

Cabinet Petitions Committee

**18th December 2019 at 5.30pm
at the Sandwell Council House, Oldbury**

Present: Councillors Crompton (Chair), Ali and Hadley.

12/19 **Minutes**

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting held on 25th September, 2019 be confirmed as a correct record.

13/19 **Progress Report**

Details were submitted of petitions received and of the action taken or proposed in each case, as detailed in the Appendix.

Resolved that the action taken or proposed, as detailed in the second column of the Appendix, be approved.

(Meeting ended at 6.10pm)

Contact Officer: Trisha Newton
Democratic Services Unit
0121 569 3193

Cabinet Petitions Committee – 18th December 2019

Appendix

Petition Received From	Action Taken/Proposed
1. West Bromwich market traders, shopkeepers and shoppers requesting that the Council liaises with West Midlands Police regarding anti-social behaviour concerns.	This matter had been referred to West Midlands Police for investigation and an update will be submitted to a future meeting.
2. Residents/road users in the vicinity of Cottrell Street, West Bromwich requesting double yellow lines along one side of Cottrell Street due to issues created by parking.	This matter was being investigated by officers within Highways and an update would be submitted to a future meeting of the Cabinet Petitions Committee.
3. Service users/park visitors requesting immediate action to stop the deaths and illness of wildfowl at Victoria Park, Smethwick Hall Park and West Smethwick Park, following a serious pollution incident at Stoney Lane, by desilting the pool and restoring the park pools to a safe environment for wildlife and humans.	This matter was being investigated by officers and an update would be submitted to a future meeting of the Cabinet Petitions Committee.
4. Residents of Queens Road, Smethwick regarding speeding and traffic accidents.	Arrangements had been made for a seven day traffic survey to be undertaken. An update would be submitted to a future meeting of the Cabinet Petitions Committee.

Cabinet Petitions Committee – 18th December 2019

Petition Received From	Action Taken/Proposed
<p>5. Residents of the Hateley Heath area requesting that the SAPA building on Hateley Heath estate be brought back into use for the community.</p>	<p>The availability of the building for community purposes was advertised in an SCVO newsletter and six expressions of interest had been received. The building would be opened up for a viewing following which it was expected that any remaining interested groups would present their proposals to the Council. A further update would be provided to a future meeting of the Cabinet Petitions Committee.</p>
<p>6. Various road users/residents requesting traffic light system at the junction of Park Lane/Manor House Road and Hobs Road/Hawthorn Road, Wednesbury.</p>	<p>Funding for road safety schemes such as traffic signals was prioritised where injury accidents were occurring. A five-year injury accident analysis showed there had been 3 recorded injury accidents during this period. This was low when compared to other locations being considered for major traffic calming schemes. Although this junction did not meet the criteria for the installation of traffic signals, a road safety scheme to implement additional carriageway markings and vehicle activated speed signs either side of the junction would be undertaken to help to warn drivers and reduce vehicle speeds on the approach to the junction. The Committee requested that the junction should be monitored to ensure that the traffic calming measures made a difference. Arrangements had been made for a further traffic survey prior to the installation of the vehicle activated speed sign. An update would be provided to a future meeting of the Cabinet Petitions Committee.</p>

Cabinet Petitions Committee – 18th December 2019

Petition Received From	Action Taken/Proposed
<p>7. Residents of View Point, Tividale requesting installation of night and day gates in the gulley located at View Point.</p>	<p>Greenbelt Group wished to assist in reducing anti-social behaviour and would not oppose the installation of gates in principle, if this represented the wishes of the 299 households which were currently billed in respect of areas. However, Greenbelt Group had specified that the Council would need to be responsible for the maintenance thereafter, agree to indemnify Greenbelt Group in respect of the gates (e.g. to cover any injury) and agree to fund the removal of the gates, if and when required. The head petitioner had advised that residents were not prepared to contribute. As the land was not in Council ownership, the Council could not take on the liability or maintenance of the gates. No further action was proposed by the Council. Following representations from the head petitioner and the local ward member, arrangements would be made for a meeting to take place between the residents, local ward member, Greenbelt Group and the Police.</p>
<p>8. Residents of The Broadway, West Bromwich requesting to gate off The Wallface, Hill Top</p>	<p>Wallface was a public right of way and as such would require a Public Space Protection Order to close this off by way of a lockable gate. A Public Space Protection Order was likely to be granted only as a last resort and it must be demonstrated that other methods of resolving the issues had been considered. In this case, an application to obtain a Public Space Protection Order was unlikely to succeed. The issue had been raised at Wednesbury Town Tasking, where partners met to discuss community safety issues and devise solutions to ongoing problems.</p>

Cabinet Petitions Committee – 18th December 2019

Petition Received From	Action Taken/Proposed
	<p>Several measures that had been put in place, such as targeting street drinking in the area and extra patrols by wardens and Police had had a positive effect with the number of incidents reported to the Council, Police and other agencies being relatively low. Temporary CCTV cameras could be allocated through the Town Tasking process and should incidents reoccur in the future, the matter could again be considered by this group. Closing Wallface to the public would also affect residents who used Wallface to cut through Hill Top Park. Although the park had several other entrances, blocking one of these off would be difficult to justify in order to obtain the Public Space Protection Order. The head petitioner had been informed.</p>
<p>9. Residents in the vicinity of Temple Way and Shinwell Crescent, Tividale regarding parking issues caused by local businesses and anti social behaviour on the car park.</p>	<p>Observations revealed parking along parts of Temple Way and Shinwell Crescent near Dudley Road East. Vehicles were not causing an obstruction, although a couple of cars were parked close to the junction of Temple Way/Shinwell Crescent. Properties in Temple Way and Shinwell Crescent had off-street parking available and therefore did not meet the Council's criteria for a residents parking scheme. Introducing long lengths of waiting restrictions to prevent non-residents from parking would displace parking, leading to further complaints from other residents. To improve access and visibility, it was proposed that No Waiting At Any Time restrictions be placed at the junction of Temple Way and Shinwell Crescent. Restrictions would also be considered for the access to the two communal parking areas in Shinwell Crescent.</p>

Cabinet Petitions Committee – 18th December 2019

Petition Received From	Action Taken/Proposed
	<p>The locations would be considered in a future parking review and this would involve following the Traffic Regulation Order process for the implementation of parking restrictions. The head petitioner had been informed. Following representations at the meeting with regard to parking on the residents' car park and also vehicles left on the highway, residents were provided with details to liaise with their local ward member/town lead member to investigate whether a barrier/signage could be provided to the car park. With regard to vehicles on the highway, the Police should be contacted if vehicles were not taxed.</p>
<p>10. Residents of Wheatsheaf Road Estate, Tividale requesting a mini bus service following the removal of the 121 bus service.</p>	<p>Following the update provided to the Committee at its meeting on 7th August 2019, the matter had been referred back to Transport for West Midlands following representations from a local ward member and concerns that the whole estate had not been taken into consideration in relation to proximity to existing bus services. Transport for West Midlands advised that they had asked the operator if it would be willing to reconsider options for a service via Wheatsheaf Road if measures were introduced to manage parking along the road. National Express indicated that it would be willing to explore this possibility further if the Council was minded to look at the options around potential parking restrictions along the road. The highway layout on Wheatsheaf Road had been considered. The existing footway was approximately 1.6m wide on the south side and 2.0m on the north side and the carriageway was approximately 5.0m wide.</p>

Cabinet Petitions Committee – 18th December 2019

Petition Received From	Action Taken/Proposed
	<p>The majority of residents had driveways but a large number of vehicles park on street which reduced the carriageway width even further. The narrow carriageway, coupled with on-street parking, made it difficult for opposing traffic to get through and this was much worse when larger vehicles needed to pass through. There was no extra space available along Wheatsheaf Road to consider extending the carriageway. The footways were already built to the minimum standard so they could not be reduced any further to allow extra space for the carriageway. The introduction of a one-way scheme would not be recommended because the on-street parking reduced the width of the carriageway which still did not leave enough space for a bus. The introduction of parking restrictions was an option to remove on street parking, however, this was not likely to be favourable with residents who wished to park their vehicles close to their houses. Objections were likely to be received for any such proposals. Highways would not therefore recommend that buses travelled along Wheatsheaf Road due to how the narrowness of the carriageway. This resulted in buses driving on the footpath to get passed which increased risk of injury to pedestrians. The head petitioner had been informed.</p>
<p>11. Residents of Regis Heath Road, Blackheath regarding parking issues.</p>	<p>Regis Heath Road did not meet the Council's criteria for a residents parking scheme, as off-street parking was available for residents. However, consultation would be undertaken with the residents to ascertain if other parking</p>

Cabinet Petitions Committee – 18th December 2019

Petition Received From	Action Taken/Proposed
	<p>restrictions would be suitable. These could mirror similar restrictions of single yellow lines applied by Dudley MBC to prevent parking in residential areas around train stations. Any proposal made for parking restrictions would be included in a future review which could take between 9-12 months. The head petitioner had been informed.</p>
<p>12. Residents of Draycott Road, Smethwick requesting a residents parking scheme.</p>	<p>36 questionnaires were delivered to Draycott Road on the 23rd October 2019 to ask if they would be in favour of a residents parking scheme. 21 questionnaires were returned, 20 in favour of a scheme and one against. In view of the results, the request would be included in a future parking review and go through the traffic regulation order process. The head petitioner had been informed.</p>
<p>13. Residents of Speaker's Close, Tividale requesting installation of night and day gates in the gully located at the end of Speaker's Close.</p>	<p>The Council had a policy on 'The Gating of Private Alleyways'. The Council's legal team had confirmed that the Council could not use any highway powers to resolve the gating issues at this location, therefore, the gating proposal would have to be implemented by a facilitated agreement between residents and landowners. The developer/landowner (Bellway) had agreed to provide better land boundary fencing but had not yet agreed to the gating of the alleyway. The Council's Commercial Properties Team would continue to liaise with the developer to secure this agreement in writing. Assuming agreement could be obtained from the landowner, arrangements would need to be made for the ongoing management, maintenance and insurance of the gate.</p>

Cabinet Petitions Committee – 18th December 2019

Petition Received From	Action Taken/Proposed
	<p>The Council's Risk Assessment Team had advised that the Council would not be able to insure the gates on behalf of the residents, but advised that Zurich could possibly provide insurance for the residents, providing they could prove that they had formed a committee. The Council's Commercial Property were exploring what help could be provided to residents to assist. The head petitioner had been informed.</p>