

Meeting date: 28 November 2022

Report to: Cabinet Member for Environment & Infrastructure

Report title: **PETITION SUMMARY**

Report from: Head of Highway Management

Report author/lead contact officer: Paul Tovey
Tel: 0121 704 6479
Email: ptovey@solihull.gov.uk

Wards affected:

- All Wards | Bickenhill | Blythe | Castle Bromwich | Chelmsley Wood |
 Dorridge/Hockley Heath | Elmdon | Kingshurst/Fordbridge | Knowle |
 Lyndon | Meriden | Olton | Shirley East | Shirley South |
 Shirley West | Silhill | Smith's Wood | St Alphege
-

Public/private report: Public

Exempt by virtue of paragraph: N/A

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 To provide an update on six petitions received for the Environment and Infrastructure portfolio, and where appropriate, agree the associated recommendations.
- 1.2 The Cabinet Member is asked to:
- (a) Note the current position regarding petitions received for this portfolio, as set out in Appendix 1.
 - (b) Agree the proposed recommendations as set out below for each petition.

Report Title: Petition Summary

2. Matters for Consideration Petition 1: Proposed changes to Blossomfield Road and Marshall Lake Road

2.1 On the 16th of March Julian Knight MP, shared a copy of a petition received from residents of Blossomfield Road and Marshall Lake Road. The petition raised concerns around congestion, condition of the carriageway, air and noise pollution and speed of traffic.

3. What options have been considered and what is the evidence telling us about them?

3.1 Recently, there has been much focus on the B4102 Blossomfield Road / Marshall Lake Road route due to changes implemented as part of the Active Travel Corridor.

3.2 The petition proposed solutions, officer's comments are as follows:

- (a) **To make both roads a low traffic and clean air zone.** This route forms part of the local classified road network (B4102) and is an important transport route for goods and people between Solihull Town Centre, Shirley and beyond to Earslwood and Redditch.

There are retail, commercial, and educational trip generators along the direct frontage of this route, in addition to numerous residential properties. This solution would result in traffic being diverted to less suitable streets.

The only location in the Borough where monitoring has highlighted air quality as a concern is on the section of the A45 Coventry Road near to M42 Junction 6, where traffic volumes exceed 40,000 vehicles daily. Traffic flows along the B4102 are much lower and vary between 20,000 and 25,000 vehicles per day.

- (b) **To scrape Blossomfield Road and put thick tarmac down.** The petition acknowledges that much of this route has recently been resurfaced as part of the Active Travel Scheme. The road surface along the rest of the route is in a good and safe condition. It will continue to be monitored in line with the approved risk-based condition survey process. No further action is considered necessary at this time.
- (c) **To lay down speed bumps as you have done in Hampton in Arden.** This route continues to be monitored to help determine the impact of the Active Travel scheme. One of the associated benefits of re-allocating the road space to cycling is expected to be a general reduction in traffic speeds. Current road safety records for this route do not suggest a need to introduce traffic calming measures, however, it is recommended that this matter is referred to the Active Travel scheme's monitoring process that will be reported to Cabinet Member in 2023.

The Hampton in Arden village traffic calming scheme has been jointly funded by the local Parish Council and a bid to the HS2 Road Safety Fund, which is not available to this part of the Solihull highway network.

- (d) **To have speed cameras installed and to have a Police camera van present once a month to detect car speeds.** The use of average speed enforcement technology is currently being used at a limited number of locations in Solihull, where there has been a proven speed related road traffic collision history. The collision record for this corridor would not support the use of this type of safety camera

A review is currently taking place of the deployment of the mobile camera-based speed enforcement service for Solihull. This corridor will be included in that piece of work which is due to be the subject of a separate report to this Cabinet meeting in the New Year.

A copy of the residents' petition has been shared with West Midlands Police to consider whether any local speed enforcement is appropriate at this time.

4. Reasons for recommending preferred option

- 4.1 The recommendations detailed above, and the on-going programmes of work will help to support the concerns raised in this petition.

5. Matters for Consideration Petition 2: Request the provision of a pedestrian crossing across Green Lane between Mason House and the Baptist Church

- 5.1 At Full Council, on 11 October 2022, Councillor Allen submitted a petition on behalf of the Sir Josiah Mason Trust and the residents of Mason House, requesting the provision of a pedestrian crossing across Green Lane between Mason House and the Baptist Church.

6. What options have been considered and what is the evidence telling us about them?

- 6.1 This location has previously been considered on two occasions for a pedestrian crossing facility, most recently in July 2019.
- 6.2 At that time, a stage 1 pedestrian crossing assessment was undertaken which found low pedestrian demand and the site was constrained by two local bus stops which would need to be relocated to install a crossing. As a result, available parking for adjacent residential properties would also be impacted.
- 6.3 It was noted that local developments (including the new retirement home) were not yet open and may increase pedestrian demand at this location.

7. Reasons for recommending preferred option

- 7.1 Considering the current circumstances, it is recommended that this request should be progressed to stage 2 of the process, whereby more detailed traffic and pedestrian

surveys will be undertaken and an options appraisal prepared.

7.2 If a formal crossing facility is considered appropriate, the scheme will be put forward for consideration and prioritisation as part of the Local Network Improvement Programme.

7.3 The Ward Members and Trust will be informed of the outcome of the Pedestrian Crossing Assessment, if the petitioners are not satisfied this would be referred to this Cabinet for further consideration.

8. Matters for Consideration Petition 3: Investigate the feasibility of different parking restrictions for Meadow Grove

8.1 At Full Council, on 11 October 2022, Councillor Carthew submitted a petition on behalf of the residents of Meadow Grove, requesting that Solihull MBC investigate the feasibility of different parking restrictions for Meadow Grove.

9. What options have been considered and what is the evidence telling us about them?

9.1 This request has been included in the annual Traffic Regulation Order prioritisation process, which is being considered, along with other similar requests, in a separate report on this meeting's agenda.

10. Reasons for recommending preferred option

10.1 It is recommended that the decision from that report is shared with Councillor Carthew after the meeting.

11. Matters for Consideration Petition 4: Investigate the feasibility of different parking restrictions for Stoneleigh Road

11.1 At Full Council, on 11 October 2022, Councillor Carthew submitted a petition on behalf of the residents of Stoneleigh Road, requesting that Solihull MBC investigate the feasibility of different parking restrictions for Stoneleigh Road.

12. What options have been considered and what is the evidence telling us about them?

12.1 This request has been included in the annual Traffic Regulation Order prioritisation process, which is being considered, along with other similar requests, in a separate report on this meeting's agenda.

13. Reasons for recommending preferred option

13.1 It is recommended that the decision from that report is shared with Councillor Carthew after the meeting.

14. Matters for Consideration Petition 5: Develop proposals to reduce the speed of traffic along Coleshill Road

14.1 At Full Council, on 11 October 2022, Councillor Sleigh submitted a petition on behalf of the residents of Coleshill Road, requesting that Solihull MBC develop proposals to

reduce the speed of traffic along Coleshill Road.

15. What options have been considered and what is the evidence telling us about them?

- 15.1 Coleshill Road is a local distributor road and bus route, whilst predominately residential in nature. It features several commercial and recreational trip generators including Pinewood Business Park, Chelmsley Town Football Club and pedestrian access to Marston Green Recreational Ground. In addition to enabling over 6,000 vehicle movements per day, it facilitates local pedestrian and cycle trips.
- 15.2 The road is currently subject to a 30mph speed limit, and benefits from a vehicle actuated sign (facing east bound traffic) which is intended to aid and encourage driver compliance with the speed limit.
- 15.3 A traffic survey in May 2022 recorded average traffic speeds of 31.7 mph with the 85th %ile increasing to 37mph. Compared to data from 2012 (32.9 mph average and 37.5 mph 85%ile) traffic speeds are broadly the same.
- 15.4 There have been four recorded injury collisions in the 3-year period 2019-2021. In all four instances, the collisions resulted in slight injuries. Each collision occurred at or in the vicinity of a junction and appear to be related to turning manoeuvres. No two collisions occurred at the same junction and there is no indication to suggest that speed was a contributing factor. No pattern can be attributed to the collisions and as such it is not a location that has been identified for a road safety intervention to date.

16. Reasons for recommending preferred option

- 16.1 Whilst acknowledging residents' concerns, and considering the available data, it is recommended that this location should not be prioritised for a traffic calming intervention at this time. It is recommended that the survey results be shared with the Police for their information to consider carrying out enforcement of speed limits. It is also suggested that the site should be included in next year's Speed Awareness programme to advise motorists travelling in the westbound direction. The anticipated cost is approximately £1,500 and can be funded from the Highway Management revenue budget.

17. Matters for Consideration Petition 6: Develop proposals to reduce the speed of traffic along Aylesbury Road, Hockley Heath

- 17.1 On 20 October 2022, Michaela Powles submitted a petition on behalf of local residents requesting that Solihull MBC develop proposals to reduce the speed of traffic along Aylesbury Road, Hockley Heath.
- 17.2 This matter is currently being investigated and the outcome will be reported at the

Cabinet Member decision session in February 2023.

18. Implications and Considerations

18.1 State how the proposals in this report contribute to the priorities in the [Council Plan](#):

| Priority: | Contribution: |
|--|--|
| <p>People and Communities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improving outcomes for children and young people in Solihull. 2. Good quality, responsive, and dignified care and support for Adults in Solihull when they need it. 3. Take action to improve life chances and health outcomes in our most disadvantaged communities. 4. Enable communities to thrive. | <p>Safety and accessibility is at the heart of everything the Council does when considering making changes to how the public highway operates. This includes the safety of children, young people and our most vulnerable road user groups</p> |
| <p>Economy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Develop and promote the borough's economy, with a focus on revitalising our town and local centres. 6. Maximising the opportunities of UK Central and HS2. 7. Increase the supply of affordable and social housing that is environmentally sustainable. | <p>The Council's priorities have been taken into consideration when making the recommendations contained within this report. It is considered that there are no direct implications as a result of the recommendations of this report</p> |
| <p>Environment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Enhance our natural environment, improve air quality and reduce net carbon emissions. | <p>The Council's priorities have been taken into consideration when making the recommendations contained within this report and there are no significant environmental implications</p> |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. Promote employee wellbeing | <p>Not applicable</p> |

18.2 Consultation and Scrutiny:

18.2.1 The matters arising from these petitions have not been subject to review by any of the Council's Scrutiny Boards. With any proposed changes the associated statutory consultation process will be followed.

18.3 Financial implications:

18.3.1 The costs associated with managing petitions are funded from within existing service core Council budgets.

18.3.2 Any financial implications associated with proposed actions identified in the report will

be prioritised and managed within the appropriate existing service revenue and capital budgets.

18.4 Legal implications:

18.4.1 None because of the recommendation in of this report.

18.5 Risk implications, including Risk Appetite:

18.5.1 The Corporate Risk Management Approach has been complied with to identify and assess the significant risk associated with this decision/project. This includes (but is not limited to), financial, political, legislation and reputation risks.

18.5.2 The approach is not intended to eliminate all risks and not all the risks identified can be managed all the time. Also, risks will still exist that have not been identified. However, based on the information provided, no significant risks have been identified.

18.6 Equality implications:

18.6.1 None because of the recommendations of this report.

18.7 Linkages to our work with the West Midlands Combined Authority (WMCA), Local Enterprise Partnership or the Birmingham & Solihull Integrated Care System (ICS):

18.7.1 None associated with the recommendations of this report.

19. List of appendices referred to

19.1 Petitions Update November 2022 – Appendix 1.

20. Background papers used to compile this report

20.1 The petitions submitted in reference to this report.

21. List of Other Relevant Documents

21.1 None.