

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

**The Metropolitan Borough of Solihull (Elmdon Lane, Digby Drive, Station Road and Canterbury Drive, Marston Green) (Total Prohibition of Waiting, Restriction of Waiting and Blue Badge Holders) Order 2024**

**24<sup>th</sup> September 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 Elmdon Lane, Digby Drive and Station Road, Marston Green.

The representations for Canterbury Drive will be addressed in a separate report.

**2. Background**

2.1. Through the council's established Traffic Regulation Order Framework process Elmdon Lane was 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 Birmingham Airport and emergency services and aim to regulate on-street parking and help to facilitate the free passage of traffic in the case of an emergency.

The request for the revocation of the restrictions on Canterbury Drive was included in response to a petition submitted by residents and Station Road was included due to an anomaly between the order and the lining on street.

The proposals as advertised are detailed on plans 9402a and 9402c in Appendix A.

**3. Matters for Consideration**

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

3.2. Five representations were received for Elmdon Lane, one from the Parish Council which supports the scheme, one requesting additional restrictions and three objections (two of these were identical but from different addresses). None were received for Station Road. The comments and suggestions received for Elmdon Lane have been fully considered. The tables overleaf summarise these representations.

Elmdon Lane and Digby Drive - Representations	Officers Comments/ Response (refer to paragraph)
<p>Two representations were received:</p> <p>While I appreciate the need for unimpeded access to the airport site, I object to the current plans, based on the following points:</p> <p>1. Unnecessary Action: The proposed action, as it stands, is not essential to achieve unimpeded access to the airport site. Further along Elmdon Lane, there are far more restrictive on-street parking on a regular basis. Without addressing that, restrictions or controls on the proposed locations would not improve accessibility.</p> <p>2. Inconvenience and Financial Impact: Implementing the proposed restrictions would impose considerable inconvenience on me as a resident and could potentially have a negative financial impact.</p> <p>3. Road Width Considerations: In most of the proposed section of road, the width allows any road-legal vehicle to pass another that is correctly and considerately parked. Therefore, parking restrictions are unnecessary in these areas. The only exceptions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The narrow section beyond the driveway of house number 211 (up to the airport entrance).</li> <li>• The short, narrow section opposite house numbers 197 and 199.</li> </ul> <p>4. Local Residents and Awareness: The road is primarily used by local residents or visitors of local residents. We are aware of the airport access requirements, and there is no record of non-local drivers causing issues.</p> <p>5. Negative Impact on Residents: The proposed restrictions would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevent parking or waiting at any time, inconveniencing visitors (including elderly ones) and delivery drivers.</li> <li>• Disallow service vans from stopping outside, affecting essential services.</li> <li>• Complicate simple tasks like rearranging parked cars.</li> <li>• Potentially make actions impossible for lone adults with young children.</li> </ul> <p>6. Property Value and Aesthetics: The additional restrictions could reduce the desirability and value of my property. Double yellow lines would negatively impact the otherwise pleasant, tree-lined cul-de-sac.</p> <p>7. Delivery Drivers and Real-World Impact: While delivery drivers occasionally park in the narrow section opposite houses 197/199, double yellow lines may not effectively prevent this. Their proximity allows quick adjustments when needed, similar to other road obstructions.</p>	<p>3.3</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>3.5</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>3.4, 3.6 &amp; 3.7</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>3.6</p>
<p>I think to put DYL's outside 191 &amp; 193 Elmdon Lane would cause a great inconvenience to the visitors who come to both properties. I've lived here 27 years and there has never been a cause to use the airport gates at the end of Elmdon Lane as an emergency (There are other gates).</p>	<p>3.3 &amp; 3.4</p>
<p>The entrance to Digby Drive is frequently obstructed by vehicles that park right on the junction. I should like to see the proposed yellow lines extended further into Digby Drive to make the junction safer.</p>	<p>3.8</p>
<p>Please be advised that Bickenhill &amp; Marston Green Parish Council have no observations on the proposed Permanent Traffic Regulation Order.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

## **Officer Comments/Responses**

- 3.3. The restrictions are necessary to discourage parking on the secondary RVP (Emergency Rendezvous Point) feed on Elmdon Lane and have been requested by Head of Fire and Emergency Planning at Birmingham Airport and supported by:
- Training and Emergency Planning, West Midlands Police/Airport Police Unit.
  - Head of Emergency Planning, West Midlands Ambulance Service.
  - Head of Response, Fire Control & Emergency Planning, West Midlands Fire Service.

Recently, the primary RVP was temporarily closed, and it was noted that parking at this location is now a single point of failure for emergency access to the site. No other locations have been identified and restrictions requested.

- 3.4. A carriageway is part of the public highway, its primary purpose is to enable access and to accommodate the flow of traffic. Whilst parking on a public highway, when not causing an obstruction or being in contravention of restrictions, is generally accepted, it cannot and should not be relied on as a source of parking.
- 3.5. The carriageway at this location is 6.3m at its widest point, for a very short length and lessens considerably within a short distance on both approaches. The access requirements for a fire appliance is a consistent 3.7m, which would not be achievable if parking were allowed at any point on this length of carriageway. Also, due the demographic of the road at this location there is no room for vehicles to use the verge/footway.
- 3.6. Loading and unloading is permitted on double yellow lines, must be continuous and must not be causing an obstruction. This includes taxis and delivery drivers.
- 3.7. Essential services such as Severn Trent as required to inform the council of its intention to work and must apply for a permit to do so. Trades people can apply for a dispensation to park on restrictions, each application is considered on an individual basis.
- 3.8. We do not have the flexibility under the current Order to expand on the advertised scheme.

## **Ward Members' Views**

The Ward Members for Bickenhill were informed of the proposals. No 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 advertised to ensure emergency access to Birmingham Airport is not obstructed in the future.

## **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 detailed on plans 9402a and 9402c in appendix A is implemented as advertised.

**The recommendation as set out above is hereby approved:**

**P.S.Tovey**

**26<sup>th</sup> September 2024**

**Signature: .....Date: .....**

**Paul Tovey  
Head of Highway Management**