

Meeting date: 27 February 2023

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 a formal response to four petitions received for the Environment and Infrastructure portfolio, as summarised in the report and in Appendix 1 at:

- (a) Aylesbury Road, Hockley Heath
- (b) Streetsbrook Road, Olton
- (c) Buryfield Road
- (d) Lode Lane near Dovehouse Lane.

2. Decision(s) Recommended

2.1 The Cabinet Member is asked to:

- (e) Note the current position regarding petitions received for this portfolio, as set out in Appendix 1.
- (f) Agree the recommended package of interventions and partnership working highlighted in 5.2 to 5.4 of this report.

Report Title: Petition Summary

3. Matters for Consideration Petition 1: Develop proposals to reduce the speed of traffic along Aylesbury Road, Hockley Heath

- 3.1 On 20 October 2022, Mrs Powles submitted a petition with 149 signatures raising concern about road safety on Aylesbury Road, requesting a deterrent to prevent speeding.
- 3.2 The petition states “People speeding on this road have no respect for the lives of the families who reside here. My dog was killed by a speeding driver on this road who then drove off. Let’s not wait for this to happen to a child. SOMETHING NEEDS TO BE DONE.”

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

- 4.1 Aylesbury Road forms part of the B4101 classified road linking Hockley Heath village to Dorridge, Knowle and beyond to Balsall Common. The road has residential properties on both sides and is subject to a 30mph speed limit. As the route progresses out of the village into Warwickshire, it becomes more rural in character and the limit increases to 40mph.
- 4.2 During the most recent 3-year period (2019-2021) & part of 2022 (until November 2022), there have been no recorded road traffic collisions resulting in personal injury on the part of Aylesbury Road within Solihull. All collision data for 2022 is provisional at present and will be confirmed later this year.
- 4.3 Proposals to introduce parking restrictions on Aylesbury Road at its junction with Park View have recently been advertised and consulted on. These proposals seek to ensure the junction remains clear of parked vehicles which can cause difficulties for vehicles entering and exiting Aylesbury Road. The representations received are currently being reviewed and, if subsequently implemented, are expected to positively contribute to the overall operation of the road.
- 4.4 A traffic survey was undertaken on Aylesbury Road in November 2022. A summary of the results is provided in the table below: -

Aylesbury Road	Traffic Flow (Daily Average)	Mean Speed (mph)	85%ile Speed (mph)
Northbound	2251	30.8	36.0
Southbound	2147	30.4	35.5
Two Way	4398	30.6	35.7

- 4.5 The 85%ile speed is the speed which 15% of motorists will be travelling at or above. The survey concluded that the 85th %ile speed for Aylesbury Road was 36mph

(northbound) and 35.5mph (southbound). This is comparable to similar locations subject to 30mph restrictions across the borough and nationwide. Speeding traffic is a nationally recognised problem with data indicating that on average 51% of cars exceed the speed limit on 30mph street lit roads.

- 4.6 The Council works in partnership with the Emergency Services to help improve road safety in the borough. A range of interventions are available to support residents' concerns which include educational, engineering and enforcement activities.
- 4.7 As there have been no recorded personal injury collisions, it is difficult to justify introducing a traffic calming scheme, unless there are other traffic management issues to resolve, which have not been raised in this case.
- 4.8 This route is also included in the Council's bi-annual review of road safety in the borough and when compared to the rest of the highway network, there is no evidence to support this location being considered as a priority.
- 4.9 The Council also works closely with the Parish Council and the request for traffic calming will be discussed at the next opportunity.
- 4.10 The first option to consider is whether this location should be included in the Council's Local Network Implementation Plan (LNIP), which details traffic calming and highway improvement schemes for future consideration. Allocation of this funding is reviewed annually in February and is aligned to the Council's Transport policies and priorities.
- 4.11 To support residents' concerns, other options for consideration include West Midlands Police enforcement activity, inclusion in the Council's Speed Awareness programme and a Road Safety review of the street.

5. Reasons for recommending preferred option

- 5.1 Inclusion in the LNIP programme could raise expectations that a solution may be delivered soon. The LNIP funding programme is unlikely to provide a funding route for a traffic calming solution due to demand from schemes with a higher priority.
- 5.2 Working in partnership with the Parish Council and WM Police has proven to be successful. Given the speed profile data is higher than desirable, the Police will be able to use this to ensure any enforcement activity is carried out at the optimum time.
- 5.3 Including this location in the Council's Speed Awareness programme will help raise the importance of speed limit compliance.
- 5.4 Finally, carrying out a road safety-based maintenance review of the local street scene will ensure motorists using this route have clear information relating to the speed limit, the tight bend, and any other hazards.

6. Matters for Consideration Petition 2: Request for Traffic Calming measures on Streetsbrook Road

- 6.1 At Full Council on 7 February 2023, Councillors Grinsell and Carthew submitted a

petition on behalf of local residents requesting the introduction of traffic calming measures on Streetsbrook Road.

- 6.2 This matter is currently being investigated, and the outcome will be reported at the Cabinet Member decision session in May 2023. This will provide sufficient time for the matters to be considered and appropriate responses/actions prepared.

7. Matters for Consideration Petition 3: Request to extend the 20mph speed limit to the entire length of Buryfield Road due to the excessive speed by motorists using the highway

- 7.1 At Full Council on 7 February 2023, Councillor Qais submitted a petition on behalf of local residents requesting the extension of the 20mph speed limit to the entire length of Buryfield Road due to the excessive speed by motorists using the highway.

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

- 8.1 This proposal is being considered as part of the School 20mph Speed Limit representation report, which is also on this agenda. The Council was made aware from the representations received during the consultation exercise of the community feeling towards a possible extension of the 20mph speed limit.
- 8.2 The alternative option would be for the request to be considered as part of the next annual Traffic Regulation Order prioritisation process expected in November.

9. Reasons for recommending preferred option

- 9.1 Officers are already committed to working on delivering phase 2 of the 20mph Speed Limit review and including this request in that programme will be the most efficient means of progress if, if Cabinet Member agrees it is a priority over the other locations in the programme.

9.2 Matters for Consideration Petition 4: Request the removal of the Dovehouse/Rover bus stop from the front of their properties

- 9.3 At Full Council on 7 February 2023, Councillor O'Nyons submitted a petition on behalf of residents requesting the removal of the Dovehouse/Rover bus stop from the front of their properties.

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

- 10.1 The responsibility for the provision of public transport infrastructure, such as bus stops, lies with the West Midlands Combined Authority and its delivery arm at Transport for West Midlands. This matter should be referred to that authority in order that it can be considered and responded to.

11. Reasons for recommending preferred option

- 11.1 Bus Stops are owned and the responsibility of Transport for West Midlands and not the responsibility of Solihull Council. As part of their processes the Council will be consulted

before they take a decision on this particular request.

12. Implications and Considerations

12.1 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 are 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>

12.2 Consultation and Scrutiny:

12.2.1 The matters arising from this petition has not been the subject to review by any of the Council's Scrutiny Boards. With any proposed changes the associated statutory consultation process will be undertaken.

12.3 Financial implications:

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

12.3.2 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.

12.4 Legal implications:

12.4.1 None because of the recommendations in this report.

12.5 Risk implications, including Risk Appetite:

12.5.1 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.

12.5.2 The approach is not intended to eliminate all risks and not all 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.

12.6 Equality implications:

12.6.1 None because of the recommendations of this report.

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

12.8 None.

13. List of appendices referred to

Petitions Update February 2023 – Appendix 1

14. Background papers used to compile this report

14.1 None.

15. List of Other Relevant Documents

15.1 None.