

Cabinet Member for City Services

11 March 2026

Name of Cabinet Member:

Cabinet Member for City Services – Councillor P Hetherton

Director Approving Submission of the report:

Director of Economic Growth

Ward affected:

Wainbody

Title:

Petitions Determined by Letter and Petitions Deferred Pending Further Investigations

Is this a key decision?

No

Executive Summary:

In accordance with the City Council's procedure for dealing with petitions, those relating to traffic management, road safety and highway maintenance issues are considered by the Cabinet Member for City Services.

In June 2015, amendments to the Petitions Scheme, which forms part of the Constitution, were approved in order to provide flexibility and streamline current practice. This change has reduced costs and bureaucracy and improved the service to the public.

These amendments allow for a petition to be dealt with or responded to by letter without being formally presented in a report to a Cabinet Member meeting.

In light of this, at the meeting of the Cabinet Member for Public Services on 15 March 2016, it was approved that a summary of those petitions received which were determined by letter, or where decisions are deferred pending further investigations, be reported to subsequent meetings of the Cabinet Member for Public Services (now Cabinet Member for City Services), where appropriate, for monitoring and transparency purposes.

Appendix A to the report sets out petitions received relating to the portfolio of the Cabinet Member for City Services and how officers propose to respond to them.

Recommendations:

Cabinet Member for City Services is recommended to:

- 1) Endorse the actions being taken by officers as set out in Section 2 and Appendix A to the report in response to the petitions received.

List of Appendices included:

Appendix A - Petitions Determined by Letter and Petitions Deferred Pending Further Investigations

Appendix B - Stoneleigh Road Footway Concept Extents

Background Papers

None

Other useful documents:

Cabinet Member for Policing and Equalities Meeting 18 June 2015 - Report: Amendments to the Constitution – Proposed Amendments to the Petitions Scheme

A copy of the report is available at: edemocracy.coventry.gov.uk.

Has it been or will it be considered by Scrutiny?

No

Has it been or will it be considered by any other Council Committee, Advisory Panel or other body?

No

Will this report go to Council?

No

Report title: Petitions Determined by Letter and Petitions Deferred Pending Further Investigations

1. Context (or background)

- 1.1 In accordance with the City Council's procedure for dealing with petitions, those relating to traffic management, road safety and highway maintenance issues are considered by the Cabinet Member for City Services.
- 1.2 Amendments to the Petitions Scheme, which forms part of the Constitution, were approved by the Cabinet Member for Policing and Equalities on 18 June 2015 and Council on 23 June 2015 in order to provide flexibility and streamline current practice.
- 1.3 These amendments allow a petition to be dealt with or responded to by letter without being formally presented in a report to a Cabinet Member meeting. The advantages of this change are two-fold; firstly, it saves taxpayers money by streamlining the process and reducing bureaucracy. Secondly it means that petitions can be dealt with and responded to quicker, improving the responsiveness of the service given to the public.
- 1.4 Each petition is still dealt with on an individual basis. The Cabinet Member considers advice from officers on appropriate action to respond to the petitioners' request, which in some circumstances, may be for the petition to be dealt with or responded to without the need for formal consideration at a Cabinet Member meeting. In such circumstances and with the approval of the Cabinet Member, written agreement is then sought from the relevant Councillor/Petition Organiser to proceed in this manner.

2. Options considered and recommended proposal

- 2.1 Officers will respond to the petitions received by determination letter or holding letter as set out in Appendix A to the report.
- 2.2 Where a holding letter is to be sent, this is because further investigation work is required of the matters raised. Details of the actions agreed are also included in Appendix A to the report.
- 2.3 Once the matters have been investigated, a determination letter will be sent to the petition organiser or, if appropriate, a report will be submitted to a future Cabinet Member meeting, detailing the results of the investigations and subsequent recommended action.

3. Results of consultation undertaken

- 3.1 In the case of a petition being determined by letter, written agreement is sought from the relevant Petition Organiser and Councillor Sponsor to proceed in this manner. If they do not agree, a report responding to the petition will be prepared for consideration at a future Cabinet Member meeting. The Petition Organiser and Councillor Sponsor will be invited to attend this meeting where they will have the opportunity to speak on behalf of the petitioners.

4. Timetable for implementing this decision

4.1 Letters referred to in Appendix A to the report will be sent out by the end of March 2026.

5. Comments from the Director of Finance and Resources and the Director of Law, Governance, and Safer Communities

5.1 Financial implications

There are no financial implications as a result of the contents of this report.

5.2 Legal implications

There are no legal implications as a result of the contents of this report.

6. Other implications

6.1 How will this contribute to the One Coventry Plan?

(<https://www.coventry.gov.uk/strategies-plans-policies/one-coventry-plan>)

Not applicable

6.2 How is risk being managed?

Not applicable

6.3 What is the impact on the organisation?

Determining petitions by letter enables petitioners' requests to be responded to more quickly and efficiently.

6.4 Equalities / EIA

There are no public sector equality duties which are of relevance.

6.5 Implications for (or impact on) climate change and the environment

None

6.6 Implications for partner organisations?

None

Report author**Name and job title:**

Martin Wilkinson
Senior Officer - Traffic Management

Directorate:

Economic Growth

Tel and email contact:

Tel: 024 7697 7139
Email: martin.wilkinson@coventry.gov.uk

Enquiries should be directed to the above person.

Contributor/ approver name	Title	Directorate	Date doc sent out	Date response received or approved
Contributors:				
David Keaney	Head of Network Management	Economic Growth	19/02/2026	20/02/2026
Vivian Robert	Traffic and Road Safety Manager	Economic Growth	19/02/2026	23/02/2026
Michelle Salmon / Caroline Taylor	Governance Services Officer	Law, Governance, and Safer Communities	19/02/2026	19/02/2026
Names of approvers for submission:				
Sunny Heer	Lead Accountant	Finance and Resources	26/02/2026	27/02/2026
Rob Parkes	Team Leader, Legal Services	Law, Governance, and Safer Communities	26/02/2026	27/02/2026
Andy Williams	Director of Economic Growth	-	27/02/2026	02/03/2026
Councillor P Hetherton	Cabinet Member for City Services	-	02/03/2026	02/03/2026

This report is published on the council's website: <https://www.coventry.gov.uk/council-meetings>

Appendix A – Petitions Determined by Letter and Petitions Deferred Pending Further Investigations

Petition No.	Petition Title	No. of signatures	Councillor Sponsor	Type of letter to be sent to petition organiser(s) and sponsor	Actions agreed
E28-25/26	Urgent Action for Pedestrian and Road Safety on Stoneleigh Road, Gibbet Hill, Coventry	501: 62 (e-petition) + 439 (paper petition)	N/A	Determination	<p>The Council recognises the concerns raised and agrees that the absence of a continuous footway, especially across the bridge, presents challenges for pedestrian safety. This matter has been reviewed in detail following several similar enquiries from residents and Ward Members, including a site meeting on 26th January 2026.</p> <p>Several options have been considered, and the most viable proposal prepared by our Transport Design Team involves constructing a footway on one side of the railway bridge. This would require narrowing the carriageway to a single lane and installing traffic signals to manage traffic flow. The estimated cost for this scheme is over £500,000. While this may appear high, the cost model is benchmarked against similar projects and reflects current material and labour costs.</p> <p>The scheme as developed consists of a value engineered unbound footway running on the northern side of Stoneleigh Road for a length of 780m. The surface material selected is a self-binding gravel which is typically seen in park style settings and has been selected both for its low-cost installation, but also as a solution which is in keeping with the rural nature of the road. The construction method will seek to minimise</p>

					<p>excavation given the presence of several mature trees in the vicinity of the proposed path as well as existing underground services which would be cost prohibitive to divert.</p> <p>Traffic signals at the rail bridge would operate in a shuttle signal arrangement whereby the width of the road is restricted so that traffic can only pass in one direction at a time. This would allow for the provision of a continuous footway on the northern side of the road, whilst also acting as a traffic calming feature by slowing traffic on each approach. A plan showing the extent of the scheme is attached at Appendix A to this report.</p> <p>These measures would aid compliance with the new reduced 30mph speed limit which was introduced on this road in 2025, and which has recently been reinforced with two vehicle-activated speed signs installed on the road in January 2026.</p> <p>Funding for new transport infrastructure is extremely limited and at present this initiative remains unfunded.</p> <p>In considering funding options, the collision history for Stoneleigh Road has been reviewed. This has shown that there has been one personal injury collision (slight) recorded by the Police in the last three years (near city boundary involving northbound vehicle colliding with vehicle exiting driveway). The Council is also aware of a recent incident where a pedestrian was clipped by a vehicle's wing mirror whilst crossing the railway</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>bridge, although that incident has not as yet been recorded on the Police casualty database.</p> <p>To put this in context, the 2025 annual collision review identified 48 roads or locations in Coventry with 6 or more PICs in the last 3 yrs, the adopted threshold for considering a location for inclusion within the Council's road safety programme of schemes.</p> <p>As a result, the scheme is unlikely to be prioritised through existing community focused funding programmes such as the Local Network Improvement Programme (LNIP) which is focused on lower cost interventions and prioritised based on evidence such as pedestrian and cycle flows, traffic speeds, and casualty data (using the criteria set out above).</p> <p>Consequently, for this scheme to come forward, alternative funding sources would need to be identified and secured and we continue to explore and actively pursue these options.</p> <p>A meeting with ward members and residents took place on site on the 26th January to discuss the concerns raised and the options under consideration.</p> <p>As part of this meeting, it was confirmed that all viable S106 developer contributions had been identified and ringfenced to support the delivery of the requested footway. This provides a core budget at present of around £100,000. As and when other developments come forward, such as the King's Hill development to the north-east of Stoneleigh Road, opportunities to close the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>remaining funding gap (circa £400,000) will continue to be explored to bring forward the requested improvements.</p> <p>Actions to arrange meetings with Warwick University to discuss potential funding opportunities are being progressed as are discussions with HS2 regarding their Community and Environment Fund. In addition, we continue to monitor conditions on Stoneleigh Road and explore opportunities for funding and delivery of the proposed improvements through future S106 allocations.</p> <p>Officers will also explore opportunities to adopt a phased approach to the delivery of the enhancements set out above using the £100,000 already secured to deliver a first phase of works comprising of a section of footway and signage enhancement to aid pedestrian movement along this road.</p> <p>It is noted that Ward Members intend to establish regular stakeholder engagement meetings to maintain momentum and focus on this matter and Council Officers will seek to attend and provide updates at appropriate times to this forum moving forward.</p> <p>In conclusion, whilst the need for a footway, and pedestrian improvements at the railway bridge, is recognised by officers, funding of a scheme through the LNIP programme cannot currently be justified. Officers will continue to work to identify alternative funding sources that could bring this scheme forward, and will also identify other low</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					cost measures such as enhanced signing at the bridge to help promote responsible driver behaviour.
--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix B – Stoneleigh Road Footway Concept Extents

