce the traffic cutting through then some of the other measures may be overkill ? I sense a lot of people are just thinking selfishly and not holistically on these proposals. Any limitations will have effects elsewhere. But ring roads and trunk roads should be better placed to cope with traffic than residential roads

In general the traffic calming measures are good, but the proposals to restrict entry/exit to certain roads are appalling and will have terrible unintended consequences. They will force more traffic onto main pedestrian routes, making our neighbourhood far more polluted, and far less walkable or liveable.

Radcliffe Road and the adjacent part of Rochester Road seem to have been completely ignored in the proposals, yet they will bear the brunt of the traffic flow changes.

Double yellow lines are needed on the junction of Rochester Road and St Andrews Road. Parents dropping/collecting their children at the nursery park right on the junction most days, hampering visibility for anyone seeking to cross St. Andrews (especially children walking to and from Earlsdon school). This is despite the fact that there are always sufficient parking spaces between St Andrews Road and Shaftesbury Road. I have complained to the nursery numerous times about the selfish and dangerous parking by their customers, but most are still too lazy to walk an extra 50 yards to park in a safe place.

Please check that the proposed improvements and traffic restrictions allow access for residents and no bottle necks

Enthusiastic about all

Anything else you want to tell us?
i see that the number 2 bus is not going to be running down Earlsdon st from Nov 5th and do not know
We moved to Earlsdon from Leamington Spa a couple of years ago and we love this area but there are some real bugbears that if sorted I think it would encourage people to stay and help Earlsdon to thrive. Spencer Avenue is a wonderful, historic road and within the conservation area, but the speed of some of the cars makes me genuinely worry about our 4 year old son who goes to school on his bike etc. The volume of two way traffic has got to be managed somehow, I note the recent resurfacing attempt (which isn't great quality by the way if you need to feed back!), but our road will be a mess again very quickly because of the sheer volume of commuting vehicles. If nothing else, please make Spencer Avenue safer and quieter - it's a gem of Earlsdon and needs to be looked after. Overall I think the proposals are good and will certainly help if implemented.
I think the majority of it should be left alone regards to the changing on roads and one way systems, just creates needless havoc
These proposals are sensible, proportionate and in my view, overdue. The volume and speed of traffic along Spencer Avenue has to be seen to be believed.
Why is there no question on the Arden St proposals??
Despite the public criticisms I have seen, I am all for making our community better and would like to help in anyway I can. These ideas seem reasonable to me and I think they should be pushed forward in the process. Living on Spencer Avenue, it really does scare me how fast people drive up and down our road. With my kids or anyone else's kids in the park or the school it feels like only a matter of time before something really bad happens. Then there are the elderly who also live around here who have their difficulties crossing the roads and getting about. The whole design of the original road plans, quite rightly feel so old and due to modern traffic count, aren't coping. Something needs doing well and quickly.
When each of the proposed schemes is considered in it's entirety, it is clear that vehicle traffic will not be able to move around Earlsdon easily, roads will become blocked at times and people will not be able to travel in their vehicles. The proposed one way and blockaded roads will unfairly push traffic on to other roads, causing more pollution and upset to those that live in the affected streets. I honestly can't believe this scheme is even being proposed, it is ludicrous with the only intent of limiting car journeys. Every single person I have spoke to, bar two people, are angered by this proposed scheme and do not want it to be implemented.
Earlsdon is a lovely place to live and visit. Car parking is and will remain a major issue for residents and visitors for many years - i.e unless and until we get a much better public transport infrastructure. ELN plans should not reduce parking as this would increase resident dissatisfaction rather than enhance it.
It is not something to be done piecemeal; the overall scheme makes sense and should be enacted, perhaps with one or two tweaks following feedback.
Due consideration should be given to pedestrians - many Earlsdon pavements are in appalling condition resulting in a hazard to elderly people.
Please expand to include Canley and Sir Henry Parkes Road
The consultation process has been badly conducted. I understood ELN only affected south Earlsdon, so didn't involve me. Then the area changed, and no contact was made, few opinions were sought from the new area. The radical impact on the north Earlsdon area was then communicated as a done deal. I am not happy that the main public meeting was cancelled.
not a good idea at all. This will reduce the number of people from across the city using Spencer Park
Please take businesses into consideration.
The leaflet we received was half the size it should have been. The information about Arden street and Shaftesbury Road was misleading - sounded more like calming but at a drop in I attended apparently these are to be no entry. The lack of proof reading was shocking - talks of Shaftesbury Avenue and Warwick Road = neither of which are part of Earlsdon. It does not bode well for this scheme is this is the level of attention given to it. just makes me feel money will be wasted on poorly planned work
Personally I think there are too many proposals here. I agree with some but am opposed to many. My own view is that many issues on Earlsdon Street could be dealt with through enforcement. - Cars parking on yellow lines outside Millseys at the junction with Moor Street blocking traffic - Cars stopping opposite the Coop blocking traffic - Cars parked on yellow lines outside Millseys on Moor Street - Cars parking on the pavement at any point along Earlsdon Street

Anything else you want to tell us?
<p>- Cars speeding on Earlsdon Street This could be dealt with by issue speeding or parking tickets so that drivers change their habits and think twice in the future. I am opposed to blocking entry to roads, the bus gate, the chicane as I just feel they are unnecessary and a waste of money. Adding double yellow lines - what difference will it make unless it is enforced. We need to educate drivers to be considerate and to drive carefully in the neighbourhood. I think the proposals are a sledgehammer and will cause inconvenience to residents in the area who drive carefully and are considerate. I think there are too many proposals and disagree with many.</p>
<p>The money used in Earlsdon Street would be better used making the road and pavements safer and useable. The restriction of the proposed access to roads will bsdly affect the thoughtput of traffic on other roads. Where is the evidence to support these proposals?</p>
<p>We need better pavements across the main walking / shopping areas - its very uneven and hazardous to walk</p>
<p>I have been pleased with the consultation process. I attended an online consultation last year, my husband attended a walk around the area and I have been to a drop in session which I found very informative. Overall I am happy with the ideas and, obviously, have more opinions linked to the street I live on. Cars will always be a part of Earlsdon as so many residents commute beyond the area and city so access in and out for residents is important. I don't want to make my area less livable because I am unable to reach my road easily after work or that I am unable to park near my house. This means some of the road closures proposed would be an issue if continued. Once home I do not use my car and walk to town or around Earlsdon so can see the benefits of pedestrian crossings, wider pavements on Earlsdon avenue.</p>
<p>I would like to know how all the individual proposals will fit together. I would have liked a public meeting at which the team could have explained how all of this will work together. It's very complicated</p>
<p>I generally like most of the proposals, and hope they get realised soon. There are two issues that I find were not addressed at all. Firstly, the crossing of Earlsdon Avenue South (and to a lesser degree Earlsdon Avenue North). EAS has three pedestrian refuge crossings east of the roundabout. The first one is at Berkeley Road North and South. This crossing is off the desire line. With the no-entry at both Berkeley Roads, maybe it could be moved onto the desire line. The middle one is near Styvechale Avenue, and it is placed next to a bend in EAS. The visibility crossing north to south at this crossing is so bad (as eastbound traffic can only be seen at the last second), that I tell my children not to use this crossing in this direction, and rather cross somewhere else. The final crossing is at the Firs, again miles off any desire line from Belvedere Road to Warwick Avenue. In my opinion, a zebra crossing between Belvedere Road and Warwick Avenue (where the road is also at the widest) is necessary. This would also create a clear entry point into the 20mph zone. A narrowing of the road at this point would also reinforce this message. The other missing item is better east-west safe cycle infrastructure, from War Memorial Park to Hearsall Common. While the measures will improve the North-South cycle permeability, the perpendicular direction is still lacking. A calming of Spencer Road/Avenue with the bus gate might make this corridor (and continuing to Newcombe Road) an alternative, but then still EAN remains (I do appreciate this is outside the consultation area for now).</p>
<p>Are there any interested parties on the council living in the area who would benefit from these changes ie quieter streets?</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The emphasis should be on reducing traffic speed by use of calming measures like the 20mph limit and chicanes etc and especially the use of planters on roads. 2. The road closures would create problems, increase journeys and CO2 emissions etc - these need to be dropped from the plan. 3. Pavements are not mentioned anywhere - to increase walking money saved on not closing roads should be used to repair/resurface pavements which are in a poor state. 4. More should be done about Earlsdon Street. Illegal parking and speeding are just 2 current problems. Reducing the speed limit to 10mph on Earlsdon St would be good. The entrance to Providence Street and the first 30/40 yards could be narrowed to stop what is currently an illegal parking hotstop. Make some parking spots in roads off/close to Earlsdon Street - not outside people's homes - time limited during the day time to create more shopper parking.
<p>Extend it to earsldon avenue north</p>
<p>I think the focus is wrong. Slowing traffic is a great idea, particularly on Beechwood Avenue but also on Earlsdon Avenue South - not considered in the proposal. Blocking routes will exacerbate current issues. Improving the area is key: More planting, fix paths and pavements, improve Earlsdon Street.</p>

Anything else you want to tell us?

However, I do believe there is greater need for community improvement elsewhere in the city.

Please consider the festival. We raise thousands for local charities and get 15-20 thousand people come. It's a massive event that all the businesses and local organisations benefit from. Road closures will stop us putting this on.

In brief:

Traffic slowing and things to improve pedestrian safety and pavement environment = YES

Traffic rerouting and flow restrictions/reduction in route options in any form = NO

We strongly would like Arden street to no be a rat run with lots of cars speeding through and crashing on an ongoing basis. Also to take into consideration plans from the residents of the street that they live on to be prioritised above residents who don't live on those streets.

I think these are good proposals. I would add that speed cameras on Earlsdon Avenue South and North would be a good idea.

Many pavements and footpaths are uneven with trip hazards. The proposals give emphasis to cycling and walking as well as reducing traffic speed so the quality of paving should be addressed. Many continental cities use smaller paving blocks which are easier to remove and replace when underground services need to be maintained, repaired or updated

Outrageous that residents have not been properly consulted! Some good proposals but traffic flow ideas seem to be optimistic/flawed. The resulting inconvenience to residents seems like an arrogant imposition in view of the lack of consultation! Obviously some changes would be beneficial but overall this looks like a sledgehammer to crack a nut. What percentage of residents have suggested these changes? A lot of these proposals have not be thought through properly - any money available for improvements should be spent on repairing pavements and monitoring/enforcing poor parking. Earlsdon would be more liveable without so many food outlets and with a better range of retail options (restrictions on greedy landlords who price out businesses that are useful to locals!)

The Liveable Neighbourhood Scheme is not what I would term a liveable neighbourhood scheme but one that is a scheme to manage traffic and restrict peoples movements in the free manner they enjoy today.

The current scheme appears to have grown arms legs and much more than the original scheme that my road was not part of. I found out late by chance through a friend who had seen something on social media. No communication from the council had been received through my door or my neighbours. I never wanted to be part of this scheme and yet somehow with no consultation or communication I am.

Who said Earlsdon needs a liveable neighbourhood scheme? I chose to live here as it is already one of the most desirable if not the most desirable neighbourhood to live in within Coventry. It is well known for its tree lined roads and avenues. Access to green spaces with the excellent Memorial Park. Good schools, colleges, and access to the University's. Social and sporting clubs thrive, the village community feel that the area has. Good local shopping. Excellent traffic routes already in place allowing freedom in and out of the City for all, and to the surrounding areas. Easy access to the main railway station and Canley station. Property prices alone indicate the desirability of the area.

If this scheme actually focussed on the things that are important to the residents we would have lower crime with more visible policing, bobby's on the beat, cleaner streets, no potholes, no dog fouling. Some of the pavements are in need of maintenance. Raised slabs, cracked and raised concrete. Only the other day my mother-in-law fell after tripping on Beechwood Avenue, smashed her face open bleeding, swollen eye socket, gashed leg. Fortunately she hasn't broken any bones, but for an 83 year old lady to make the area more liveable, Fix the pavements! Reopen the public toilets and maintain them by the Library. Get rid of the weeds that are growing everywhere, and provide enforcement penalties for those dog owners who do not pick up after their dogs who foul the pavements.

Providing more street furniture, benches, planters, cycle racks will not enhance our lives. They will become unsightly, and shabby. I don't know as it has not been made public but my guess is there will be no ongoing money for maintenance and upkeep of these items. This will fall on a small number of volunteers to maintain their upkeep, and when the volunteers can no longer do it who will then? We should not be reliant on good natured volunteers. This is not a sustainable way of introducing and maintaining these changes in our neighbourhood.

Anything else you want to tell us?

This scheme will not enhance our lives or make Earlsdon a more desirable place to live. It will help with killing off the high street, making businesses leave or go out of business, and the end result is one that pushes Earlsdon to become more like other areas of the City unloved and uncared for. I for one do not want these proposals as laid out.

The scheme needs to be paused and let the residents of Earlsdon have proper consultation and provide the council with direction if any changes are to be made, let the residents decide. In a democratic country this scheme and it's proposed way of consulting with the residents it affects, is far from being one where we feel we have had a proper say in the matters that will affect our daily lives. How many of the decision makers actually live in Earlsdon? Why can't the people of Earlsdon have a proper vote on this scheme? How many of the decision makers can say they truly represent the residents of Earlsdon?

I did not received the leaflets which were distributed in September 2023. A comment on Facebook 'Earlsdon' alerted me to the latest proposals.

Disappointed that the public meeting on 14th September 2023 at Earlsdon Methodist Church was cancelled. There was no excuse for this, and the meeting should be reinstated/rescheduled, and if further meetings are needed, then schedule them in.

This is not a Liveable Neighbourhood scheme. This is a Low Traffic scheme. A neighbourhood which is 'liveable' would be a reduction in crime (experienced first hand with house burglary and two cars stolen, thus sleeping uneasy in our beds, fearing it will happen again), footpaths and pavements which are NOT in are a deplorable state, posing a significant risk to pedestrians. The cracked, uneven, and potholed surfaces make it difficult for people to walk safely, especially the elderly and those with mobility issues. My 83 year old mother had a serious fall on XXXXXXX, resulting in a knee injury, a black eye, bleeding and bruised face. There are weeds everywhere, blocked drains, filthy pavements, dog poo. Earlsdon is turning into a hovel. Money needs to be spent on these things, so that people can walk in a nice environment. A Banking Hub would be nice, now that all the banks and Building Society have gone.

Your version of the 'Liveable Neighbourhood' scheme does not address these issues.

When money is tight, it seems an awful waste of money, whichever 'pot' it is coming from!

As this proposal is a Pilot, how long would the Pilot last for, before being reverted back to how it was?

You state that "It is shaped by the community....." Earlsdon residents have not asked for this. Why don't you put your Pilot somewhere else in the city?

Nope

Whilst I appreciate that there was literature early in this scheme, it would seem from local public opinion that most people did not fully appreciate the full facts. This was compounded by the cancellation of the only meeting where opinions could be expressed fully and frankly . The drop in sessions were only a tick box solution with no chance to bounce ideas and on line did not allow this fully. The strength of feeling expressed at the meeting organised by a resident amplified this feeling of exclusion of local opinion in order to boost a traffic free zone.

The proposals tackle some issues with the neighbourhood that have long needed addressing. However, the totality of the proposals feels quite overwhelming and excessive, and needs to be slimmed down. Making all of these changes will have complex interactions and lead to unforeseen consequences, and so some restraint needs to be applied. Moreover, the proposals have given grist to the conspiracy-minded fringe, and undermined the purpose of making the area more liveable for the sane majority. I would like to see only the most popular of these proposals implemented, and a moratorium placed on further modifications/restrictions until they can be tested in the real world.

This plan contains a few credible proposals, but it has been hijacked by the minority of residents who led the initial planning, and has been followed by a flawed and poorly managed consultation process. Its title is a euphemism for "reduced traffic plan". If it was genuinely about enhancing Earlsdon as a "liveable neighbourhood" it would embrace such things as substantially improved, regular street cleaning (of footpaths and roads), and regular enforcement of parking restrictions (unlike the current "once in a blue moon" activity), rather than restricting the use of the private car. The area has a significant number of on-street electric charging points which are used, but not in great numbers, and if moving Earlsdon towards a cleaner, greener traffic environment, increasing awareness of their existence would be a more sensible step than some of the

Anything else you want to tell us?

ideas included in this plan. The inclusion of the next question (question 17) is a clear indication that a decision has been made to proceed with this plan regardless of views expressed by Earlsdon residents.

The proposals fail to address the highly dangerous junction of Beechwood Avenue and Kenilworth Road. This needs traffic lights as per Earlsdon Avenue so that residents in that area (Woodland, Stoneleigh, Beechwood Aves) can exit safely without having to go down Warwick or Styvechale Aves.

Analysis of through traffic from insurance black box data is mentioned but not analysis of local traffic. The proposals will greatly extend local journeys and displace them onto already congested routes. This analysis should be published. Also the traffic maps that are included do not seem to support the existence of most of the claimed 'rat-runs'.

Pedestrian journeys do not appear to have been analysed. eg. for Woodland/Stoneleigh residents to reach the bus stop on Earlsdon Ave they need a crossing point on Beechwood Ave near Warwick Avenue.

There should be more measures to encourage walking. eg:

- Blocking off streets and reducing traffic actually makes walking more intimidating at night.

- the paving in the alleys from Earlsdon Ave South to Broadway is in a very dangerous state and needs to be fixed.

- Pavements need to be free of dog mess.

The use of alleyways by cyclists also needs to be clarified – the present shared usage is dangerous.

As above, making Warwick Avenue no entry from Beechwood Avenue is not acceptable. This will make the junction with Earlsdon Road South busier and more dangerous. Through journeys by cars is not an issue on Warwick Avenue. What is an issue is the speed with which cars drive down the road. The introduction of double chicanes along the road with large planters 1/3 and 2/3rds of the way along the road will significantly reduce the speed cars and vans can drive at which not adding unnecessary time, distance, cost and environmental impact to journeys for those who live on the road.

Local parking is a real problem and will become more so with electric cars in future. One easy should free up more space in roads.

permit parking restrictions on Earlsdon Avenue South need to be extended to side streets eg Berkeley Road South because atm everyone just parks there instead

Not enough consultation - lots of people don't even know it's happening. It doesn't make Earlsdon a more liveable neighbourhood but just seems like redirection of traffic. Good for some but not for others

Yes. I would like the road outside of Nexus in Albany road changed to delivery only. Since they started up a Sunday service people keep parking all along the road and it causes a lot of problems.

Reopening or creating new public toilets in Earlsdon Street would be by far the most useful single thing you could do.

The consultation has been poorly organised as far as the Spencer Avenue end of the area is concerned and it is unfortunate that we have not had a public meeting. There must be one when the results of the consultation have been processed.

I think that as a recent meeting was cancelled as venue too small, it would be good to arrange another public meeting before proceeding further. Matters should also be revisited as the Spon End works were taking place when surveys were carried out initially. Things may be different now.

The scheme makes sense; the main concern is: blocking Spencer Avenue will generate cut-through traffic in adjacent streets which is the opposite of what is wanted.

I'm in favour of cleaner living. However, these proposals have been generated by a team who don't seem to have understanding of existing issues that will be amplified for the worse with what is being suggested.

I'm a resident of Beechwood Avenue and have only just found out about the extent of the proposals. My wife also had no clue. This has therefore been really badly communicated and to then find out that the proposals to make it a more Liveable Neighbourhood are actually making it less liveable for us is really distressful.

I think the focus should be on the 20 mph limit, improvements to Earlsdon Street, the safety measures on Beechwood Avenue and the improvements to pedestrian walkways - I think great care should be taken in respect of restricting vehicle access to residential streets as it has huge potential for unintended consequences.

Seems a totally useless waste of money when far more vital improvements could be made. Inconsiderate parking on the pavements, broken and uneven flagstones, unruly social behaviour at weekends and evenings etc.

Anything else you want to tell us?

I am extremely disappointed about the way the consultation has been handled. Many of the points in the scheme are sensible/great ideas. Unfortunately the original consultation was focused on a small 'liveable neighbourhood area' that did not include a considerable number of the actual streets affected e.g. Spencer Road/Avenue and my own road Stanway Road. Some of the changes identified outside the original 'liveable neighbourhood area' are worth implementing, but another round of consultation should have been implemented, notifying residents of the change to the scope of the scheme. As it is, the way this has been handled (including the cancellation without reorganisation of a major public meeting!) has really got people's backs up as they feel they have not properly been consulted. What a shame!

Earlsdon and the area of the liveable neighbourhood is relatively small and therefore I support the proposals that would encourage and support the ability to walk safely. However, outside of some of the options to reduce speed on roads and to make crossing roads easier the proposals do not consider the elements that would have the biggest positive impact:

- improving pavements, where due to uneven surfaces, tree roots and overhanging hedges it is easier to walk on the road and very difficult for anybody with mobility problems to consider walking;
- enforcement of current parking restrictions, particularly on double yellow lines which limits visibility; and
- stopping parking on pavements

The overall impact of the proposals will be to increase traffic flows on Kenilworth Road, Albany Road, Earlsdon Avenues North and South and the A429. This will mean increased queues and delays on these already busy roads for which no solutions are proposed. The proposed road closures and the creation of one-way routes will increase journey lengths.

For the sake of transparency the source of funding for the proposals should have been made much clearer in the consultation and in particular what is the source of funding for each of the proposals. Without this clarity there is a risk the proposals are not solely based on the priorities of the residents of Earlsdon.

Please could every opportunity be taken to increase the number of street trees and areas of planting around Earlsdon. When selecting trees / flowers, please could species be chosen that will support wildlife. For example, flowering plants that are attractive to pollinating insects. There are lots of lists available online e.g. <https://www.rhs.org.uk/science/conservation-biodiversity/wildlife/plants-for-pollinators>

In general I am wholly supportive of the LN initiative and am excited about the changes that should make the area more pedestrian friendly and discourages people using Earlsdon as a cut through BUT traffic like water will always find a way through and by solving one problem I fear you may create another/different problem. It feels like significant thought has gone into this and I appreciate that a balance needs to be had and pleasing everyone will be hard. I think more radical suggestions such as making the high street pedestrian or one way only would have been interesting as would considering making Beechwood Ave no entry from the roundabout at Canley Rd (near The Farmhouse) to reduce the traffic along the narrow bendy bit of Beechwood although I recognise that is probably outside the LN area :-)

Earlsdon is a suburb which is adjacent to the city centre. Some residents want it treated like an exclusive area which prevents those who are not "local" from even accessing it. The parking restrictions already in place in much of the suburb is so unkind and speaks to a wider nasty and pervasive ethos that some residence think they are entitled to use the area to the detriment of the residents of the rest of the city. I am for any measures which reduce speeding and making the area liveable but Earlsdon is already a gentle and pleasant place to live without preventing those from elsewhere from accessing it with ease and being forced to drive round it instead. Please rethink many of these measures as they will be detrimental in the long term for the area.

In effect the proposals are to overcome the inconsiderate and entitled behaviour of a small but increasing number of people because of the lack of enforcement.

Spending all this money yet where was the money for the library

Improve muddy street signs on Earlsdon Street. All very random blocking pavement.

No public money should be spent without an extremely good reason. You have provided no good reasons to fritter away tax payer money on this ridiculous proposal.

I absolutely do not want those ridiculous over sized planters blocking access to roads.

This will cause problems for emergency vehicle access and for elderly residents who rely on their cars.

By asking for volunteers, you are basically admitting that there is no money to maintain any of the communal areas that you have proposed. That should tell you that it will be a waste of money

Have already made mitigation suggestions in other comments - disappointed that there is no proposals for improving Earlsdon High Street environment , which is a mish mash of private forecourts and public footpath -

Anything else you want to tell us?

and generally seen as a free for all for trade vehicles to park - especially outside empty premises

I very much welcome the council's wish to improve the Earlsdon environment and many aspects of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Plan.

While I agree with the objective of reducing traffic (numbers and speed) using Spencer Road and Spencer Avenue I strongly object to proposals which appear to move these problems elsewhere. It is unsatisfactory that the council is effectively asking Broadway residents to accept some increase in traffic without being able to provide any information as to the expected extent of this.

While I am happy with the Earlsdon Liveable Neighbourhood Plan addressing issues outside the designated Liveable Neighbourhood Area the quality of the consultation in this extended area has been less comprehensive than that offered in the original area. Leaflet distribution has been patchy and the planned public meeting with Councillors was cancelled (without explanation) with only 24hrs notice. This was never rearranged despite requests to do so.

Basically I feel this is an unnecessary waste of a huge amount of money . There is nothing wrong with what we have in Earlsdon now . If there was a problem people wouldn't buy/rent a house here.or they would move on . I've been here for almost 40 years so it can't be that bad !!!!

I think the majority of the proposals are absolutely crazy. I am disgusted with the council and our local Councillors for pushing this anti-resident proposal through without any meaningful consultation. The only public meeting was cancelled and the silence of the local Councillors on this matter is absolutely deafening. Councils are supposed to work for THEIR residents. This feels like a town planners dream, that the unelected officials of the council are determined to push through irrespective of the feelings of the local community. The council should organise a referendum NOW to give all of those affected by the proposals a vote

Please can you implement a physical traffic calming measure that would help to reduce excessive speeding between the railway bridge and the mini roundabout . Also can you consider making the railway bridge one way to traffic other than buses . Many thanks

I am glad that the Council has an opportunity to introduce measures that may increase safety.

I very strongly favour the imposition of a 20 m.p.h. speed limit but am doubtful of its effect if not enforced by speed cameras and prosecution.

My main concern is that the problems of speeding and congestion on Spencer Avenue will be solved at the expense of residents of Broadway. We already suffer from speeding traffic and consequent damage to parked cars, animal deaths and injuries and congestion. This will only worsen as the result of the proposals about Spencer Avenue and the bus gate.

I wonder whether it might be possible to introduce only some of the proposals (especially the speed limit and other speed reduction measures) and not all of them at once.

I wonder also whether a process of review and amendment might be possible over a period of time.

I do not feel that the consultation process has worked effectively. My own household received no written information about the proposals and consultation meetings, which I understand to be the consequence of the Council contracting out the delivery of leaflets. Paying a private contractor does not means that the job gets done!

I think it is shameful that the proposed consultation meeting with Councillors was cancelled and not rescheduled. I only heard about this meeting very close to the meeting date from a neighbourhood WhatsApp group, and then heard from the same source that it had been cancelled.

In contrast, I have found the willingness of Council officers to engage with residents, in detail and sometimes at short notice, to be exemplary. My thanks go to the Council officers involved.


If there is time, amend proposals to have a balance of street-scape, pavement and crossings alongside less traffic re-routing. It would encourage walking if pavement quality was tackled more urgently, if extra crossings were installed as detailed on other answers, the drainage was tackled to stop flooding on the well used path between Hartington Crescent and Myrtle Grove, and better lighting on path from Myrtle Grove/Moor St to Earlsdon Av North. For my own street there will be increased traffic turning onto XXXXXX from Beechwood Av as a result of all the blocked-off roads off Beechwood, with a greater hazard for ABC nursery parking at the junction of St Andrews Rd. More traffic will come along St Andrews with the block on Shaftesbury Road,

Anything else you want to tell us?

including staff, visitors, deliveries and emergency vehicles for ST Andrews house who come from the direction of The Farmhouse/Coventry Business Park.

Demographics of respondents

How old are you?




Question options

(Click items to hide)

- Under 16
- 16-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65-74
- 75-74
- ▲ 1/2 ▼


How would you describe your ethnic background?



Question options

- White - English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British
- White - Irish
- White - Other
- Mixed - Other
- Asian/ Asian British - Indian
- Asian/ Asian British - Chinese
- Asian/ Asian British - Other
- Black/ Black British - Caribbean
- Other
- Mixed - White and Black Caribbean
- White - Gypsy or Irish Traveller
- Mixed - White and Black African
- Asian/ Asian British - Pakistani
- Asian/ Asian British - Bangladeshi
- Black/ Black British - African
- Black/ Black British - Other
- Arab

How would you describe yourself?



- Question options**
(Click items to hide)
- Male
 - Female
 - Prefer not to say
 - In another way (please specify)

Do you consider yourself to be a disabled person?

Of the 408 people that responded to this question, 30 people consider themselves to be disabled.

3.2 Drop-in sessions and online meetings

The following drop-in sessions and online meetings were arranged so that people could find out more and ask questions:

Monday 18 September 12noon to 4pm	Drop-in Earlsdon Methodist Church
Monday 25 September 7pm to 9pm	Drop-in Hearsall Golf Club v c
Wednesday 27 September 7.30pm to 8.30pm	Online meeting
Thursday 28 September 10am to 12noon	Drop-in Earlsdon Library
Monday 2 October 7.30pm to 8.30pm	Online meeting
Wednesday 4 October 6pm to 9pm	Drop-in St Barbara's Church

Feedback themes from drop-in sessions and online meetings

Number of attendees - 300

Theme - rationale/purpose of scheme, consultation approach, and modelling

- Purpose of liveable neighbourhoods, why Earlsdon was chosen, funding available/cost. This included some comments from those who believed the level of spend is not required for this locality. It also included comments from people very supportive of the purpose of the scheme.
- Cancellation of kick off meeting and people saying they were hoping for a public meeting to hear the views of others. Comments also received from people who appreciated the drop-in sessions and the opportunity to ask questions and discuss 1:1 and in small groups.
- Reports that Street News not received - some due to being outside of area but others who appear to have been missed from delivery.
- Suggested alternative approaches e.g. geofencing roads to remove from Sat Nav and comments stating preference for speed bumps. Some commented that they are against all road closures.
- Too focused on traffic, without bringing in other potential council actions like footway maintenance and developing community-run facilities, e.g. banking hub or local currency.

- Traffic impact and modelling – comments included concerns around impact of displaced traffic, queries around the data used in modelling and if this is representative, queries around if modelling is correct given changes to junction 7.
- How will impacts will be monitored and whether things will be changed back if they don't work as hoped, and some queries around next steps and timeline for a final decision.

Theme - benches, cycling, pedestrian routes, planters

- Routes to Sustrans scheme and querying why not Canley Station
- NCN52 cycle route and how this will look/work
- WM Cycle Hire stations and desired locations for additional docks
- Benches - Many people very supportive of benches, while some people point out that benches have previously been removed due to anti-social behaviour and poor maintenance, and a few opposed due to pavement space or concerns re benches could be used e.g. for sleeping.
- Pavement widening outside Library and Elsie Jones House – overall many more responses in support of rather than opposed to this.
- Strong support for proposed crossings particularly between Co-op and City Arms. Some requests for additional crossing at Poplar Road.
- Earlsdon Street – comments included concerns around full pedestrianisation (not proposed), also queries around the proposed timing for Moor Street taxi rank.
- Many people supportive of proposals relating to outside Library and Primary School
- Support for planters and a few raising concerns about planters, some positive comments regarding community being involved in decisions/maintenance of planters.

Theme - speed, parking, and enforcement

- Suggestions that Earlsdon street should be one way to increase parking, some concerns around delivery vehicles being able to load/unload.
- A very large number of positive comments supporting 20mph but many queries about how this and traffic restrictions will be enforced.
- Difficulty of parking in Earlsdon currently and perceived lack of parking enforcement.
- Need for residents parking permit scheme.

- Albany Road Parking - Some people on Albany Road want the existing short-stay parking changed to allow residents to park there.
- Beechwood Ave - proposed traffic calming – quite a lot of support for proposals, some queries around logic of pedestrian islands, comments from people who feel chicane at tennis club is wrong way around, some people disappointed by lack of measures on some parts of Beechwood. Re Beechwood Avenue proposed double yellow lines from Golf Club to Kenilworth Road some people commented they felt double yellow lines would increase speed.

Theme - comments re specific proposals

- Many specific queries from people who wanted to know how proposals would impact their regular driving routes and understand alternative routes they could take.
- Multiple comments re **Spencer Park proposed bus gate** – comments made both by people stating they are in favour of this and by people stating they are opposed.
- **Warwick Avenue & Styvechale Avenue** proposed point no entry – clarity on what no entry would mean, some felt no entry was too restrictive. Alternative suggestions people made included use of speed bumps or reversing one of the no entries. Some also raised concerns that they felt one way would increase speeds.
- **Arden Street** proposed mode filter – some support and also some opposition to this. Concerns raised around access during Earlsdon Festival.
- **Newcombe Road** proposed one-way system – concerns raised about exiting at the Earlsdon Avenue North end because of the one-way. There is a need to be able to get out at both ends to avoid the congestion on Earlsdon Avenue North.
- **Stoneleigh Avenue & Woodland Avenue** proposed mode filter - residents in Woodland Avenue are unhappy about the full closure proposed. No Entry into Warwick and Styvechale means that the only route out of the area is Beechwood Avenue, and this may compound existing issues. Suggestions that people often use Warwick / Styvechale from Beechwood Avenue area to join Earlsdon Avenue South, to then turn right at the lights because turning out of Beechwood is difficult. People used to use the War Memorial Car Park to turn around to avoid the right turn, but this is more difficult since barriers were introduced.
- **Berkeley Road North** – queries around the proposal and the reason for the No Entry Point.
- **Hartington Ave** – proposed mini-island changes – will the mini-island will be raised. People stated this would be their preference as they felt it would be more effective.
- **Rochester Road** proposed junction changes – requests for a pedestrian crossing on St. Barbara's side of junction, also queries around logic of reversing priorities, concerns about loss of parking were also raised.

3.3 Focus Groups

Earlsdon Primary School

We visited the School Council to find out what they thought of the proposals. Nineteen children took part.

Feedback:

- The speed of the Ring Road should go from 40mph to 30mph.
- We need speed bumps throughout the roads and speed cameras where people get an email when they drive too quickly.
- The speeding at night is so loud it's hard to sleep – a slower speed would mean that it's easier to sleep.
- The bus gate is a good idea, because the drivers are too angry driving quickly along the road.

Road closed to reduce traffic and speed

Yes – 10 No – 1 Maybe – 8

It would encourage more walking and cycling

New Pedestrian Crossing on Earlsdon Street

Yes – 19

Easier to cross. Better for older people. Safer and quicker with crossing. Blister (tactile) paving.

Traffic Calming on Beechwood Avenue

Yes – 12 No – 1 Maybe – 6

Traffic lights would be better than chicane. Add a mirror so traffic can see round the corner.

Green Space and Seating outside school

Yes – 18

Brilliant idea. Love reading. Narrower road makes it better for reading. More people would cycle.

Improve some of the worst pavements to make it better for walking, for pushchairs and for wheelchairs

Yes - 19

North Earlsdon Neighbourhood Association (NENA)

Officer met with representatives of NENA on 3 October 2023. Lots of discussion with the group, mostly about the Spencer Road bus gate and Beechwood Avenue proposals. Many of the group were keen on resident permit holder exemption to the bus gate.

3.4 Community meeting

Local people organised their own community meeting to discuss the proposals. This took place on 8 October 2023. Officers from the Council were not present at the meeting. Feedback from the meeting was shared with us.

Introducing a 20mph zone – this will cover the whole area (shown on the plan on the right hand side of the page) as well as Bates Road, Beechwood Ave, Dorney Close, Innis Road, Nightingale Lane, Raven Cragg Road, Rochester Road, The Riddings and Woodfield Rd and Morningside, Davenport Rd and The Firs. Info Sheet: 2

- I am strongly in favour of a 20mph for the entire area, but it should be enforced and not treated as a nudge issue.
- Yes, good idea if enforced.
- Great idea needs to be enforced.
- Its already liveable!
- It won't stop the speedsters – speed bumps?
- Strongly in favour of traffic speed
- 20mph zones are ok outside areas that need them, like schools, the high St. but not a blanket 20mph zone.
- Will there be mass signal and cctv to enforce this? Total waste of money and hideously ugly? Those who speeds, fri sat night, in supped up vehicles will continue to do so as there is no police presence. Everybody else will drive safely as they already do.
- Good idea, but only if enforced.
- Cancel some of the more complicated schemes and put more money into average speed ANPR at each end of rat runs.
- I would like to echo and enforce above comment (points at comment about “average speed ANPR at each end of rat runs”)
- 20pmh ok. 25mph on beechwood. 20mph Bates Road/Innis Road etc
- I support this (comment above) providing it is enforceable.
- A great idea it must be enforced. Remember 20mph Is a limit, not the mandatory speed.
- Yes, agree, especially outside Earlsdon school please.
- Agree, but must be enforced, unlike the zigzags at current pedestrian crossing at Earlsdon st
- No, 30mph with speed cameras and flashing speed signs.
- Targeted 20phm zones outside schools and maybe outside access on Earlsdon st, but not a blanket change.
- Definitely needed.
- 20pmh should extend to Earlsdon street and stop people parking on the zebra crossing.
- Maybe (comment above) that would make a big difference, a good difference.
- Extend throughout area.
- Definitely needed.
- Needs policing!
- Speed calming not road closing!
- Needs to cover all of Earlsdon. We live in Stanley road and cars speed up and down all the time.

- Children and dogs are in real danger of being hurt. Permit parking for residents of street required. There is a public carpark for anyone who wants to go to cafes and shops.
 - No. speed cameras and flashing signs.
 - Yes, definitely needed.
 - Yes, all schools should have 20mph on roads next to.'
 - And Earlsdon street
 - Yes, weight of cars has doubled since 1960s and need to reduce speed in response.
 - No. 20mph zone. Any 20pmh limited should be targets, ie school crossing.
 - Not in favour, will create dangerous bottle neck on Bates Road junction.
 - Why? (to comment above)
 - In favour but needs to include the entire area, as shown on the liveable neighbourhood's map, not just the streets listed. Also, should be enforced.
 - yes, it works in London.
 - 20mph wouldn't add much to journey times and would make cycling and walking much better without the need for more measures. I would like to see all Coventry residential roads 20mph.
 - Yes, reduce the speed. Too many fast cars in high parking areas
 - A good idea if backed up with traffic calming an enforcement.
 - Yes, and enforce them.
 - Yes, if enforced, there is no need for all other expensive, unnecessary, inconvenient, environmentally damaging changes.
 - I agree with the above comment.
 - No, 20pmh outside schools, but not rest of Earlsdon. 20mph will not stop the idiots.
 - Could speed humps remedy Beechwood Ave speeding?
 - Beechwood Ave is horrendous regarding speed. It's difficult to get out our drive. When drivers go past the tennis club and see the straight road ahead and see Kenilworth Road, they reach ridiculous speeds. Extending the yellow lines will only be more of an incentive to speed.
 - Should be 25mph on Beechwood Ave not aware of access speeding. Should be 20mph on Bates Road etc as cars and vans do speed on the routes.
- Extending the existing one-way loop around Providence Street, Berkeley Rd South and Moor Street so that Berkeley Rd South becomes fully one-way. Berkeley Rd North will become no entry from Earlsdon Ave South but will remain two-way. Cycles will be able to pass through the no entry and use the Rd as two-way. Info Sheet: 7.
- Issue with pushing more traffic onto Earlsdon Ave south. Particularly with bus gate preventing exit on Spencer, to island/hotel exit. Earlsdon Ave south is already like a motorway at peak times.
- Speeding traffic.
- Removal vans blocking road. Road works requiring road closures. Delivery vans? Not a good idea.
 - Don't block Berkeley Road north.
 - Berkeley Road North no entry will block a rat run between Earlsdon Ave south and Albany Road.
 - The rat run traffic will take Mayfield or Belvedere for the same purpose, increasing traffic down Broadway.
 - Where will the displaced traffic go? Very likely Belvedere/Mayfield which will increase Broadway traffic.

- Positive. Alleviate traffic when Earlsdon street has event and keeps through traffic off Earlsdon st when it's not.
- Will restrict parking access to new car park on Moor St. will potentially increase traffic and parking, providence st, Berkeley Road South and Moor st.
- Already totally overloaded and big problems with parking on double yellow lines and on drop curbs in providence street.
- Forcing traffic down Providence st, a residential street, why would you do that?
- Resident parking permits urgently needed.
- Resident parking a must, not able to park near our homes. Too much parking outside people's drives, garages and around double yellow lines.
- The proposal creates a rat run and increases traffic in certain roads. No consideration has been given to the total impact of all proposals on everyone who lives in Earlsdon.
- Solutions for parking for business are needed. Solutions for residents.
- Totally unnecessary. Causes more problems than it's supposed to solve.
- One-way routes increase traffic and create more climate damaging co2. And we are supposed to be in a climate emergency.
- Against this. Earlsdon will be becoming a no-go area for people due to confusion, for example what roads to access and worse parking.
- This makes sense to me as a former resident of Berkeley Road South
- No to one way loop
- One way loops more inconvenience and traffic.

Installing a bus gate on Spencer Rd at the junction with Dalton Road, near to King Henry VIII school. This means that only permitted vehicles such as buses, cycles and taxis would be able to travel between Dalton Rd and the entrance to Parkview flats. All other parts of the street remain fully accessible. No frontage loses any vehicular access to their front door or parking places. Info Sheet: 15.

- Would it greatly increase traffic along Spencer and Broadway for those trying to leave the area?
- Rubbish idea and not needed.
- Don't see any advantage.
- Taxis and Henrys school traffic will exit via Broadway.
- All local traffic going to Albany rd. will exit via Broadway.
- Will stop local traffic going to/from Warwick Road a428 via spencer road
- Next step: 15 min cities. Possibly the WORST idea possible projected. Parents of pupils at KHVIII will be unable to pickup/drop off children using the bays on Spencer and Dalton Road. It will push traffic into other areas of congestion. Completely pointless, many KHVIII children live on the edge of Coventry or further afield so cannot walk or cycle, nor will they be using the bus.
- The proposal will allow taxis and buses to pass through the gate, this proposal, combined with the one way proposal for Spencer, will result in more traffic on Broadway. Spencer Road's problems that need solving are being dealt with at the expense of Broadway residents with these proposals.
- (2 x agreement comments to above comment regarding impact on residents of Broadway)
- No I do not want a bus gate, use the money to teach pupils and parents the highway code.
- No, will increase traffic on Kenilworth rd, people getting to Dalton rd will have to drive much further.
- No, too complicated. Try and enforce the 20mph zone first. See what happens. Then see if further measures are needed/desirable.
- Agree with this (in reference to previous comment re: 20mph)

- Could cause more problems than it will solve. Shunting traffic onto other local roads, affecting school traffic, and creating log jams elsewhere, for example, Earlsdon Ave North.
- This will impose significantly more traffic on Kenilworth/Earlsdon Ave South, which is already too busy. There must be a better way to protect Spencer Ave from speeding.
- Again, it will make other narrow roads busy. Problems will especially occur at Henrys pick up and drop off times.
- Another ridiculous proposal, who will benefit?
- All the ideas provided increase the carbon footprint, not reduce it.
- As a resident of Morningside, I am concerned we will be badly impacted. The street will be much less accessible traveling from and to Spencer Ave. It will add a significant amount of travel time to our personal journeys. Is it planned that Morningside resident would be able to drive through the gate? This would be a big help. Clarification would be appreciated. The current traffic isn't so severe to warrant the investment in this project.
- Comment re: Morningside also apply, in my submission to Mickelton Rd
- Bus gate maybe too much cutting the area off and make it hard to access but definitely need some traffic calming outside the (Spencer) park.
- This will cause worse traffic congestion.
- Bus gate cuts off all NENA streets, pushing traffic that wants to go across the city onto Kenilworth Road. Traffic lights at rush hour are jammed already.
- No! going to and from the train station/central 6 etc will be a nightmare. Either going into town to do a detour or going onto the Kenilworth Road by the memorial park, which is already hugely congested with traffic queuing.
- Real concern that more traffic will go down Mickleton/Broadway/Mayfield/Stanway etc as it will be used as a cut through from Albany rd or Earlsdon Ave south. These roads have parked cars each side and the roads are narrow. Broadway frequently gets blocked due to the bend in the road, more traffic will make it worse.
- Will throw significantly large amount of traffic on to Kenilworth rd./Earlsdon Ave south. Bad idea Making Spencer Ave/Newcombe Rd a one-way system which would make Newcombe Rd one way from Albany Rd to Earlsdon Ave North and Spencer Ave one way from Albany Rd to Mayfield Road. Cycles would be able to pass through and use the Rd as two-way. Info Sheet: 16.
- No opinion
- Newcombe one way good but think should be other direction as exiting onto Earlsdon Ave North is hazardous already.
- No, it isn't necessary.
- No, first put 20mph in place with average speed check at each end of rat runs and see what happens.
- Agree 20mph.
- No, people will have to drive for further to get to Dalton rd. and Morningside side etc
- Parents dropping off to and from KHVIII will stop on Spencer Road by the park and exit via Broadway, increasing Broadway traffic considerably.
- All local traffic heading for Albany Road will be obliged to exit via Broadway, essentially excessive traffic on spencer being redirected to Broadway.
- Newcombe might be better in other direction but (I'm) supportive of one way + on parallel roads. (Kensington/Westwood/Bristol etc)
- No benefit!
- Will cause other issues, will only move the problem elsewhere.
- Not needed

- Agree that bus gate will increase Earlsdon Ave South being used as main route to Kenilworth rd / city centre.
- Not in favour. Will increase traffic speed.
- No. just slow the traffic down.
- Rubbish idea and not needed.
- Should be traffic lights at junction Spencer/Albany/Newcombe. Bad accident area.

Adding new pedestrian crossings on Albany Road, Earlsdon Street (between the Co-op and the City Arms) and Beechwood Ave, as well as making improvements to the existing zebra crossing outside the library. Changes to the Spencer Road/Dalton Rd junction to make it easier to cross the road. Info Sheet: 4, 5 and 15.

- In favour
- Definitely in favour
- No
- Definitely not in favour
- We do not need them, have not seen mass fatalities.
- We have 2 crossing; they are not well placed but we don't need more.
- Extra crossing on Earlsdon St (by coop) would add to safety. Placement of crossing crucial.
- Agreed (with comment above)
- Not necessary
- Not needed, would reduce parking & would reduce parking and encourage driver to park on zig zag lines etc.
- In favour provided on peninsula's
- Excellent idea and much needed as long as not too near to the roundabout.
- In favour, need to be well placed.
- Need a crossing – Co op to Weatherspoon's.
- Very much in favour. Beechwood crossing needs to be well clear of sharp corner and chicane.

Support

anything that reduces beechwood traffic.

- Earlsdon St crossing and lower Albany are very needed.
- Yes, good idea.
- Yes good.
- Yes, good proposal.
- Excellent idea
- Albany road should be 20mph with speed face (smiley/sad if going too fast)
- I lived in Palmerstone Rd, my son now 30, wanted to walk to school at Earlsdon primary when he was 9 years. Can you imagine his experience now down the street.

More traffic calming needed. Toucan crossing at the entrance to Spencer Ave on Albany Road, improving the Sustrans National Cycle Route, allowing both pedestrians and cyclists to cross the road. Info Sheet: 17

- Agree
- Agree
- Agree
- Agree
- Good
- Good
- Fine
- Yes please.
- Yes

- Yes
- Agree with this proposal.
- No
- No, full traffic lights needed. Maybe including toucan crossing. To temper speeds up Albany Road. This junction has many accidents.

Measures to limit through journeys on Arden Street, Shaftesbury Road, Warwick Ave/ Styvechale Ave, Stoneleigh Ave/ Woodland Ave through no entry points. These measures could include planters or bollards, and we are interested in whether you would like to be involved in the design and maintenance

- Arden street closure and one way system will cause disruption for residents of Clarendon st, Myrtle Grove, Moor Street as well as driving more traffic down Warwick Street.
- Don't agree with, seems like overkill
- Closing Warwick Ave and Styvechale Ave will cut this end of Beechwood Ave, Stoneleigh and Woodland Ave from all Earlsdon facilities and any safe and reliable access to Kenilworth road (we always go to the Earlsdon Ave traffic lights)
- Not in favour. Pushes traffic onto Beechwood Ave
- No in favour. This seems unnecessary
- One way will encourage speeding
- Arden street cause extra traffic on Moor Street and speeding.
- Not in favour, I think it's too much
- In favour, keep traffic from rat running.
- Understanding objective but displacing traffic onto roads does not reduce traffic, always could increase traffic speed.
- Closures displace traffic. Planned one way on Moor St and no entry on Arden Street not welcome.
- If you make it too hard to visit Earlsdon, no one will
- Silly. Makes life difficult for residents. Traffic will just be displaced. Totally unnecessary
- Against this. Will cause a lot of traffic on Beechwood Ave.
- Closing Stoneleigh Ave and no entry signs on Warwick/Styvechale Ave will add 1.25 tonnes of co2 and we are supposed to be in a climate avenue. Question? What will the whole scheme add to climate change?
- Closing Arden Street one end will have massive inconvenience for drivers wishing to go to a45/Sainsburys and back, forcing longer journeys and more emissions.
- No to no entry points
- Surely traffic will be rerouted with no obvious advantages. ie times of journeys? Co2 emissions etc
- Not happy with any of these, will push traffic onto already congested Kenilworth Road.
- I don't want any no entry points.
- Completely against, will create more congestion in other areas, like Kenilworth Road.
- Benefit to a few at the inconvenience to the many. Not just in Earlsdon too!
- Rising bollard for emergency services? Otherwise in favour.
- No
- Pushing traffic onto residential areas. Don't want
- No, completely against, will create more congestion, not necessary

- Those who may have suggested this, be careful what you wish for, when you're trying to get home in a timely manner, you won't be able to, unnecessary.
- Not necessary, will cause long tail back at Beechwood/Kenilworth Rd and Earlsdon Ave/Kenilworth as all the traffic is funnelled onto these junctions. Closing Stoneleigh junction unnecessary, we aren't used as a rat run.
- I think its bad idea mainly that it already hazardous exiting both ends of Stycehale Ave especially at busy times of the day.
- Ridiculous, cannot see any benefits.
- No, very divisive, makes much of Earlsdon, unliveable.
- Why?
- Very much in favour, reduce rat running.
- Who thought this one up?
- Not necessary
- Not happy about no entry points, inconvenient for resident and will simply funnel traffic issues elsewhere.,
- What is rationale? Seems pointless.
- These no entry points will cause congestion, confusion and so put people off coming into Earlsdon, which at the moment is a thriving happy community.
- Agree with above, I do not want additional journey distances for anyone. It will just add significant CO2 pollution/climate change
- Ask the council for their environmental impact assessment.
- Pushing traffic onto Kenilworth Rd just adds to congestion points.
- Absolutely awful idea. Causes so many issues. Wat do we do when there's road works blocking exits.
- Causes incredible problems for the Earlsdon festival and visitors/residents as the festival blocks off more streets. It may affect the festival so much it cant happen due to affecting residents too much.

Enabling a new zebra crossing by the Co-op, by rearranging parking. The short stay parking outside the Co-op would be reduced, but there will be more spaces on side streets because of the one-way system. The existing restriction on parking after 10pm would be removed. Blue badge parking bays will be introduced on Earlsdon Street, close to Providence Street and the Post Office and the Co-op. Info Sheet: 5.

- Agree
- Where will the blue badge parking be? It is not on the map.
- The blue badge parking will restrict the limit parking in the streets for local residents.
- Crossing outside Albany club – yes
- No – the laws etc on crossing are not enforced now.
- Zebra crossing all to have peninsulas.
- Less parking.
- No, less parking. Leave as is
- Zebra crossing – yes. More parking?
- Where is more parking going? Surely, we should be promoting walking and cycling?
- Slow down the traffic first, parking needs to be monitored.
- Leave it as it is.
- Agree in principle, but please don't reduce street parking, its already in short supply and all that happens is people park in residential streets, which is unacceptable to residents.
- Agree with crossing by co-op but need proper enforcement. The one by Café Bravo is ignored by some motorists and people park on zigzag chevrons.

- People have no regard to parking restrictions and park where they like such as double yellow lines/pedestrian crossing and on junctions/corners of the road. I'm amazed no one has been killed.
- No

Widen the path at the number 11 bus stops outside Earlsdon Primary School and opposite the Methodist Church. Info Sheet: 4.

- Agree
 - Yes, it might slow traffic, but crossing will be safer.
 - As long as crossing isn't compromised
 - Ok
 - As long as crossing is not moved
 - Its wide enough and does the job
 - As safer crossing for children is important as long as it doesn't cause more congestion and pollution.
 - It is wide enough and narrowing the road will only cause more congestion and pollution right in the heart of Earlsdon.
 - Waste of time and money. Who will want to sit down with all the traffic fumes? Benches outside library for short-term waiting.
- Cycle parking on Shaftesbury Ave, Arden Street, Warwick Street, Earlsdon Ave South, Berkeley Rd N & S • Agree
- Disagree, already insufficient parking, why not use Warwick/Styvechale Ave instead.
 - Being brutally honest, who will use this much cycle parking?
 - Not enough parking spaces for residents
 - Are there that many cycles needing parking?
 - Very positive, need somewhere to store bikes for terrace houses as 3 bikes won't fit in a hallway.
 - Would think a wider road like Warwick Ave would be better. Should be part of the integrated transport to reduce traffic.
 - Nobody who doesn't ride, and knows where to park, is about to start. Thus, we don't need loads of bike racks, thus they look a mess, block pavements, and could attract thieves (unless 24hr security) big waste of money.
 - Ditto (as above)
 - Agree (comment above)
 - Agree (comment above)
 - No problem for bike parking, waste of money.
 - Who for?
 - Don't agree. How many cyclists are being catered for? What is the physical footprint for such a scheme on each street?
 - More cycle racks in Earlsdon St near post office at top
 - Why do they need special parking?

Market gates on Earlsdon Street, so that a Rd closure could be implemented for trader led markets or community events. Earlsdon St would remain open to vehicles at all other times. Information sheet num 6.

- Unnecessary. Market is not a guaranteed periodic event. Would only be used for Earlsdon festival once a year.
- Agreed (with above)
- Don't want
- Don't want
- Don't want
- Would be great as can become more of a community space.
- Absolutely ridiculous, it impacts on the lives of residents who live on Earlsdon streets. I believe if other streets in Earlsdon had the same proposals, they would be up in arms. The community involves people who live happily, this goes against Earlsdon street residents.
- Agree (comment above)
- I live in XXXXX, I think this is a terrible idea. No thank you!! It's not set up to be a market place.
- Waste of money
- Unnecessary
- We do not need more street clutter
- The organisers can easily provide road closure signs.
- Don't need it. Kenilworth market is fine.
- Why do we need permanent gates, when it is normal to place traffic cones as usual! Sinister!
- Where will the traffic go? Into providence street? What part of liveable does that make providence? Do we need a market or will the shops just sell more coffee?
- Agree (comment above)
- Why? In whose benefit. No rational, agree, unnecessary.
- Would be unsightly and wouldn't stop the need for special road closure orders.
- Completely against, more street clutter, waste of money
- Disagree!
- I think this is a good idea (obvs in the minority)
- Depends on how often?
- Certainly not needed for limited use. Unnecessary use of money.
- Do not require gates. Will worsen the access. How many markets will there be? Not many!
- Markets gates shouldn't be proposed until the market gets permission from the council, which they do not have at the moment. As of today, they are still waiting for their public consultation to start. This will also cause problems for the Earlsdon festival as they wouldn't be used by the festival as it goes further than the gated area and would be a problem on the day with the crowds and set up of the event. Seems pointless to have gates for something that doesn't exist at the moment and may not ever happen. It will also limit the size of markets and many street events have actually extended further than the proposed area that have happened previously.
- Single vehicle 24-hour taxi rank near to the Co-op. A daytime (7am to 7pm) feeder rank on Moor Street (replacing the double yellow lines), outside these times anyone can park there. Overnight feeder rank (10pm to 7am) on Earlsdon Street near Moor Street. Info Sheet: 5 and 8.
- Don't like.
- Uber? Lyft? Alans taxis?
- Where on Earlsdon street? Ubers already park outside houses with engines running.
- Good but need to address parking opposite double yellows.
- We already have a taxi rank outside royal oak, why do shoppers at the Co-op lose parking spaces/
- Taxis are not green in anyway. One passenger in one private car.

- Where? If a new crossing is put in?
 - Already very busy with taxis parked on pavements all along Earlsdon street sometimes.
 - No, not necessary.
 - Not needed
 - Unnecessary!
 - Not convinced is necessary
 - Not needed. How will the number of taxis be allowed/ be enforced on the street. Noise abatement during the evenings.
 - Enforce existing
 - Why? They will only do U-turns in the roads.
 - We should be promoting walking and cycling. No taxis, horrible for residents.
 - Uber is cheaper than cabs.
 - Against, will increase number of taxis or Ubers. And increase traffic on Moor St, to arrive and depart the feeder ranks.
 - Only needs to be there until the last pub closes.
 - There needs to be greater safety for pedestrians, there are major problems caused by taxis parking/ driving on pavements on Earlsdon St. more thought needs to go into the waiting of taxis. The council and police say it's necessary to have taxis in Earlsdon St to move visitors out.
 - Can the width of the footpath to Earlsdon be reduced to allow more parking on both sides?
- Improving the area by the library and Earlsdon Primary School with planting and seating, creating a shared community space. Info Sheet: 4.**

- Agree
- Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Disagree
- Good idea
- Good idea
- Yes good
- Good
- More shared community space needed.
- No, please, I totally disagree, Earlsdon already looks a bit of a mess with so many closed shops. We already have an issue with homeless people, benches may attract graffiti. There are so many places for people to sit, like the library and coffee shops. And it rains a lot in England.
- No, waste of money.
- Good idea if properly green and managed.
- Good idea, improving area, greening it. The library is a jewel in Earlsdon.
- No. Earlsdon Ave is going to be narrowed and make it more dangerous.
- I am a former cyclist. Earlsdon Ave North is the only unsafe part I ever encountered.
- Who will maintain the planters? Once the money has been spent, it's likely the planters and benches will fall into disrepair.
- Yes if it's on the pavement.
- Not if it narrows the existing road, increased congestion and population.

Benches on Earlsdon Street and around the roundabout. There will also be opportunities for you to tell us how you would like some of the smaller details to be decided, for example where you might want more planting or seating. Info Sheet: 9.

- Very much in favour
- Would like
- Yes please
- Yes this a good idea
- No thank you, not necessary.
- People can sit in a coffee shop.
- Will attract graffiti and look messy.
- Place to dispose of beer cans and urine.
- Good idea
- Not necessary
- Good idea, not too many though
- A ridiculous proposal, the shop frontages are owned by the shop owners and like the current where sitting/eating are created, there will be no room to install a bench on the pavement (1.5m) this will impact on pedestrians / disability scooters and the safety of people walking down Earlsdon St.
- Is there enough room on the pavements for this?
- Why?
- Better on Earlsdon street then around roundabout.
- Good and flower tubs
- Not sure that this could be implemented (pavement not wide enough) and maintain pavement width for wheelchair users and buggies
- Why? To sit and watch the traffic? Benches are a nice idea but not on an island.
- Remember wheelchair users and buggies. Planter and benches shouldn't clutter pavement to make streets difficult or inaccessible.
- Dropped curbs useful too.

All other feedback

- All is ok if it doesn't impact the issues Earlsdon residents suffer from already.
- Promise not to make our lives worse for the sack of a few benches and flowers.
- Parking is terrible, encourage visitors to come by public transport, walk or cycle.
- Traffic proposals are total overkill. Who asked for these changes? No proper consultation.
- Agree (comment above)
- The pavements in Earlsdon street need improving. They are hazardous for pedestrians.
- Agree (comment above) elderly people falling.
- When were the traffic surveys conducted, re; beechwood, Stoneleigh, Earlsdon Ave, accessing Kenilworth

Road? At the moment 5-minute wait is not unusual in the daytime, Beechwood/Stoneleigh onto Kenilworth

Road.

- Overall, the plan is too ambitious and impact negatively on some streets/areas. Better to prioritise - -traffic speed and overall volume of traffic, dangerous speeds across crossings, parking on zigzags/on double yellow line/on drop curbs.
- None of the proposals are for our benefit.
- Council have wider agenda, more liveable neighbourhoods leading to 15 minutes cities.
- I nearly got killed on the zebra crossing on Earlsdon St due to people parking on the actual crossing and the

zigzags on either side.

- Not enough people know about the proposals, the scheme should be paused for more consultation.
- Do something about parking outside of Nexus – loading only or double yellow.
- Closure of Arden Street together with one way system creates disruption and inconvenience for adjustment

side roads. Having to turn right at the end of Arden Street to get to a45.

- More traffic will be channelled onto Beechwood Ave with accompanying congestion. Traffic needs slowing on

Beechwood Ave, especially on the bend. Also need consideration of those visiting Earlsdon.

Crossings and

speed restrictions won't work without enforcement.

- This scheme is too complicated and over ambitious. First put 20mph zone in place, second enforce it with avg

ANPR at each end of rat run, third, watch and evaluate. Everything else might be unnecessary.

- Totally favour the 20mph restrictions. It is essential that street parking is not reduced because all that will

happen is that visitors will park on residential streets, where parking is already in short supply for residents.

- Street could be with judicious use of one way systems.

- Has a traffic survey been carried out? Where is evidence this will improve situation? If no survey, why not?

Why no general meeting to replace one cancelled?

- It seems clear to me that there is a very low public knowledge of this scheme and people are sleepwalking

into radical changes to their lifestyle.

- This is being rushed through without proper consideration of the Earlsdon residents and to what end?

- Changing the priority of Rochester Road / Beechwood Ave wouldn't slow traffic down and is highly

dangerous as there's no visibility when stopped on Beechwood Ave down towards the high st/Rochester Road. Has this actually been tested because visibility is extremely limited, and this will cause horrendous accidents as cars try to cross. Visibility can't be improved as the buildings there are permanent.

3.4 Emails

Local people were able to email us at transportprojects@coventry.gov.uk. We received the following emails:

<p>- It's a great initiative, and a chance to be bold and make some significant changes. We also very much hope it will be rolled out to other areas that need help more than Earlsdon.</p> <p>- Making Earlsdon more liveable and walkable and reducing car journeys depends on good links in and out of the area too. Walking from Earlsdon to the main rail station and adjacent bus transport hub via the route through Spencer Park is very 'doable' for many, and I think more people would be encouraged to do that if there was a stairway to get on/off the foot/cycle bridge immediately after it crosses the rail line. At present one has to walk to the far side of Central Six and then back to the buses/train station. I appreciate that it would be difficult to also install a wheelchair access/egress at that point, but a stairway (and a 'gutter' along side the stair down which one can wheel a bike) would be relatively easy to install.</p> <p>- I would like to see the High Street pedestrianised with free short-stay parking provided in the car park areas to the NW of the High street (plus blue badge parking provision as required). I think it would transform the High street and give real impetus to the liveable neighbourhood idea.</p> <p>- Warwick Ave double parking may be resolved by double yellow lines along one side or the other.</p> <p>Thanks and best of luck with the scheme.</p>
<p>Having just moved to XXXXXXXX I've missed out on the Liveable Neighbourhoods consultation. I accept I'm too late to the party, so feel free to ignore this email. However, ifor what it's worth, if I had been able to respond to the consultation I would have made the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Expand the area under consideration so it is bounded by Spencer Ave to the north and Stoneleigh Ave / Woodland Ave to the south.2) Make the whole area 20mph - with a number of the most hazardous streets (with parking on both sides of the road, leaving room for single file traffic), 15mph.3) Include extra traffic calming measures on the roads used as through routes - eg Spencer, Beechwood, Stoneleigh Avenues.4) Make the Royal Oak side of Earlsdon St no parking except for taxis, and enforce effectively.5) Create extensive cycle parking areas on Earlsdon Street. <p>That's it! Thanks and good luck with the scheme.</p>
<p>Thanks for sharing the link in our email below. I have read the Earlsdon consultation document and can see improvements to the alleyway between moor street and Earlsdon Avenue north is mentioned twice in your report once under pavements and once under alleyways. Does this mean improving it will be part of your plans? How do I get involved in the sept when you share your plans? I can't see any future events. It would be good to know if the area is council owned as if it is, is there another part of the council i can speak to about their responsibility to maintain it? Especially the area by moor street which is mainly rubble now. Hopefully it is part of your loveable area plans Thanks</p>
<p>When will the proposals be released to be looked at?</p>
<p>FYI, there are still many people in our neighbourhood who believe that this scheme includes the 15 minute neighbourhood plan. They strongly object to the 15 minute plan. There is currently discussion about this on the Earlsdon social media site. I know that this is not the case but it may be helpful if your team clarifies the situation.</p>
<p>Where can I find out about what is being discussed. I understand from friends that a meeting is due to be held could you send me some details about it.</p>

I have just received a copy of the Liveable Neighbourhoods leaflet which I read with interest but I wondered if you could clarify a couple of points:

i the first para on the main proposals states that the 20 mph zone refers to the whole area shown on the centre map. We live on XXXXXXXX- it's not clear to me whether the centre map refers to the whole map or just that in blue. I would be very disappointed if Broadway were not included, as it is already a 'rat run' and one that is becoming increasingly dangerous for families trying to cross the road from Spencer Park. In my opinion there should also be a crossing and traffic calming at the top of Broadway to give protection from the dangerous driving that has become increasingly common.

ii on a second point, I have concerns about the fact that drivers are to be denied entry to Warwick and Styvechale Ave from Beechwood Ave. In the future when we leave XXXXXXXX we will have to travel onto Kenilworth Rd from Beechwood and then down Earlsdon Ave South to Belvedere. It seems that the way things are going, Broadway will become increasingly unsafe for park users and residents as increasing numbers of vehicles travel at speed up and down the rd without any restrictions.

lii Finally it would be great if there could be a campaign to encourage people to drop their speed around Earlsdon before the new regulations come into effect. I've lived in the area as a driver myself for XXX years and have become increasingly worried by the reckless driving of many drivers. I feel that our children and grandchildren are at serious risk of harm. It is no surprise that our streets are denuded of children when the area is so unsafe for pedestrians.

I trust this email finds you well. I would like to express my concerns and offer suggestions concerning the ELNP proposal to implement a no-entry point into Arden Street from Earlsdon Street. This change will redirect traffic towards Shaftesbury Road, an alternative route to Beachwood Avenue. As a resident of XXXXXXXX I believe this increase in traffic flow could present several challenges:

1. Difficult Right Turn: The right turn into Shaftesbury Road from Earlsdon High Street is currently quite challenging due to oncoming traffic from the blind bend of Rochester Road, which can be taken at high speeds.
2. Bus Stop Obstruction: A bus stop is located at the intersection of Shaftesbury Road and Rochester Road. When a bus is waiting, it can obstruct the smooth flow of traffic, making it difficult to turn in and out of Shaftesbury Road.
3. Visibility Concerns: At the Beachwood Avenue end of Shaftesbury Road, there is a bend and a dip in the road that can obstruct the view of oncoming traffic, especially vehicles that have just turned into Shaftesbury Road and are gaining speed up the slope.
4. Safety on Busy Beechwood Avenue: Exiting or turning into Shaftesbury Road, onto the busy Beechwood Avenue, can be challenging due to the volume and speed of traffic on this straight section. Traffic going via Arden Street merges into Beachwood Avenue using the roundabout, which is much safer.
5. Road Width: Similar to Arden Street, Shaftesbury Road is not wide enough to comfortably accommodate traffic traveling in both directions simultaneously.

I believe that the proposed solution, which redirects traffic from Arden Street to Shaftesbury Road, may exacerbate these road traffic safety issues. To address these concerns, I would like to propose the following alternatives:

1. Retain Arden Street Entry: Consider retaining entry access to Arden Street instead of implementing the proposed no-entry point. While this may not be an ideal solution, it could be safer than redirecting the same traffic down Shaftesbury Road.
2. Implement No-Entry on Shaftesbury Road: In line with the plans for Arden Street, explore the possibility of adding a no-entry point to Shaftesbury Road. A similar proposed approach has been taken on Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Avenue.

I am more than willing to discuss these suggestions further and collaborate on finding the best solution to address the concerns raised while maintaining road safety for all residents. Your attention to these matters is greatly appreciated, and I look forward to your response.

<p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>
<p>We would like to invite you or a member of your team to our next NENA neighbourhood residents meeting Tuesday 3rd October 7.30 in the back room of the Royal Oak, Earlsdon High Street to update local people about the proposed plans for the Earlsdon area and gain feedback. We do hope you will be able to attend</p>
<p>Just to let you know I have asked all I know on Warwick, Stoneleigh and Styvechale avenues and NONE have received official notification of the meeting tomorrow (or the drop in dates). Considering the plan has major effects on us all I think this is a major failing.</p>
<p>Thank you for the email regarding the cancellation of the meeting on Thursday. I have to say I regard this as wholly unsatisfactory.</p> <p>You have described the drop in sessions as a way for us to tell you what we think of the plans, as well as opportunities to talk to the team directly. There is no better way than to have an open debate with the team, local councillors and other residents. Drop in sessions will not achieve that and neither will a zoom meeting to the same degree. It almost suggests that the consultation is a done deal, that the money is going to be spent whether worthwhile or not, huge inconvenience to travel around Earlsdon incurred, as well as increased carbon emissions, PM2.5s, brake and tyre dust.</p> <p>If you are concerned about the numbers who are likely to attend, then have two public meetings. The numbers expected is a good sign that residents want to make sure that the right decisions are taken, and that they understand other residents' points of view. This last is most important as some will be content with proposals whilst their neighbours may be wholly against.</p> <p>Am I right in saying that the biggest single answer is "Do nothing"? I would certainly support that option. Earlsdon is already a very Liveable Neighborhood, other areas in Coventry are in far greater need. Scarce resources must be used wisely.</p>
<p>Good evening I am very disappointed that this public meeting has been cancelled I do not consider that the drop in sessions or zoom meetings are a suitable substitute If there are too many people have two meetings I consider that the proposals are unnecessary and would be expensive We are fortunate in Earlsdon that that traffic congestion is not a big problem I think that the proposals should be withdrawn and things left as they are. In times of restricted funds the money, if it were to be spent, could be better used in more deserving areas of the city</p>
<p>I have read the message from Councillor Tucker, posted to the Earlsdon Local Message Board page on Facebook, stating that the scheduled meeting due to be held at Earlsdon Methodist Church on Thursday evening, 14th September, has been cancelled, apparently because of "limited venue capacity and expected high turn-out".</p> <p>Of course there is an expected high turn-out. That should not be surprising. I have posted a reply to Councillor Tucker stating that this cancellation is unacceptable. While there are also drop-in and online meetings available, and they will no doubt contribute, a full public meeting as originally envisaged is essential to allow an active discussion over such wide-ranging measures to take place.</p> <p>There will no doubt be many points of view that people will want to express, and that should occur in a public forum. An appropriate venue could surely be sourced for such a meeting and, until it is, these proposals should be put on hold.</p> <p>More than one meeting could be scheduled if necessary. If we are going to get this right and have decisions made as satisfactorily as possible, the whole package should be paused until all perspectives are thoroughly aired.</p> <p>I would appreciate a response, and I look forward to this cancellation being reconsidered.</p>

I would have thought that you are trying to avoid. Furthermore, I am not sure (as a cyclist) about the safety of allowing cyclists to travel both ways on a one-way street.

3. The proposals for Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Avenue will have the effect of isolating residents of Woodland Avenue and Stoneleigh Avenue from the rest of Earlsdon, and will probably also force more traffic onto Beechwood Avenue and Earlsdon Street (eg. for residents to access Albany Road and Earlsdon Avenue North) which, again, is what I would have thought you are trying to avoid. Furthermore, I don't understand what problem you are trying to solve in relation to Warwick Avenue. I use it regularly by car, bicycle and on foot. It is one of the widest roads in Earlsdon, with relatively few parked cars, and it is normally fairly quiet. For example, last Monday morning I walked along its full length and not a single car passed me in either direction whilst I did so. If car speed is the issue, then some form of traffic calming would be the most effective solution.
4. Measures to reduce cars using Stoneleigh Avenue and Woodland Avenue as a "cut-through" are welcome although access for local residents needs to be maintained. However, as indicated above, it is not possible to comment on these proposals without knowing precisely what is entailed. However, I think that consideration should be given to why motorists use this route, and I would suggest that this is because the Beechwood Avenue/Kenilworth Road junction is a difficult and time-consuming one to negotiate. If anything, your proposals will make the bottleneck at this junction even worse. I would suggest that a traffic-light controlled junction, linked to the pedestrian crossing, might be a good solution, in the same way that it is at the end of Earlsdon Avenue South. It may also have the effect of slowing down traffic on Kenilworth Road.
5. Other than comments relating to Berkeley Road, your proposals do not make it clear whether cyclists will need to adhere to the new no entry restrictions proposed. Could you clarify this please?

I should be grateful if you would please provide the information requested above so that I will then be in a position to engage more meaningfully with the proposals. I may then have further comments once it is clearer what it is that is envisaged.

I have been a resident of XXXXXXXX and am struggling to see any logic behind your proposal to stop entry into Warwick and Styvechale Aves from Beechwood Ave.

1 it is not used as a rat run (from where to where?) We do get the odd boy racers late at night but it will hardly deter them. The only occasions when we get significant through traffic is when traffic is diverted by police because of an accident on the Kenilworth Rd (how will that work)

2 It will increase congestion at the traffic lights at the Kenilworth Rd/ Earlsdon Ave S junction even if it were only the residents of both avenues trying to get home from the A45 area

3 Turning out of Warwick Ave onto Earlsdon Ave is already difficult. Traffic coming from the Kenilworth Rd rarely obeys the 30 mph limit. The road has a bend and in addition parking is permitted which obstructs the view further. There always seems to be a horse trailer parked there.

4 There is a tricky bend on Beechwood Ave near the golf and tennis club entrances, but I fail to see how traffic turning into our avenues from the Kenilworth Rd has any bearing on this.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX priorities- in particular the state of the pavements mainly because of damage by tree roots. Earlsdon Ave in particular is barely passable for a single pedestrian never mind anyone in a wheelchair or pushing a pram. I am sure you are aware that there is a centre for the blind nearby.

I would be interested in hearing your comments on the above

I recently attended a drop in meeting regarding the above issue and my wife has responded on the response sheet offered. However, I would like to raise a few points myself.

Firstly, I think that the blanket 20 mph suggestion is very good for the area.

My concerns cover some of the one way suggestions in that I hope affected residents would be made directly aware of the plans.

The flyers issued recently never came to my house, nor my neighbours in Spencer Avenue.

I am not too sure as to the benefits of a bus gate in Spencer Road unless residents in Spencer Avenue, Dalton Road, Morningside, Broadway and Belvedere Road, at least, could be allowed to go through this gate if they have resident or visitor parking permits. If not, then the liveableness of the area is diminished for residents entering from Warwick Road, Leamington area, and indeed from the east and north east of the city.

I do not see the need to restrict access to Berkeley Road North from Earlsdon Avenue South if traffic is restricted to 20 mph. This also seems to be the case for restricting access to Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Avenue

from Beechwood Avenue, For residents to the East this would create unreasonable and extended routes to traverse the Earlsdon area which does not make for a more liveable area.

I am also very unclear about the plans for entry to Stoneleigh Avenue from the Kenilworth Road. Do filters mean no access? Any restrictions could lead to traffic issues on the main Kenilworth Road, and really what is the point of inconveniencing largely local residents with such restrictions?

Finally, I do feel that there should be public meetings and if anticipated numbers are high then set up two or three and invite residents from specific parts of Earlsdon to specific events.

Thank you for your attention and I hope all points raised by residents will be carefully considered.

A XXX idea, dreamt up by a bunch of XXXXX sitting in offices trying to justify their jobs, when they spend most of their workday in the XXXXX

The nail in the coffin for neighbourhoods, and a physical assault on the private car owner. How dare you.

You as the council are elected by the public to work for us, not against us. You are NOT elected to come up with crackpot hairbrained schemes to make the lives of the local public harder and more miserable.

Hello,

I would like to respond to the proposals for the Liveable Neighbourhood scheme. I live on XXXXX.

I think that the 20mph in Earlsdon is fantastic, and I am a car driver as well as a pedestrian. Increasing the cycle lanes is also a really good thing, as well as innovative ideas like including planters at certain locations as traffic management. There are lots of people who invest in their communities in Earlsdon who would be willing to maintain them. I would be willing.

Adding a crossing at the Co-op is the most important proposal as it is so dangerous to cross there especially at the junction with Moor Street. I like the idea of the one-way streets around the High Street but won't that just funnel more cars down the High street? I think it would be better to be braver: make the High Street itself one way. Keep access via parking bays for shops and cars to park and use the extra space as a cycle lane. This is the model of Wellfield Road in Cardiff (image below). It works so well. Using this space is so much better for pedestrians and lots of businesses have outdoor seating because it is a nicer, calmer, cleaner, quieter place to sit. So make the High Street as well as the other roads around it one way.

Thank you in advance for your time.

I find it unbelievable that you are yet again tampering with the Earlsdon "traffic" .

The yellow lines in our neighbourhood have resulted in Styvechale Avenue becoming goto carpark for all and sundry.

The closure of the Beechwood end will result inevitably in a major problem at the Kenilworth Rd junction as well as inconvenience when returning to Styvechale and Warwick Avenues from that end of the city and overloading Kenilworth Rd/Earlsdon Av.South traffic lights.

The whole idea is ill thought out while not doubting the underlying good intentions ,so were Brexit and HS2 though not sure about the goodness of the intentions there.

Perhaps you should devote your energies to ensuring the repairs to the local streets and pavements, both of which are in a catastrophic state of disrepair and represent a danger to walkers especially elderly.

I recently went to a drop in meeting about the above plan and overall can see some real benefits, especially the 20 mph speed in the local streets. However, I am concerned by one or two items especially the proposed bus gate in Spencer Road which would have a detrimental effect on residents in Spencer Avenue, Dalton Road, Morningside, Broadway and even Belvedere Road, if they were travelling by car from any eastern side. The Council Representatives did mention a facility to allow those with parking permits, and their guests to pass

through such a gate. This would clearly help but I do question the need for, and expense of, a bus gate in the first place. In addition, some of the restricted entrances to roads like Berkeley Road North, Styvechale Avenue and Warwick Avenue do seem unnecessary and would create inconvenience which is contrary to the scheme I would have thought.

The biggest concern, however, is the fact that we had no leaflets about the scheme delivered to our house, nor did a number of friends in the immediate area. I did raise this with the representative who said that leaflets should have gone out and that perhaps the deliverers had not done a proper job. Surely it is vital that all residents are made aware of the various plans such as one-way roads and entry restrictions. Could I please ask you to look into this as the idea of enhancing living in the area is commendable but not if it creates new and potentially serious inconveniences and restrictions for residents, who may be unaware of a number of plans.

I have been trying to register for this evening's meeting. Could you please send me a link.

Additionally, can you please let me know why our street Radcliffe Road has been totally left off any of your maps, information sheets or proposals. We may be a small street of around 20 houses, yet many of the current proposals will have a direct impact on our residents. And currently this is not reflected anywhere in your report.

At the initial Liveable Neighbourhoods meeting I understand that the analogy of Walthamstow was used. There was no acknowledgment that the demographic is completely different.

Our age profile is at least twice that and our public transport system just cannot be used as a comparison. We have two buses an hour and they arrive very closely to each other. An ageing population will not be able to cycle everywhere and will need their cars to shop and visit other places. Unable to use bicycles for a weekly shop would only add to the use of delivery drivers.

Having attended a consultation meeting at Earlsdon Library I feel I must put my concerns into writing as I was not aware of any notes being taken at the time.

Firstly, like many others in the community, I do support the 20mph speed limit, the extra crossing by the Co op and the shared community space between the school and the library.

However, having looked carefully at the plans I would like to ask the following questions:

Has traffic flow been monitored on every street affected?

If so, can the findings be made public?

Traffic flow through Styvechale and Warwick Avenues mostly is from the residents - they remain an oasis of calm throughout the busiest times. Even many of their residents do not want to be limited to only having one entrance/exit.

Let us focus too on Moor Street for example. You turn into it, can only turn left into Warwick Street and then right into Arden Street. You are then met with a traffic filter- supposedly you can drive through it? Otherwise you could be trapped inside an area of narrow streets - already over used. There is no vehicular access out of Myrtle Grove onto Hartington Crescent.

In terms of cycle parking, how many car parking spaces will be lost? Why are there no designated bicycle spaces in Styvechale and Warwick Avenues - where houses have drives and parking isn't an issue?

The plans for changing Spencer Avenue and preventing access to the Kenilworth Road concern me too: it will just make people go on longer journeys and add considerably to the bottle necks on the Kenilworth Road by the school.

On another issue, as it is clear that traffic will be further directed into Earlsdon Street and Radcliffe Road, why are you further inconveniencing residents by installing gates so that the road can be closed?

Despite the HMOs and student population Earlsdon retains a strong sense of community - as is evidenced by the support for the festival. A local venture supporting local people and giving to local charities. Residents do not want or need a market using outside traders and impacting negatively on the shops which are already struggling.

I wish to make two further points. Nowhere are people living in the area mentioned and the impact on householders and long term residents seems not to have been considered at all - and the statement that the 'contractors have been found and will begin in January' seems to me to imply a 'done deal'.

I pay my council tax and road tax and have lived here for almost XXXX. I have seen Earlsdon undergo many changes but never have I felt so insignificant and disempowered.

I would therefore appreciate acknowledgment of the points I have made and would hope to be reassured that plans are not yet set in stone.

I joined the online consultation this evening but left as I could not see when I would be able to ask my specific questions.

Please add these comments to your survey.

I live on XXXXXXXX and have two main concerns :

1.The Spencer Road Bus gate

I am concerned that if a bus gate is installed up by Henry 8th we will have no car access to the Kenilworth Road from Broadway other than by going via very circuitous routes which would add to air pollution. To get to Central Six and the the rail station would involve driving along Earlsdon Avenue South and joining all the traffic going north or driving down Albany Road to Spon End and adding to the traffic there and on the ring road. At present I usually walk but my husband and I XXXXXXXXso can see a time when this may not be possible. At present we take our granddaughter to the XXXXXXSpencer, but with the bus gate there it would be a very convoluted journey. Having the bus gate would stop all cars from Spencer and Broadway going directly to the Kenilworth Rd. increasing the burden on other roads and adding to environmental pollution.

2. One way on Spencer from Mayfield Rd to Albany Rd.

There are two problems here. One is that all residents of that stretch of road will have to drive up Broadway and then do a U turn into Spencer. Secondly when through drivers find they cannot drive up Spencer they will drive up Broadway and because of the bus gate, would turn into Belvedere to get to Earlsdon Avenue South. This would create chaos on Broadway which is narrower than Spencer. It would also increase traffic on Belvedere which would be likely to be quite speedy as it is a much wider road.

I understand that Spencer is currently used by a lot of non-residents and often cars go at speed, but I feel a better approach would be to reduce the speed of cars by installing speed bumps and imposing a 20 mph speed limit. I do not accept your arguments on page 3 of sheet 15 under "Alternative proposals" that traffic calming would have a negative impact as this would be counterbalanced by drivers having to make longer circuitous journeys which would produce more negative impact.

I realise that a 20 mph speed limit has been politicised by the current government trying to gain votes, but I feel that the only way to improve our living environment, make it safer and reduce pollution is by having a 20 mph limit in all urban side streets as has been introduced in Wales. It is most concerning that central government is talking about taking the authority from local councils to reduce the speed limits in towns.

I would be grateful if these comments could be added to your report.

Dear Sirs,

Your leaflet on this scheme dropped through my door recently and I took the opportunity to drop into the "Consultation" session at Earlsdon Golf Club today.

I put "consultation" in "" as clearly this was nothing of the sort as any observations made were more or less rebuffed with buzz phrases like ..traffic modelling...and assertions on traffic patterns that left me and everyone

else at the table bewildered based on a collective 100 years of actually living in Earlsdon and driving around its roads at all times of the day and week.

The singular provision I objected to, as indeed...again... did everyone else was the bus gate on Spencer Road which despite the protestations about computer modelling I can assure you will very adversely affect the access to Kenilworth Road at the junction with Earlsdon Avenue South. Others and myself systematically pointed out the plans various drawbacks and none were actually addressed other than through blandishments about what the computer says!

What did come out of the chat was that basically £500000 has been parachuted in from transport West Midlands...itself trickled down from central government ...so all our money, and you now have to find a scheme to spend it!

I have an incredibly simple message to your consultation, although I am sure this will find as much traction as the discussion today...

DON'T!

Just stop this scheme designed to tangle up the roads in Earlsdon..by all means put in a few pedestrian crossings...but no bus gates, no additional one ways; they will create more issues than they ever solve; this appears to me money trying to find a scheme which is trying to find a problem.

After spending the morning at the ELN drop in session I've just started completing your online feedback form and find I'm stuck at the question about 20MPH Zone (which I very much favour).

I had understood that the zone would include all of the streets enclosed by the red-dotted line on the map but the list of streets which follows the question includes only a few of these. Thus for example Morningside is included in the list but Broadway isn't.

Could I ask you please to confirm which area is proposed to be covered by the 20MPH Zone?

What is most effective way to stop all the proposals?

Good afternoon

I have attended one of the drop in sessions relating to the above but have some concerns as to whether my views and those of other attendees were taken on board.

I consider that Earlsdon is a reasonably affluent area with no real congestion problems. Whilst I agree with a few of the suggestions in the scheme, the items concerned could and should be dealt with by local councillors.

I consider that considering spending £500,000 in this area on this project is an appalling waste of money and should not go ahead.

I live in XXXXXXXXXXXX and do not wish to see the end of the road blocked/ restricted. We do not suffer any real congestion problems. I do not wish to lil am against all of the one way systems and road closures as, it appeared, were most if not all of the attendees at the meeting.

Considering gates to shut Earlsdon Street when events occur is a shocking waste of money.

This project should not go ahead is the overwhelming view. It is largely unnecessary and a complete waste of taxpayers money.

Please let me know what happens if this does go ahead but over time the residents think there is no improvement or a deterioration?

I look forward to your response.

Transport project proposal

I am writing to comment on the proposals for changes in Earlsdon to make it more 'Livable'

I have lived here for over XXXX years and now as I have got older and am no longer able to cycle or walk with heavy shopping I need to use these roads by car (the ones which have been earmarked for change)

Examples

First example

(1) I go to the City Centre shops as I feel they need to be supported and also Central six (which has good parking)

My route is XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

(I am Totally Opposed to this Bus Gate)

So

The alternatives for me to go to town

* The High Streetthis can be very busy (even now) with cars, delivery vans, Buses, pedestrian crossings (and more to be placed here)

Plus if there is a street market with Road closure ... there will be a diversion of traffic making it even more difficult and dangerous to go down the High Street

Driving all the way round Hearsall Common to Spon End is a heartsink plangoing to make it Harder for me (and the idea is to make this area more Livable)....

* The other way into town is up Kenilworth Road to Warwick Road which involves a 3 way junction (with Leamington Road) where I have seen the aftermath of a serious car accident with ambulances and police cars and the Police Officer said "people just don't follow the Highway Code and they don't follow speed restrictions" I have also had near misses at this place so now avoid it and would greatly resent being forced to use it

Question 1

Please could you tell me as to which route I must take to continue supporting the City Centre shops (and those in Central 6)

Or will they all be closing anyway?

(2) Second example

The next issue is going South by turning into Kenilworth Road eg to visit friends even travelling further South At certain times it is quite busy so turning right from Beechwood Avenue into Kenilworth Road does take a long time (and at other times it is possible)

So

When it is busy we (both my husband and I) go down Warwick Avenue or Styvechale Avenue to get to the traffic lights to turn Right into Kenilworth Road

Question 2

Please advise as to how we turn into Kenilworth Road safely (Avoiding the High Street which will be busier)

Comment

I am TOTALLY Against

(1) a Street Market in Earlsdon (with proposed Road closure).

* I have no idea why someone would want it....I certainly have no intention of attending or supporting it

So NO to a market Gate

Also Zero interest in benches around the library....why would anyone want to sit in the middle of all those traffic fumes when they can sit in the Park?

Why not have the the street market somewhere with space and parking like at Central Six?

(2) the Bus Gate....definitely a NO

(3) NO to present closures to Styvechale and Warwick avenues at Beechwood Road end....

These plans will make my life more difficult and Definitely from my point of view make XXXXXXXXXa Worse Place to live in

(A Prison with no Walls)

I would really appreciate it if these points could be looked at carefully and if possible could you answer the above 2 questions

Thank you for your attention

<p>Can I please add an additional thought to my earlier e-mail about the liveable neighbourhood scheme. I would like to particularly add a comment about a proposed bus gate in Spencer Road. One of the advisors said that some system whereby residents and guests with parking permits might be a solution if they were allowed to drive through the bus gate. However, for the unexpected (but welcome) visitor would the provision of an on-line parking permit when they arrived and parked at Spencer Avenue or Broadway protect them from any penalty if they had traversed the bus gate en-route? Such visitors add to the liveable nature of any neighbourhood. The process seems to be built in with problems and the cancellation of the bus gate would solve more issues than it might ever solve if implemented. As a resident in XXXXXX I can say that the road is not a rat-run now that the ring road alterations are completed by the Butts. Obviously, living in an urban area does involve traffic at certain times as every resident knows.</p>
<p>I have some serious concerns regarding the above of which I and many other Earlsdon residents have only recently been made fully aware. The lack of supporting evidence is very alarming. XXXXXXXXXXXXX I have been Earlsdon residents for nearly fifty years and cannot recall a single serious road traffic accident so where is the official data? I was informed by a council representative at a recent drop-in meeting that the maps showing traffic density proportions (not numbers ?) were compiled from insurance companies data from those motorists with fitted black boxes. I am informed that this represents less than two % of the motoring population. All of the proposed road closures are nonsensical and will serve only to penalise and inconvenience the residents. I live in XXXXXX including Myrtle Grove, Clarendon Street and Bell End there are more than one hundred residents with cars (plus the many visitors to the Jigsaw nursery and the Earlsdon health centre) . Due to the closure of Arden Street north and Moor Street becoming partially one way, each journey towards the city centre will involve 400 metres extra driving and 800 metres for each journey north towards the A45. This will generate an enormous increase in vehicle emissions and cannot possibly be compatible with the City Council's air quality improvement initiatives. I hope you share my concerns and will endeavour, as a minimum, to ensure these measures are all postponed (hopefully scrapped or substantially revised) until there is comprehensive, measured and understandable evidence and all residents individually informed . I've spoken to neighbours and many are completely unaware of these measures.</p>
<p>Dear Sir Madam I am new resident in XXXXXXXX who has read and responded to the online consultation of Earlsdon Liveable Neighbourhood project- there is a lot that is positive in the proposals. I think it would be helpful in clarifying the basis of the proposals if the data gathered to inform te proposals was made available for review. In particular I think the data on traffic flows by street and road would be of particular significance and use for community reveiw. would you be able to confirm if ths data will be published in conjunction with the summary of resposnes to the consultation, if this not to be the case would you advise who may need to be contacted for a request for the data under a FOI request.</p>
<p>I have read the documents and attended a meeting but have some unanswered questions. Please can you tell me: 1. What environmental impact assessments have been carried out? (CO2, air pollution etc) 2. What impact assessments on local businesses have been carried out? 3. What traffic measurements have been made and have accidents been analysed? These seem to me fundamental underpinnings to any proposed changes, but I can't see any info on them. I hope you can help.</p>
<p>I have lived on XXXX for 34 years and as years have gone by the level of traffic has increased. Whilst this is a nationwide issue in recent years the level of air pollution has been of great concern to me. I have found to my dismay that my address is 3 levels above the WHO recommended percentile. I now am very concerned that some of the Liveable Neighbourhood suggestions put forward will increase both the traffic and air pollution exponentially on the Avenue.</p>

I would like to know if the city Council is going to install air quality stations and take this problem into consideration?

Moving traffic from one street to another is not a practical solution.

I do not feel that the feedback from residents is being listened to.

I look forward to your feedback.

I have only just seen, yesterday, your pamphlet outlining proposals for the Earlsdon Area. I am writing to show significant objection to a number of the proposals with some detail on our lifestyle. The impact on our lives in Kenilworth / Stoneleigh with HS2 is unimaginable as for some years now we face a constant pattern of closed roads and traffic lights. So, to add more delays at the home end of our journey seems too much to leave unchallenged.

1/ Bus Gate proposed Spencer road. The way I read this is that we will no longer be able to exit Dalton road by car and turn right to go up to the A429 (Kenilworth Road). The right of way will be for Buses, Taxis and Cycles. This short section is a route that we use multiple times a day and we find it hard to understand how to consider it acceptable that our journey times will increase significantly adding more car pollution and congestion to the area. Monday to Friday our day starts with the school run and our children are at different schools, so we use Spencer road to take the Leamington Road out of town. I am also working at Stoneleigh so also use the Spencer road route out of town. In the evening the same happens in reverse where we return via Leamington Road to pick up Spencer Road. The alternative way out would be to now use Belvedere Road, Earlsdon Av South, Kenilworth Road and head back to town to take the Leamington Road via a junction that is often the site of some serious accidents.

Our Doctor for some of the familyXXXXXXXX and whilst we are all healthy we do have frequent visits to the doctors for vaccines, routine medicine and nurse appointments. This again means we use Spencer Road Frequently.

We try where possible to shop local and the new Aldi at Central six is convenient and on our doorstep. Whilst this is a short walking distance, carrying family needs of heavy things like milk, vegetable and toiletries means we need to take the car at least every couple of days. Today, this is a journey of 3 to 4 minutes but if you close off Spencer Road we will be forced to go Belvedere Road, Earlsdon Avenue South and then onto Kenilworth road which is then 10 minutes plus.

We are frequent visitors to XXXXXXXXXXX and once again as you may know this is just XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX or Warwick Avenues which again is 4 to 5 minutes but you would now force out onto Kenilworth Road and timing this journey it is now 10 mins plus each way.

3/ One way proposal Spencer Avenue

As I said before we do like to shop local and by our fuel and the odd takeaway from Spon End but the changes to Spencer Avenue would mean a longer journey time with again more pollution and congestion.

We also take the Albany road to get to Westminster Road for the XXXXXX

If you haven't already done so you may also like to consult with residents in Scholars Court as I know they also use Spencer Road to make similar journey to ours up to the A429 Junction.

When we first moved to Coventry the city was a visible working class city where it was possible to find a wide range of interesting shops and for sure we supported the city businesses spending several hundred pounds a week in the city. Now I am afraid we never go to the city as the demographics have changed and the shops have virtually all disappeared.

The decline of the city and these proposed road alterations, if they proceed, would be a strong indication that our lifestyle is not welcomed in Earlsdon and that we must seriously consider a move away from Coventry.

Apologies if this sounds abrupt but our lives are about to be significantly disrupted if you choose to go ahead with the first 2 alterations that you propose.

Hoping our voice is heard and shame we were not advised or consulted when this process started.

Thank you for replying. I wrote to you as the leaflet suggested doing so and you are local
Why can't you forward it to the 'govt survey' site?

There are many people opposed to the plans especially th3 Bus Gate which would be horrendous.

Q

1) Why have the people in the centre of Earlsdon been given priority when their ideas leading to the present plans was bound to affect a much larger group of residents?

2) Who is responsible for consulting just the smaller group of residents?

3) Is this something instigated at Govt level rather than Locally by the Council?

May I first comment on the failure to inform many Earlsdon residents with regard to this project and, I believe, the cancellation of the initial public meeting where Cabinet Members and Ward Councillors were supposed to be present. Not a good start I feel.

I attended two of your meetings at Hearsall Golf Club and St Barbara's Church and was unimpressed by the poor organisation and the failure of Coventry Ward Councillors to attend. Your representatives appeared to take no notes and even commented that "other people didn't have the same opinion as you" which was not in their remit. The whole thing, frankly, was shambles.

Your proposals seem to have little to commend them apart from speed restrictions which are regularly broken by a few due to the inability of the police to maintain law and order - so everyone has to suffer. Road closures will affect Coventry citizens using the Kenilworth Road, Leamington Road, Earlsdon Avenue, and through to Hearsall Common, and I question the right of "Earlsdon people" to have this affect on others by becoming, so they hope, a liveable Neighbourhood. The plans to close off certain roads or make one way systems make already awkward junctions even more difficult. To make a bus gate in Spencer Avenue is ridiculous and, if put forward by residents, merely shows that it doesn't pay to ask people what they want because someone, somewhere, is going to suggest almost anything. I was surprised that it was even put forward unless someone wishes to close KHS School.

I also attended a privately and well attended meeting at Hearsall Golf Club last Sunday. This consisted of filling in forms of comments on various points followed by a general discussion. XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX. So congratulations, your interference has made for a rather less liveable neighbourhood. Incidentally, I was amazed to find that none of your team actually live in Earlsdon.

So, although you can do nothing about it because it is not the business of the quango you represent, let me tell you that to improve Earlsdon, a decent shopping street with all facilities, decent pavement, proper policing to enforce speeding and parking laws, adequate street cleaning, rejigging the crossing by the library so it was on adjacent roads, proper council support for the library - no wonder those City Councillors failed to put in an appearance. A few flower troughs and seats do not make up for these many deficiencies.

And, of course, your proposals are just tinkering at the edges. Costly, in the main quite useless and pandering to the moaning of those who fail to understand the principal of live and let live and complain so selfishly about almost everything that affects them personally. Perhaps lockdown has had a greater affect than is generally realised.

I only hope that this Pilot Scheme fails to materialise. The damage I fear it will cause, will never be undone but will be deemed as yet another wonderful innovation. Yet I had the feeling that despite all your discussions and meetings, the matter had already been decided.

Well done - I didn't manage to get to any of the meetings, but I did read your proposals and all of the ancillary information sheets. You've put in a lot of work, and come up with a fine set of proposals. Of course, it does mean some extra inconvenience for residents, but well worth it. I particularly like the inclusion of Spencer Road/Avenue where at present the residents sometimes have to withstand an avalanche of cars thundering down the hill.

Concerning my own road XXXXXXX, I fully agree with your proposals, and the priority assigned to Rochester Road is sheer brilliance. There is a lot of foot traffic crossing Beechwood Avenue at that intersection and the priority given to Rochester Road will greatly assist them, and may encourage more.

Congratulations to you all. Now you just have to implement the plan - difficult and time-consuming work. Best of luck!

I live XXXXXXX and so would be affected by the implementation of plans to calm and alter the flow of traffic in this area.

I would like to express my surprise and disappointment that I have received no leaflet or letter from the council to alert me to these plans. The only reason I am aware of them is through a local WhatsApp group formed during lockdown! I do not think that that is good enough from my council - I have not been informed let alone consulted.

From what I have seen of the plans, my major concerns are as follows: I do not see an impact study of the proposed changes so feel we could end up with a different, but equally troublesome set of traffic conditions for all it is possible to tell e.g. long traffic queues on Albany Rd and Beechwood Avenue; I think the bus gate at the top of Spencer Ave would be a bad idea. I do approve of most of the 20 mph restrictions but am not convinced about the need for so many blocked off/one way roads.

In brief, an impact study and proper notification and consultation are what I consider necessary.

I am writing about the Earlsdon proposals for Liveable Neighbourhoods.

My husband and I are residents of XXXXXXXX and we are in favour of improved pedestrian crossings and limiting speed on Beechwood Avenue by sensible means, eg speed humps, speed limit signs and cameras. The proposal for making Rochester Rd the primary road rather than Beechwood Avenue will cause dangerous problems as the cross roads of said roads has very limited visibility if you are on Beechwood Avenue. High fences and trees and walls make visibility from Beechwood Ave along Rochester Rd left and right extremely difficult.

The proposal of a bus gate on Spencer Road will have a very negative impact on a lot of people living in Earlsdon as well as for Henry VIII school pupils, teachers and parents who have to drop off and pick up children.

The many one way road system proposals will only serve to hurt Earlsdon residents, the very people your campaign is supposed to help. It will mean residents having to go much further to get home or access certain roads and areas of Earlsdon, thus creating more pollution not less. The resulting road signage will be confusing for everyone and put people off coming to Earlsdon completely, thus having a disastrous effect on the many businesses in Earlsdon.

Much more traffic will be pushed onto already busy roads creating more dangers for the hundreds of schoolchildren using them.

We feel we have been treated very shabbily about this project and are still waiting to have a public meeting about it.

Everyone in Earlsdon wants a safe environment for residents and visitors but what you are proposing is at best a complete waste of money when simpler measures could be taken, and at worst an imposition on residents of things we simply do not want.

I write on the above subject and I was given excellent information by your team at an open session at St Barbara's Church recently.

I welcome many parts of the scheme. Particularly the extension of the bicycle lanes scheme and the need to reduce traffic speed with the 20mph zone for the area.

I am surprised you have not considered Arden Street in the one way system as this is a narrow street with parking on both sides of the road, busy and often log jammed with two way traffic. The no entry point with Earlsdon Street will reduce some traffic but the entry point to Arden Street from Warwick Street is often a blind spot with parked cars and vans.

My interest is as a resident of XXXXXXXX with the proposed no entry point. As you will be aware it is a high density street with an even higher car ownership and usage.

I assume that the no entry point proposed will still be an exit point which is currently hazardous with exit either right of left into heavy oncoming traffic with obscured views by parked vehicles. However, turning into Berkeley Road North from Earlsdon Avenue South either right of left is not hazardous with clear views of oncoming traffic and with space for vehicles to pass whilst waiting to turn right.

The proposal is in effect creating Berkeley Road North as a one way street by using and increasing traffic into Mayfield Road or Broadway as entry to the road. (The use of the road for three point turns for cars, vans or trucks is likely to cause problems of blocking traffic.

The solution you propose is the opposite to the real problem of exiting into heavy traffic and not entering Berkeley Road North from Earlsdon Ave South. No doubt you have your reasons but they appear to escape me at the present. I would ask you to seriously reconsider this specific action as I can see no rationale for it.

I look forward to your response.

I was made aware of the traffic proposals for Earlsdon via my daughter's school.

I'm a resident at XXX and deeply surprised that no information about the proposal was provided to my house when there is significant changes being planned on my doorstep. Proposal which some I agree will be helpful to reduce traffic to Beechwood Avenue.

Couple of comments, referencing the sheets on website:

Sheet 1 Beechwood Avenue Traffic calming scheme:

Proposal 3:

- Agree will reduce speed to Beechwood Avenue
- I recall seeing proposal to have car charging on the section across the elongated central island, is that now not going to happen?
- Is there a need to have a staggered entrance as might cause confusion/accidents (if stagger is not far enough)?
- There seems to be no unrestricted parking from the new junction all the way to near tennis club. Is the yellow lines double of single? Delivery drivers won't have anywhere to stop/park, especially for deliveries down narrow lane on 125 - they park either outside 129/127 or 113-119 (which seems to be gone in proposal 4) then walk down.

Proposal 4:

- As mentioned above lost of unrestricted parking. Why not have one side only as per proposal 7? Or at least highlight lost of parking!
- Could similar objective of pedestrian and reducing speed be achieved with using proposal 5? Allows parking (as wide road/move to opposite side) then pinchpoint chicane at 117/119.
- I can't see anything thing being done for the small lane beside Bates road as visibility needs to be increased
- Proposal likely reduce visibility of cars coming out of Bates Road. Volume of cars not going to reduce as only road out of Riddings area is via Bates Road.

Proposal 7:

- Removing access would mean all the cars from houses in the area would need to use Kenilworth road. What analysis has been done to see if Kenilworth road can take the extra load? It's already really busy during school runs.
- What analysis has been done to avoid this junction be significantly busier/takes ages to turn left? At times I've used these roads so as to be able to use the traffic lights at Earsldon to get to Kenilworth Road. I will have no option or go down Stoneleigh avenue - which is something the proposals are trying to avoid.
- Warwick Avenue is a wide road so don't think the proposal for no entry makes sense. I can see it making sense for Styvechale Avenue where road is narrower.
- Having double yellow is good idea as improves the visibility and one side still provides unrestricted parking (unlike proposal 4!)

Sheet 15: Spencer Road Bus Gate

- This proposal, together with proposal 7 will mean I will have to use Kenilworth road then Davenport Road for school drop off.
- Davenport Road is already very busy which will get worse.
- Cars will have to carry U-turn before the bus gate on Spencer Avenue - really don't see how this can be safer for cyclist/pedestrians.
- In section on influencing proposal, could the timing be set that allow road to be open during school run times.
- Otherwise, the proposal just doesn't makes sense. Will push drop-offs onto other areas which just creates problems elsewhere - at the moment it is fairly spread out.
- Making on way entry at Spencer/Albany junction (sheet 16) will already reduce the traffic coming down Spencer Road. What additional reduction is this actually going to make with bus gate after that proposal?

Separately, what is the timelines for the implementation?

I was intending to respond scheme by scheme, but due top pressure of work, (and a new grand-daughter living with us), I have not been able to commit the time necessary.
It seems that all the assessment work has been done whilst the chaos of the Butts improvements were under way (plus the Charter Avenue works to some extent), and many road users were using Earlsdon as a relief road. Now they are done, there has been a noticeable drop in traffic. Surely a new assessment is needed?

It is well known that users avoid the Canley Island(fire station), Kenilworth Rd Lights and Leamington Road island by coming by Sainsburys, beechwood Ave, Kenilworth Rd/ Coat of Arms bridge Road, Baginton Rd, and Back on the A45 by the Festival Island. None of these schemes will change that.

As many cars ignore the 30mph, why you think making it 20mph will make any difference to speeds I cannot understand.(unless you are to spend money on enforcement)

With that in mind

I will therefore try to break down my responses in groups.

These assume ALL the schemes are introduced as designed.

If any of them are removed from the plan, then the whole dynamic will change, and if that happens, then surely you will have to issue the consultation process yet again.

Schemes that will benefit, and cause little adverse effects:-

- Albany Road Toucan Crossing
- Berkeley Road North restriction
- Beechwood Avenue/Hartington Crescent Island improvements
- Moor St and Warwick one way
- Arden St egress only junction

Schemes that will benefit, but dependant on other parts being adopted , could cause minor issues.

- Closure of access to Shaftsbury Road, this will increase traffic on Beechwood Avenue
- One way at the bottom of Spencer Road, only really effective with the Bus gate
- One way in Newcombe Road, this will have issue on egress during school time, made worse with the new bus stops designs.
- One way on Berkeley Road South. This will mean the majority of deliveries will have to use Stvechale/Osbourne Road. It will also mean that any taxi accessing the new taxi rank will logically use the same route.

Road restriction on Beechwood adjacent to the Tennis Club access. If a vehicle approaches from Kenilworth Road, wishing to access the club, it will be on the right hand side of the road, if a vehicle is exiting and wishes to turn toward Kenilworth Road, the will be an impasse, and that car will have to turn left. This happens currently, but the cars can safely manoeuvre to allow them to pass.

Schemes that will have adverse effects on local area

Moving the bus stops into the running lanes on Earlsdon Avenue North and South. This will cause severe traffic congestion, especially on the section outside the library at school times. It also could have a knock on effect on the upper part of Newcombe road, as when busy, users will use that and Poplar Road to avoid the library bus stop.

No entry to Warwick and Stvechale Aveues. This will increase traffic On Earlsdon Avenue North and South, as access from

- Town/Cheylesmore/Rugby/London will, logically, have to use Leamington Road (and its junction with Warwick Rd and Kenilworth Road), Kenilworth Road, and its Junction with Earlsdon Avenue
- Allesley/Tile Hill/Birmingham will now HAVE to use Broad Lane/Tile Hill Lane, Hearsall Common, Earlsdon Ave North and South.

- It also does nothing to stop the cars using the roads in the other direction during the evenings (which will only be worse if more vehicles are forced to use Earlsdon Ave/Kenilworth Rd Lights.)

No access/Egress from Stoneleigh Avenue. This will increase traffic on Beechwood Avenue, and its junction with Kenilworth Road, and its junction with Rochester Road.

Yellow line works on Beechwood from the golf club to Kenilworth Rd. This will only enable any speeding driver to have an unimpeded dead straight line between the S bend and Kenilworth Rd. Currently the staggered parking significantly reduce speeding vehicles. They would also cause extra parking on Stvechale and Stoneleigh Avenues from the Golf Club.

No access/egress on Arden St. This will move traffic along Beechwood Avenue to Rochester Road, then down towards Earlsdon St. It will also increase traffic on Earlsdon St, as all the residents will have to use it for access and egress.

Access only at Moor St. As above this will force more vehicles on to Earlsdon St.

Beechwood Avenue/Rochester Junction change. The current issue with buses at this junction is that they have to swing into the right hand lane to make the turn into Rochester Road. The new junction design does not seem to aid this, in fact it could make the issue more difficult. If the bus prepares the turn, but the running lanes of Rochester want to turn into Beechwood, then the junction will gridlock. There will also be a significant loss in parking in the area, which will have an adverse effect on the Church.

Pedestrian Crossing outside Wetherspoons. Many people are in favour of the crossing, but the subsequent design changes to Earlsdon St. seem somewhat strange. I realise you need the zig zag protection, but why not put the bus stop right up to them, then the bus has a clean route to depart. This would leave the original parking as is.

Delivery bay in Earlsdon St. Anyone who has used this road when a blue badge car parked outside the old building society will tell you the chaos that car caused. Putting a 10 tonne lorry there for a period of time would be far worse.

Bus gate in Spencer Road. Primarily, this will move even more traffic onto Kenilworth Road and its junction at Earlsdon Ave South, it also raise questions as to how car users who utilise the additional parking spaces are supposed to get back out of the road (or lorries who would then have to reverse all the way back to Davenport Road.

Other alternative schemes that would achieve the original objective, but have not been considered.

Delete

Arden St Closure

Stoneliagh Ave closure

Shaftsbury Rd closure

Bus gate

Warwick and Stvechale no entry

Restriction on Beechwood by the Tennis club

Yellow line works on Beechwood Ave

Use Tabletop junctions at

Warwick Avenue/Beechwood Ave

Styvechale Ave/Beechwood Avenue

Rochester Road/Beechwood Ave, and remove changes to parking and road lining at the junction with Bates Rd.

Access to Tennis Club

Moor St/Earlsdon St

Albany Rd/Newcombe Rd/Spencer Ave.

Dalton Road/Spencer Ave

Move the bus stop on Earlsdon Ave south back to start after the access drop kerb to the care home, this would ensure the bus can get into the stop straight, (which is not possible most of the time)

Leave the bus stop outside the Library but enlarge the central refuge at the pedestrian crossing to make the road a single lane (currently many near misses as some think it is wide enough for 2 cars). This, if staggered, would ensure a safer crossing, and would let traffic move on one side, rather than both ways stopping once a pedestrian commences to cross.

I believe this email may have bounced back the first time I sent it as Ive had no response.

On the 8th of October, just less than 200 local Earlsdon residents came together to discuss the changes. The meeting went on for over 2 hours, XXXXXXXXX, many views were respectfully listened too and challenged.

I set up feedback sheets for attendees to put their views. Please find this attached. Please note this has been typed word for word and I haven't the originals if needed.

Please can this feedback be officially acknowledged as its a true account of Earlsdon residents views.

Broadway Road Views

Enthusiastic and moixed views.

Concern that if Bus ate goes ahead a lot of the traffic will be diverted down Broadway .

Concerns that as it has two bends and is less straiht than Spencer this will creat worse problems.

20mph broad support

Crossing broad support

Concerns about whether enforcement will be possible.

Combination of effect of closure on Berkely Road , Stoneleigh Road and Bus ate on Broadway.

Concern for knock on effect on Earlsdon Ave South and Albany Road and the Broadway.

In favour of something to reduce issues on SPencer Avenue.

Bus ate wont solve issue.

Taxis could be allowed through or not.

Does bus gate have to be 24 hour

Plan will help cycling.

Hello,

After attending an initial meeting, I fell out of the loop on the Liveable Neighbourhood meetings. I've just done my survey and am impressed by your ambitious and potentially transformative plans! When are you meeting next? I would like to get back involved as much as possible. I really hope we don't let this opportunity for change pass us by.

I've now left a couple of voicemail messages for you but, as you've not yet been able to get back to me, I thought it best to send you an email.

I live in XXXXX and earlier this week I met with a group of residents (on Zoom) to discuss the implications of the ELN Plan for our Street.

Some questions about the plan were raised (which couldn't answer) and I was asked to contact you on behalf of the group to seek your assistance.

You'll appreciate, that it is important to my neighbours and I to have our queries addressed before the end of the consultation period so that any additional information you provide can be taken into account when submitting our responses to the consultation. I would therefore be most grateful if you could please phone me as soon as possible and certainly before the weekend.

EARLSDON LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOOD SCHEME

Personal Observations

Earlsdon, (a mid-19th century creation), unsurprisingly does not cope well with 21st century traffic; the volume of it; the increasing size of cars and the 'assumed need' for them. There is insufficient car parking; there is no/little police or traffic warden/ Police Community Support Officer (PCBO) 'presence' - even a 'walk-through' might be helpful? Therefore, cars I often see as parked badly and often ignore double-yellow lines, etc. Recently, it has become noticeable that cars now undertake 3-point turns in the centre of Earlsdon rather than drive round a block.

Residential streets have indeed become 'rat-runs' (e.g. Arden St).

Commercial Earlsdon has also changed; there are increased coffee shops and restaurants – bringing people into it for 14 – 15 hours a day, and not just the 'working day'. I wonder if this has increased the number of lorries and vans coming into central Earlsdon to service these outlets, (adding to the volume and pressures of traffic)?

I feel that there needs to be a careful balance between 'traffic' and Earlsdon residents and local people on foot, children, older people, cyclists, etc. This also includes the idea that (a) traffic passing through should use the main (arterial) roads, and (b) that good traffic-flow through Earlsdon should be promoted. Failure creates impatience/frustration for both residents and drivers, etc. and I believe the risks are heightened thro' both drivers' and pedestrians' 'poor behaviour' when this happens.

Therefore, there should be efforts made to reduce the 'rat-run' effect; that there should be some one-way streets / routing; that there should be a further reduced speed limit for, and around, 'the centre' of Earlsdon; there should be some, if limited, traffic wardens / PCBO presence on a more routine basis.

The Centre of Earlsdon – Clocktower Roundabout

- The information around the crossings is confusing: Albany Rd crossing to Library and School has gone (Map pdf 4) although itself seems well used. The narrative identifies there is a new Earlsdon St. crossing.

Is this a new and additional crossing, or re-siting of the Albany Rd crossing to Library and School?

If so, perhaps this crossing could be situated further up Earlsdon St. and the 'Post Office crossing' removed?

- Would CO-ORDINATING the 3 or 4 pedestrian crossing lights be helpful around school opening and leaving times? (This part of Earlsdon seems to be very busy / higher risk area and balance between traffic flow and pedestrians is important?)

- Is it practical to remove the roundabout and having traffic /pedestrian crossing signals?

- 'Benches' around the pavements here will potentially make the area around the roundabout a very busy place; many possible driver distractions; people crossing the roads irrespective of crossroads, etc.

Beechwood Road

- The junction at the crossroads of Beechwood Avenue and Rochester Road.....'will have to turn right/left'.

- Is this correct? Cannot traffic continue the whole length of the Beechwood Av.?

- Will this not create more traffic going into the Rochester Rd (North) & Earlsdon St?

- What about those who live in in and around 'South of Beechwood Av. If they want to make a simple journey across the railway bridge?

- I understand the 'barrier' with Palmerstone Rd and Beechwood Av. Is to be strengthened (understandably) which is positive.

- I understand also there is to be a 'chicane' introduced to help slow traffic around the Palmerstone/Beechwood area, (tennis club entrance). The 'S-bend' (between the tennis court and golf club entrance seems to be 'a risk area': who would expect to see an S-type Jaguar on its roof here, (albeit some years ago now)!

Perhaps the 'S-bend' should be 'the chicane': re-styling the bend with additional 'assistance' to slow down the traffic entering from both ends of this stretch of Beechwood Av. This road should have a 20 mph throughout its length.

Perhaps some thought should be given to removing 50 – 75 mtrs of bushes & trees along the tennis court side would improve visibility 'across the bend' and ensure vehicles can see each other and are able to 'judge the bend' more easily?

This part of the road surface is also poor, and efforts should be made to ensure it is routinely well kept/maintained as I'm sure this does not help.

- The Beechwood / Hartington Cres. mini roundabout: as a cyclist using this route, I am not sure quite how the 'narrowing' of the roundabout will help. There should certainly be some traffic-calming measures in place in this area and signage reminding road-users about not undertaking U-turns on this (mini) roundabout. ('Avoid making-turns on mini-roundabouts', Highway Code, Rule 188).

Would narrowing the road here create difficulties for vehicles and cyclists / slower road-users making a right turn?

Other

- Overnight Taxi feeder rank (10pm to 7am) on Earlsdon Street near Moor Street, (pdf 5 and 8): experience demonstrates that exiting from Moor St with taxi's parked, (in the past previously on Yellow Lines), is difficult as a result of poor visibility posed, and therefore making Moor St. one-way would be essential.
- 'Cycle parking on Shaftesbury Avenue, Arden Street, Warwick Street, Earlsdon Avenue South, Berkeley Road North and South: what sort of 'cycle-parking?' – is any thought being given to ways of preventing cycle thefts!

The following email was received just after the closing date of the consultation via a Ward Councillor:

I wondered if you would support a parking issue i regular have

Location - outside 77 moor st/ Earlsdon health centre cv56eu

I wanted to investigate having double yellow lines installed due to visibility for people entering and exiting the health centre car park and car's constantly obstructing XXXXXXXXX

