

**REPORT TO THE HEAD OF HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT
REPRESENTATION TO AN ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER**

**The Metropolitan Borough of Solihull
(Lode Lane Service Road, Henley Crescent and Rowlands Crescent, Solihull)
(Total Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting) Order 2024**

16th August 2024

LEAD OFFICER: Jane Williams

1. Purpose of Report

1.1. To consider representations received to a permanent Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to introduce new parking and amended parking restrictions on Lode Lane Service Road (303 – 307) & (357 – 369), Henley Crescent and Rowlands Crescent.

2. Background

2.1. Through the council's established Traffic Regulation Order Framework process the above locations were identified as priority locations in the 2024/25 works programme to be considered for the introduction of new or amended parking restrictions.

The restrictions are proposed in response to concerns from local residents and aim to regulate on-street parking and help to facilitate the free passage of traffic.

The proposals as advertised are detailed on plan 9439a and 9439b in Appendix A.

3. Matters for Consideration

3.1. The proposals were formally advertised on 17th May 2024 and the closing date for receipt of representations was 10th June 2024.

3.2. Separate consultations were undertaken for the two different locations:

- a) Lode Lane (303 - 307), Henley Crescent and Rowland Crescent received 5 representations, 3 against, 1 fully supportive and 1 supportive with additional requests.
- b) Lode Lane (357 - 369) received 5 representation, 4 against and one with additional requests.

The comments and suggestions received have been fully considered. The tables below summarise these representations.

Representations for 303 – 307 Lode Lane, Henley Crescent and Rowland Crescent	Officers Comments/ Response (refer to paragraph)
Our neighbour has informed us of these proposals as we had not received this information. Concerned that we have not received this.	3.3
Our road is small and there is limited space to drive up. We fear local businesses and their customers will park outside our homes; this can be awkward when trying to park on our drive. My daughter needs to park outside our house as well as my elderly mum in law when she visits. Family parking should be made a priority.	3.4
If these proposals go ahead our road again will be full of people parking. Our privacy will be impacted and will increase risk of accidents as drivers use the service road as a cut through as it is. We have children living on this road.	3.5

<p>I would like to strongly oppose the proposal of double yellow lines and 2 hours limited waiting time.</p> <p>Imposing these restrictions would have a catastrophic and very detrimental impact on our business. Due to the nature of the service we provide we ask our customers to leave their cars with us for a full day as we mot and service vehicles which take place at different times throughout the day.</p> <p>The service road that you are discussing only facilitates our particular building, so I see no reason for anyone to complain about the parking. There is a through road between the buildings which is never blocked but we would be more than happy for double yellow lines to go just in front of throughfare.</p>	3.5
<p>Considering I made a complaint about the issues outside my home you are not extending the proposal to cover my address.</p> <p>All the people who park at the business for the valeting and shops will now be parking outside my home.</p> <p>I am totally dissatisfied with this proposal. As you are making it worse for the rest of the residents in the lay-by. You could close the road at the far end of this lay-by like you have on the opposite side and give permits in the lay-by.</p>	3.5 & 3.6 3.5 3.4, 3.5 & 3.7
<p>With reference to the recent communication regarding the above, we fully support this proposal. Parking in Henley Crescent has become a nightmare especially with parents waiting to pick up their children from Lode Heath school. They seem to think that they can park anywhere and double park regularly blocking access to the Crescent.</p> <p>There are also cars parked fully on the pavement thus blocking access to pedestrians. Pedestrians regularly have to step into the road due to selfish and inconsiderate parking.</p> <p>Our only concern is how will this be 'policed as motorists tend to ignore double yellow lines/waiting times. Is there going to be more traffic wardens patrolling at key times?</p>	N/A 3.8
<p>I support the new proposal for the parking restriction on Henley Crescent. Albeit I would kindly request that you also consider placing double yellow lines in the middle of this road, as well as bollards on each side of the curbs (<i>identifying information is on file and has been considered but has been redacted from this document</i>). This proposal may increase the public blocking my drive.</p>	3.5, 3.7 & 3.9

Representations for 357 – 369 Lode Lane	Officers Comments/ Response (refer to paragraph)
<p>We strongly object to the proposed single yellow lines. We consider this proposal unnecessary and unwanted by the local residents (7 houses) that would be affected by this. There is an issue with workers at Rover parking around this area, but this has been less so recently and feel this issue for Rover to resolve. Just to reiterate, we do not want yellow lines in this cul-de-sac.</p>	3.10
<p>These proposals are of no benefit to the residents and will in fact cause some inconvenience to some of our neighbours, as such we would like to register our objection to these proposals.</p>	3.10
<p>We cannot see what benefit this restricted parking will have for the above houses, we personally have three vehicles at the address, so we are not sure where we are expected to park. Several of the drives are that small they have trouble parking one vehicle off road. I would presume you will be supplying us with parking permits to alleviate this.</p>	3.10
<p>Any of the indicated proposals would affect our parking and visiting family and friends parking. What would be beneficial would be a sign or signs stating RESIDENTIAL PARKING ONLY.</p> <p>Not sure if the problem we have on the main road is covered by your office, but the wild grassing of the central reservation is so high it's restricting the traffic sight line to view traffic traveling towards Solihull when turning across the central reservation.</p>	3.10
<p>Could I suggest that those are not the appropriate times, as they will only cover days and back shift. To cover nights, you also need to do say 10 - 11pm or 5 - 6am or are the residents okay with night shift parking? You may also want to consider leaving the 9 - 11 in on Saturdays and Sundays.</p>	3.10

Officer Comments/Responses

- 3.3. A consultation letter was sent to properties in the immediate vicinity of the proposal, and it is necessary to have a 'cut off point'. The legal requirements of a public consultation are notices on street and a notification in the local press, both of which were undertaken.
- 3.4. Residents parking schemes are typically introduced following an application from residents indicating their agreement to meet both the initial cost of joining the scheme and the ongoing annual permit renewal cost. This process sits outside the annual TRO priority process and would not be considered under this Order.
However, if a subsequent application was made it would be considered accordingly. Further information can be found at <https://www.solihull.gov.uk/parking/residentparkingpermit> .
- 3.5. In view of the objection received it has been decided to withdraw the proposal for limited waiting and the double yellow lines immediately outside 303 Lode Lane. The proposals for the double yellow lines protecting the junctions will remain as they support the rule 243 of the Highways Code which states:
- 'DO NOT stop or park: opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction,
except in an authorised parking space'
- NB. this distance is dependent on the demographic of the junction and as vehicle have increased in size it has been necessary to extend this distance.
- 3.6. The complaint/request received clearly states the issue as being 'Lode Lane service road from number 303 to the junction with Henley Crescent'.
- 3.7. Providing physical measures such as bollards or closing one end of a service road is outside of the scope of these proposals.
- 3.8. Enforcement is carried out in line with our commitments across the whole borough. If the proposals are subsequently implemented there will be a proactive push to drive compliance with the new restrictions.
- 3.9. If the scheme is implemented and the concerns are subsequently borne out, the roads could be considered for further intervention through the council's annual Traffic Regulation Order framework process; we don't have the flexibility under the current Order to expand on the advertised scheme.
- 3.10. The consensus from residents is that these restrictions are no longer required as JLR monitor the situation and assist if necessary. In view of this, the proposals for waiting restrictions outside 357 – 369 Lode Lane will be withdrawn, and the road remain unrestricted.

Ward Members' Views

The Ward Members for Elmdon and Lyndon wards were informed of the proposals. One representation was received in respect of 357 – 369 Lode Lane and has been considered and no longer applies as these proposals will not be taken forward. No other objections were received.

Officer Recommendation

The representations received in respect of the proposed Traffic Regulation Order have been fully considered and responded to accordingly in section 3 of the report.

It is recommended that the proposed Traffic Regulation Order be implemented as modified.

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.

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.

For Decision

The Head of Highway Management is asked to approve that the Traffic Regulation Order as modified on plan 9439a in Appendix B is implemented and that the proposal for 357 – 369 Lode Lane is withdrawn.

The recommendation as set out above is hereby approved:

Signature: ...P.S.Tovey.....Date: 23rd August 2024.....

**Paul Tovey
Head of Highway Management**