

**REPORT TO THE HEAD OF HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT
REPRESENTATIONS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS**

**The Metropolitan Borough of Solihull (Olton Primary School Area)
(School Streets Phase III) (Prohibition of Driving) Order 2021**

**The Metropolitan Borough of Solihull (Olton Primary School Area)
(20mph Maximum Speed Limit) Order 2021**

**The Metropolitan Borough of Solihull (Olton Primary School Area)
(Total Prohibition of Waiting and Restriction of Waiting) Order 2021**

14/01/2021

LEAD OFFICER: STEVE HAWLEY

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To consider representations received to three permanent Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) named above, proposing to introduce a third phase of the council's 'School Streets' initiative, new/amended parking restrictions and permanent 20mph maximum speed limits in close proximity to Olton School and the surrounding areas.

1 Background

- 1.1 Lyndon Road was identified as a priority location for the 2020/21 works programme through the council's established Traffic Regulation Order Framework. The framework is used to prioritise requests for new and amended parking restrictions within the borough.
- 1.2 In addition to a number of new and amended parking restrictions, it is proposed to introduce 20mph speed limits in close proximity to the Olton Primary School and a prohibition of driving on Kents Close and on Lyndon Road (fronting Nos 155-165), applicable at school times and introduced as an expansion of the council's existing 'School Streets' offering.
- 1.3 The Traffic Regulation Orders were proposed in response to concerns from the local community and aim to regulate on-street parking, help to facilitate the free passage of traffic, aid visibility and discouraging obstructive parking, aid traffic flows and control vehicle speeds. The package of traffic management measures is deemed appropriate following the amalgamation of two local schools into one site.

2 Matters for Consideration

- 2.1 The proposed Orders were formally advertised on 2nd December 2021 and the closing date for receipt of representations was 23rd December 2021. The relevant plans can be found in Appendix A.
- 2.2 The objections, comments and suggestions received have been fully considered. The following sections of the report consider the representations received to each individual Order, along with Officer comments and recommendations.

3 The Metropolitan Borough of Solihull (Olton Primary School Area) (School Streets Phase III) (Prohibition of Driving) Order 2021

3.1 This Order attracted 2 supportive comments and a recommendation that the council should consider introducing permits to enable healthcare workers to carry out their duties effectively in areas subject to the school streets scheme.

3.1.1 Officers note the recommendation and would comment that healthcare workers (including doctors on-call, district nurses, personal carers, support workers and essential healthcare) are exempt from the prohibition of driving Order introduced by the School Streets initiative. At the current time, the method of enforcement means that such workers can be easily identified. Should alternative enforcement come forward in the future we would consider the suitability of permits or other means to assist these essential members of our communities.

3.2 Officer Recommendations

The Order should be implemented as originally advertised.

4 **The Metropolitan Borough of Solihull (Olton Primary School Area) (20mph Maximum Speed Limit) Order 2021**

4.1 This Order attracted 26 representations in total. 16 messages of support, 1 objection and 10 representations classified as other as they are partially supportive. The comments received are summarised in the table below.

Table 4.1.1 Supportive Comments

Supportive Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully support/agree (12 received) • I wholeheartedly agree with the plans submitted by the borough. Congratulations on a well drafted plan. • We would agree with the speed limits and parking restrictions being in place throughout the year and not just operating during school term time. Will need to be backed up with targeted, proactive enforcement by West Midlands. • The introduction of a sizable 20 mph zone is a really positive step, not just for safety near the schools but also for reducing emissions and vehicle noise on the street. are there any plans for these measures to be implemented so the road design itself reinforces the new speed limit? • The proposed 20 mph limit seems a sensible idea.

Table 4.1.2 Other Comments

Other Comments	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will traffic calming be introduced alongside the 20mph speed limit. (2 received) • Can some of the side roads be made one way to stop rat running? • Who will actively police the 20 mph proposed limit? • I recognise that speeding is a problem throughout the roads indicated on the plans. I don't see any point in introducing a new speed lower limit if it cannot be enforced. Whenever the road is relatively quiet, and especially so at weekends or late at night, cars can travel down the road significantly above the speed limit and I fear this could be dangerous when other people are following the new lower speed limit. • This email is in support of the proposal, but, as is the case along Knightsbridge Road, Ulverley Green Road and Ulverley Crescent, the proposal requires traffic calming preventative measures to have any positive impact on our respective wellbeing, or nothing will change. • Permanent 20mph limits are, I believe, a step too far. In the rush periods when school children are going to school and workers to work, slowing traffic to 20mph has validity, but outside of these times the roads in question are relatively quiet and drivers on the whole respectful of others - they are not in a rush! I would prefer to see the existing system in and around Lyndon Road extended to include Richmond Road, and perhaps roads off, so that during busy periods, when children are going to and coming from school, a warning light systems advertises the temporary 20mph limit. Most definitely we do not need more speed bumps which, it would appear, generally accompany 20mph limits. • Will the 20mph zones be managed with the introduction of traffic calming measures such as chicanes and sleeping policemen. I cannot find any details on this element, but these things tend to go hand in hand. Can you also explain the logic behind easing congestion by slowing down the traffic? If the suggestion is that introducing 20mph speed limits will encourage the parents to walk their children to school, then I don't believe that will happen as most parents do what is easiest and quickest. Will slowing the traffic produce more fumes from cars exhaust which in turn affects children's health. • I am writing in support of a permanent 20mph speed limit on Greyfort Crescent, Olton to help control vehicle speeds. Ideally, law enforcement would have a huge impact on this ongoing problem. However realistically, a reduction in the speed limit would certainly be a more cost-effective means of reducing speeding. I also know that fellow neighbours would prefer no speed humps, to help combat this socially irresponsible problem. • Totally support the introduction of but wonder why Ulleries Road has been left as a 30mph road. 	<p>4.2</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.4</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.2, 4.4</p> <p>4.6</p>

Table 4.1.3 Objection

Objection	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I disagree wholeheartedly. I have seen the minority of inconsiderate drivers who do not adhere to the speed restriction put in place. The reasons for this plan do not specify anything life threatening/indeed real accidents/fatalities. The money will be better spent with more policing of the existing speed limit, especially around school start and end times, would greatly improve the attitude of the drivers and expectations of the residents. The majority on Richmond Road drive above the existing limit, Castle Lane and Ulleries Road not included in this plan are also higher speed roads. Lyndon Road because of it twists and has many speed humps is a slower through road. This will impact those in the neighbourhood whenever the speed is policed because the majority of drivers are locals. This feels like a plan proposed by people outside the area that do not understand our neighbourhood. If this unhelpful scheme gets the go ahead I will immediately put my house on the market and leave. 	4.6

4.2 The proposed 20 mph speed limits will be introduced on-street with signs and road markings only, they do not include other measures such as traffic calming, or one way streets. Given the proposals cover a wide area of the Lyndon ward (and a small part of Olton ward) it would not be practical, or financially possible to provide additional calming. Such interventions are not always popular with residents, indeed the representations to the proposals include two specific requests not to provide speed humps. However, the proposed 20 mph speed limits will feature repeater signs to remind motorists and encourage compliance of the lower limit. Currently the 30mph speed limits are by virtue of street lighting with no signs as reminders to motorists as to the speed limit in force.

4.3 Research undertaken for the DfT in 2018 in respect of 20mph speed limits concluded that average speeds are unlikely to see significant changes, and that 20mph speed limits reduce the higher top end speeds of faster drivers. Higher speeds come with a greater safety risk, particularly in terms of severity should a collision occur, so any reduction in speed has an obvious potential benefit to all road users.

SMBC's approved criteria for the introduction of 20mph speed limits focuses on roads fronting retail centres, schools and locations with high pedestrian movements. With a number of local schools, shopping parades and a park, the roads subject to the proposed 20mph speed limits meet the criteria. The police currently have the responsibility for enforcing speed limits nationally as levels of their resources permit. The 20mph speed limit would be largely self-enforcing with the provision of signs to indicate the lower speed limit to motorists; reduced speed limits have demonstrated changes in driver behaviour that typically results in slightly lower driving speeds.

4.4 The introduction of part time 20mph speed limit requires flashing hazard units to draw a driver's attention to the change in speed limit. These require electric connections, ducting and ongoing maintenance and energy costs. Permanent 20mph schemes can be delivered at significantly less cost and will encourage, slower, careful driving at all times. It is important to remember that the existing 30mph limits are a maximum speed not a target speed, and in many circumstances, road/traffic conditions dictate a lower speed to be appropriate. 20mph speed limits will help to encourage better driver decisions.

- 4.5 The primary objective of the 20mph speed limits is to help control vehicle speeds and aid road safety; this may result in a more pleasurable environment for road users to consider more sustainable alternative modes of travel. However, easing congestion is not the primary objective of the reduced speed limits. In the locations where parking restrictions are also proposed the free passage of traffic may be improved by discouraging obstructive parking. Air pollution is complex, some research suggests the health impacts are likely to be negligible and outweighed by the health benefits of slowed traffic. In addition, the increase in electric vehicles using our roads over the next few years is also likely to have positive impact on air quality.
- 4.6 Other research suggests that ~70% of residents agree that a 20mph speed limit is beneficial for residents, having reviewed the responses to this consultation, the objector presents a view which we don't believe is typically shared by the majority of residents within the borough. The scheme originally focused on Lyndon Road, however we believe there is a benefit to including the wider area, which includes making some of the existing part time 20mph speed limits permanent. Ulleries Road and Castle Lane are not included in the current Order but may come forward in the future, as there is a high demand for the introduction of further 20mph speed limits.

4.7 **Officer Recommendations**

The Order should be implemented as originally advertised. Clearly there is support for the lower 20mph speed limit, and minimal opposition. The main area of concern is around enforcement in the representations classed as other. It is expected that compliance with the lower limit will improve over time, as more limits are introduced, attitudes and behaviours will change accordingly. There is growing momentum for 20mph to be the default speed limit in residential areas, and Solihull council wants to help to drive that change.

5 The Metropolitan Borough of Solihull (Olton Primary School Area) (Total Prohibition of Waiting and Restriction of Waiting) Order 2021

- 5.1 This Order attracted 35 representations in total. 8 messages of support, 13 objections and 14 representations classified as other as they are partially supportive. The comments received are summarised in the table below.

Table 5.1.1 Supportive Comments

Supportive Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am writing to support the TRO for the Lyndon Road end of Chapel Fields Road. • I wholeheartedly agree with the plans submitted by the borough. Congratulations on a well drafted plan. • Simply put, please go ahead and implement double yellow lines on Pierce Avenue at Richmond Road. • We wish to register our support for the proposals on the grounds documented in the communication. • Not only do parked cars reduce visibility, and therefore create potential dangers, but often these cars are badly driven and badly parked by people who, apparently, are in too much of a hurry to fully consider their own safety, or the safety of others. Making and enforcing parking restrictions, whereby parents/guardians are prevented from parking in the vicinity of the schools would, in my view, reduce radically the safety problems in the area. • We FULLY support this application for parking restrictions as per the plans sent out we really need the double yellows in the mouth of Butler Road but I'm not convinced it's going to stop cars parking on the wide pavement area here and on the grass verge unless it is policed and fines handed out. Currently I've witnessed the police on more than 2 occasions just walk by. I note the school has introduced a school walking bus in line with the planning agreement, but they've even implemented a "stop" for Butler Road, so rather than deter traffic we now have walking bus parents parking in Butler Road half hour early to wait for the walking bus to stop off. Seems pointless and detracts from the purpose of removing traffic from the locality? • We are writing to support the introduction of the proposed Traffic Regulation Orders. These will assist in the delivery of the boroughs "School Streets" programme in the locality of Olton Primary School and encourage the use of sustainable active modes (walking and cycling) on journeys to and from school; while encouraging modal shift from parents taking their children to and from school by car and lessening the impacts of the morning and afternoon school run. • Thank you for your notice of new parking restrictions, I can safely say on behalf of the small residency of Woodhall Croft in the interest of Health and safety we would totally agree with all the modifications and restrictions on the plans.

Table 5.1.2 Other Comments

Other Comments	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Butler Road Your proposals will simply move the problem to the even number side further up, this creates a visibility problem trying to get off my drive. I would like to see Butler road as a no school parking road. 	5.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eastbury Drive Request for single yellow lines on one or both sides of Eastbury Drive around the Green/Blaythorn Avenue area to address school related double parking that potentially obstructs the road in particular for larger/emergency vehicles and results in a partial footway parking obstructing pedestrian and wheelchair users. (8 received) 	5.3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lyndon Road Will the existing zebra crossing be retained on Lyndon Road? Does not appear to address problems of parking on Lyndon Road between Ulleries Road and Kents Close. This section has single yellow lines opposite the school, cars and vans regularly park on the school side creating single file traffic, it's difficult to get a break in the opposing traffic, visibility is poor due to the length of the line of parked vehicles, only way for the two cars to pass is if one goes up onto the kerb. I would like to see this stretch of road having double yellow lines on both sides. 	5.4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lyndon Road Double yellow lines are not essential. They will disrupt our personal use of the area - family and friends who visit will not be able to park immediately outside our property and visitors to Jubilee Park. The double yellow lines are in immediate proximity to the entrance to Jubilee Park, which very well used all year round by local residents. Solihull MBC Council tax payers have every right to freely access and use the park whenever they choose to. There will be no parking available close to the park those mobility impairments will be adversely affected by this, this is not in spirit of inclusivity SMBC promotes and may be viewed as discriminatory towards people with disabilities. <i>Continued overleaf...</i> 	5.4

<p>Double yellow lines will create more access difficulties with people inevitably parking... across driveways. The school will be closed for approximately 13 weeks each year during school holidays when the park is used the most and the double yellow lines may deter visitors to the park at those times. Some parking restrictions at certain times may be of benefit and improve traffic safety in the area. Single yellow lines with parking restrictions at school opening/closing times would seem a proportionate way forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Richmond Road I understand this is primarily focused on Olton Primary, however I feel it would be sensible to factor in St Margaret's too, which currently seems missed. The plan only extends as far as the existing school keep clear and adds in new restrictions on Richmond Road north of St Margaret's and the junction with Fernhill/Chapel Fields. Richmond Road gets exceedingly busy at peak school drop off times, with drives frequently blocked and traffic brought to a crawl due to the amount of cars nearly double parked. With restrictions added north of the school but none added south of the school, I fear that it could become even busier than it already is and make it even worse for residents. I feel that the same restrictions as used on chapel fields road with a proposed single yellow line along at least along the even numbered side of the road up until the Lyndon road mini roundabout would greatly help with the traffic issue. (Note: I suggest the even side as the odd sided drives are nearly all double drives, meaning cars are not able to park on that side without blocking drives. On the even side the drives are narrow, so drivers park in the space between but with frequently 2-3 cars between drives, end up blocking the drives for residents). The Richmond Road/Wagon Lane junction has so many near misses each day but is not included. 	5.5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Richmond Road The double yellow proposals for Richmond Road seems over the top, a single yellow with time restrictions a more reasonable solution. Residents of this road have visiting relations and tradesmen, who cannot always be accommodated on resident's drives. The extension of the double yellows from Fernhill road to the bus stop bay would be a great inconvenience in respect of visitors, a single restricted yellow up to the double yellows on the corners of the junction a more reasonable solution. 	5.5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ulleries Road I think this is long overdue but would question the halting of the double yellows on Ulleries Road at what appears to be the entrance to the park, which is extremely busy, will this not just push parking down the road and make for limited visibility for the children leaving the park? 	5.6

Table 5.1.3 Objections

Objections	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Butler Road I would prefer double yellow lines on the junction with Lyndon Road only, what you have outlined only pushes the parking on to our side of the road, other than this we would be better off with single yellow lines for both sides. 	5.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Butler Road Why should residents of have restrictions imposed on them due to inconsiderate parents at the local school. Residents will not be allowed to park outside our own homes during the restricted times. Or even have visitors, tradesmen at these times. Not all residents have off road parking and it would mean we would all be parking on the same side of the road. Some residents have disabilities and do not have off road parking, so would struggle if they had to park further away from their own home. Residents should be issued with parking permits which will allow us to continue to park outside our own homes. Given the number of primary schools in the area I can't understand why parents have to travel by car to take their children to school. If they have to use a car perhaps the local authority should investigate if they are within the catchment area to attend Olton Primary and if not they should find a school closer to their own home which would be in walking distance. 	5.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Butler Road I would like to raise my objection to the proposed parking restrictions this would cause disturbance to our current parking arrangements. I am a childcare provider, I therefore need access to parking outside my property regularly throughout the day. I do not want any parking restrictions times outside my property. • Chapel Fields Road I believe that the proposed double & single yellow lines & parking restrictions are totally unnecessary. The school parking is only for a very short time twice a day & I believe it is very important for parents to be able to park close to the school to drop off & collect their infant & primary school age children safely. There really is very little inconvenience caused to residents by this. The real problem is caused by the A12 Bus. Chapel Fields Road was never designed as a Bus route & is far too narrow, the bus company has been lobbied to remove the bus by ward members but was reluctant to. <i>Continued overleaf...</i> 	5.2 5.7

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapel Fields Road This disadvantages local residents, parking restrictions will affect them in several ways, work and deliveries, overnight guests will have to move vehicles to comply. The small minority of parents who choose to bring children in a car should be penalised, the School should take full responsibility to notify all parents that this is unacceptable behaviour, it impinges on residents whose driveways are blocked, pollution from increased school traffic affects the local environment and will in later life cause those children to be less physically fit and for obesity to develop. The council should look to other methods to encourage walking to school and if some persist then sanctions through fines or the like be imposed. The school should for the spring term send out official letters to all parents advising that no child unless medical conditions apply, should be transported to school in a vehicle. Monitoring the effectiveness of such action which could be undertaken by the council's enforcement team, with offender's vehicle registration details being recorded then further action could be possible. If the matter is not resolved by the summer of 2022, then further consultation with residents around road markings and the possibility of permits to allow residents service providers or visitors to park at the times of greatest stress to traffic flow. This will reduce the damage done to the local roads and pavements whose surfaces are in a state of requiring replacement rather than patch repair as parents walking children will have a safe environment to travel to and from school and reduce the need for expensive road marking and signage. 	5.7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eastbury Drive Single yellow lines restrictions would be far more of benefit to residents, double yellow lines near my bungalow would restrict any visitors. 	5.3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eastbury Drive We absolutely object to the double yellow lines at the north eastern extent of the road, this area is frequently being used, not just by us and our neighbours but by home help, delivery of medicines and family members. 	5.3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eastbury Drive Close this pathway and sell the adjoining piece of prime land with planning permission for two houses, thereby generating some income. There would be no need for yellow lines except for a short area at the entrance to Eastbury Drive. Or, in order to control only those nuisance periods of the day 8-9am and 2.45-3.45pm, rather than controlling the residents 24/7, a single yellow line along the length of Eastbury Drive Eastern side, to include restricted parking signage/hours from the entrance at Ulleries Road down to 42 Eastbury Drive or if deemed necessary, to no. 54. This prevents double adjacent parking, which the current proposals do not. 	5.3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eastbury Drive Double yellow lines on junctions will impact residents, trades etc. A single yellow line on the eastern side leaves parking on the western side but stops double parking. Closing the path to Lyndon would solve the problem, it's not well used by residents, and has attracted antisocial behaviour. 	5.3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eastbury Drive Installing the parking restrictions is going to seriously affect the wellbeing and daily support needs of the residents in the bungalows. 	5.3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blaythorn Avenue I am writing to object to the proposed double yellows lines suggested at the entrance of Blaythorn Avenue, Solihull. We feel that the double yellow lines need to be extended up to property number 1 Blaythorn Avenue, Solihull and that they need to be on at least one side of the road. Blaythorn Avenue, Solihull is the only road which at the moment, has no parking restrictions at all, under the proposed restrictions, it will encourage further school parking in the morning and again in the afternoon, which is not fair to the residents. 	5.3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Richmond Road Our objection is you are not addressing the road outside 104/102 Richmond Road and 103/107 Richmond Road. Your plans show no proposed restrictions whatsoever, each school day there are issues with double parking at school times outside 105/107. This makes it dangerous, difficult to get off drive and completely blocks our vision of the zebra crossing outside St Margaret's school. With regards to the school parking outside 102 please note this is directly opposite the bus stop and when there is a bus and someone parked outside 102 it brings Richmond Road to a standstill and again prevents residents getting off their drives. The council appear to be overlooking this area and a no waiting limit between 8 am to 9 am and 2.45 to 3.45pm should be put in place to bring it in line with Chapel Fields Road proposal. Finally, we support the no parking along slip road by the park and doctors at Richmond Road. 	5.5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Comment These measures in my opinion will solve very little. You have overlooked the fact that you are dealing with parents who already trash grass verges, ignore double yellow lines and signs. They double park and twice on weekdays Lyndon road becomes a log jam thus preventing free passage for ambulances and public service vehicles. Fancy maps and extra signs will do nothing to deter these selfish and inconsiderate parent drivers. These people have and still cost taxpayer's cash; therefore, I would suggest the only measure to put a stop to these problems would be to issue fixed penalty tickets preceded with a warning notice of intended action. Please stop wasting public resources. 	5.8

- 5.2 A small percentage of Butler Road residents are clearly not fully supportive of the parking restrictions being proposed. The proposed double yellow lines at the junction with Lyndon Road appear to be accepted and the restriction would apply to the adjacent wide footways, noted by one supporter as a problem area. The single yellow lines will discourage obstructive parking and will minimise the potential impact of displaced parking from other areas restricted under the Order.
- 5.3 A number of Eastbury Drive residents support a scheme that includes additional single yellow line restrictions to discourage parking on both sides of the road at school start and end times, with a similar intervention suggested on Blaythorn Avenue. This significant modification to the original proposal would need to be considered and brought into effect under a separate Order, following further monitoring of the area. The double yellow lines at junctions, although not entirely supported would be in line with highway code guidance. It is accepted that at the northern extent of Eastbury Drive there isn't a current issue with obstructive parking and the proposed double yellow lines can be omitted.
- 5.4 The existing zebra crossing will remain on Lyndon Road and was not included on the plan for reasons of simplicity. The new zebra crossing just north of the roundabout at the Ulleries Road junction was included for reference and the controlled area of the crossing will prohibit some of the parking that current takes place adjacent to the school. In addition, the existing bus stop clearway will be moved to the end of the controlled crossing area, further prohibiting parking on the kerbside space outside the school. The resultant area for unrestricted parking outside the school will be a much shorter length and is unlikely to impact traffic flows in the manner currently seen. However, some give and take of opposing traffic will be required.

The extension of the existing double yellow lines on Lyndon Road south of the Chapel Fields Road junction was a specific request from one of the households near to the park. Although we wish residents to enjoy the open space, we are not compelled to facilitate parking at the nearest entry points. We would encourage residents to walk to their local park. Accepting that some residents have mobility issues, a blue badge holder could park on the double yellow lines, for a maximum of three hours if they do not cause an obstruction to other road users.

- 5.5 The area of Richmond Road outside St Margaret's School does already benefit from some parking restrictions, and if implemented, will also benefit from the reduced 20mph speed limit. We can consider this part of Richmond Road in a separate Order; this might be particularly beneficial once the impact of any displacement from implementation of any of the current proposals is known.

The section on the western side of Richmond Road, south of the Fernhill Road junction already has double height kerbs and bollards to discourage unsuitable parking. The proposed double yellow lines will reinforce this. Appreciating that access for trades may be difficult the council can issue exemption permits in certain circumstances.

The junction of Richmond Road and Wagon Lane is being considered for double yellow lines under a separate Traffic Regulation Order due to advertised at the end of January 2022.

- 5.6 The double yellow lines cover the entrance to the park and the area of Ulleries Road to the east of the park entrance and adjacent to the junction with Eastbury Road which is the main area of concern in terms of the interaction between road users. Further parking restrictions at the current time are deemed unnecessary and would disadvantage residents.

- 5.7 Chapel Fields Road will remain a bus route, as the highway authority, we have an obligation to provide an intervention that allows the bus free passage along the road. To minimise the potential impact on residents and their visitors, the proposed restrictions would only be effective at the known problem times at the start and end of the school day and would not apply at evenings and weekends. This is therefore deemed to be an acceptable compromise. One objector details their thoughts on robust measures to discourage parental parking, however there is no legislation or powers for the council to take that approach.
- 5.8 The issues detailed by the objector can be addressed by the proposed parking restrictions which if implemented will apply to the footways and adjacent grass verges, without the restrictions and the legal Order behind them, we cannot take the action suggested. Penalty Charge Notices can be issued by the council's civil enforcement officers when transgression of a restriction occurs.

5.9 **Officer Recommendations**

The Traffic Regulation Order should be implemented as originally advertised except for the proposed double yellow lines at the northern extent of Eastbury Drive as detailed on the revised plan 8675/2 in Appendix B. It is also recommended that further monitoring is undertaken following implementation to understand the impact of displacement parking particularly on Richmond Road, Eastbury Drive and Blaythorn Avenue.

6 Ward Members' Views

The Ward Members for Lyndon and Olton were aware of the intention to advertise the original proposals and have been updated on the subsequent consultation outcome and Officer recommendations.

7 Democratic Services

Democratic Services have confirmed that the proposed order was subject to statutory advertisement on the dates reported and that representations were received as noted above.

8 Risk Implications

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

The Approach is not intended to eliminate all risks and not all the risks identified can be managed all of the time. Also, risks will still exist that have not been identified.

9 For Decision

The Head of Highway Management is asked to approve that the 3 Traffic Regulation Orders under consideration are implemented in line with the recommendations set out in 3.2, 4.7 and 5.9.

The recommendation as set out above is hereby approved:

Signature: *P.S.Tovey*.....Date: *20th January 2022.*

Paul Tovey, Head of Highway Management