

REPORT TO THE HEAD OF HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT

REPRESENTATIONS TO AN ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

The Metropolitan Borough of Solihull (Lawnswood Avenue and adjacent roads, Shirley East) (Prohibition of Waiting & Stopping) Order 2022

20TH APRIL 2022

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 restrictions on Lawnswood Avenue and adjacent roads, Shirley East.

2 Background

- 2.1 Solihull Council's 'School Streets' is an innovative project which seeks to aid and promote active travel to school whilst addressing a number of traffic related issues which are a common sight at the school gate at the beginning and end of each day. Through phase 3 of the scheme, measures will be introduced to discourage obstructive parking practices whilst creating a more pleasant environment for everyone around schools. The scheme will promote active travel to school by walking and cycling, which in turn, will help to reduce congestion and improve air quality in the area.

At Lawnswood Avenue and connecting roads, this will be achieved through the introduction of amended parking restrictions, including the introduction of a new loading ban at the start and end of the school day. The intention being to prevent obstructive parking on the main spine of Lawnswood Avenue near to the school. The introduction of a no loading ban will enhance the Authority's ability to proactively enforce the restrictions in place which will benefit both residents and school children as they walk to school.

The Order is expected to have a positive impact by reducing instances of obstructive and dangerous parking, improving the quality of life for residents, and enhancing road safety for school children.

3 Matters for Consideration

- 3.1 The proposals were formally advertised on 27th January 2022 and the closing date for receipt of representations was 17th February 2022.
- 3.2 In total twenty-eight representations were received, twenty-one from residents generally supporting and seven from parents who raised objection to potential lack of parking in the vicinity of the school. The objections, comments and suggestions received have been fully considered. The tables overleaf summarise the representations in relation to the proposed Order: -

Representations (comments/questions)	Officers Comments/ Response (Refer to paragraph)
<p>Parking for residents on Freasley Close is very restricted. There is often not enough parking for the residents alone, during school pick up times the parking is even worse. Putting in restrictions is going to cause residents more problems parking. As parents/ carers will then continue to park further up Freasley Close and use the little residential parking available. I propose for the grass area outside the houses to be removed. (This is the first grass area when entering Freasley Close) Removal of the grass area would enable the four privately owned houses to have drive access and will ease parking. Also, the bungalows either side would have drive access or parking outside their property.</p> <p>This has been done on all of the other roads leading off Lawnswood Road and Blenheim Road so I'm unsure why this hasn't been available for Freasley Close</p>	3.3
<p>The only thing that I would ask of this process, is that these proposals are future proofed, to consider the building project due to start for the building of 5 Dorma Bungalows in the rear gardens of 79 – 83 Lawnswood Avenue.</p> <p>This will include a private unadopted driveway between 81 and 83 Lawnswood Avenue, I would appreciate if consideration could be made for no waiting and no loading at any time (Double Yellow Lines) with the relevant time restrictions to joining the no waiting no loading lines and times from their end at Newham Rise up to and including the new proposed lines on Freasley Close. As the new driveway will be an unadopted private road I appreciate that restrictions can only be planned to the building lines. If the increase in the waiting/loading restrictions are considered this will cover Lawnswood Avenue properties from 69 – 81 Lawnswood Avenue and will not have any detrimental effect on adjacent properties, as all properties have access to dropped kerbs with off street parking. This would only affect the motorists causing parking chaos in Lawnswood Avenue at School times.</p>	3.4 & 3.5
<p>I am concerned that residents will be severely affected by these parking restrictions when they have genuine visitors, or a tradesman parked outside their own house during the stated restriction times. There are also some residents that have to park on the road due not having space on their own drives due to more than one or two vehicles.</p> <p>I am also concerned that whatever parking restrictions are in place, will be ignored by parents \ guardians unless these are enforced by the council.</p> <p>With regard to your "Young Lungs" campaign, I would fully endorse the concept, we appear to be well behind Birmingham school in this area. It also would hopefully mean that residents don't get so much grief when politely asking the drivers of school traffic to turn their engines off and not leave them running for anything up to 20 minutes. Any signage indicating 'no idling, turn engine off while waiting', would be welcome.</p>	<p>3.6</p> <p>3.7</p> <p>n/a</p>

Representations (Support)	Officers Comments/ Response (Refer to paragraph)
I support these changes.	n/a
I am a resident of Lawnswood Avenue and wish to support the proposals. I welcome the introduction of this proposal and it has my full support.	n/a
<p>I want to express my support for the plans as I think parking on Lawnswood avenue during school picking-up time is particularly bad. As someone who must travel during the school rush times, I am frequently held up by parents double-parking, causing obstructions through bad parking, or even sometimes clogging the street by letting children out of the car in the middle of the road!</p> <p>I think restrictions are the right way to go to ease the pressures on residents and also promote more walking to school! As a teacher, I know that infant schools usually have very small catchment areas, and many children could be walked or cycled to school instead! Thank you for proposing the new plans, I hope this email helps support the plans.</p>	n/a
I just wanted to say that I'm happy with the new proposals as long as they are actually enforced. I'm very concerned that they won't be as has happened in other areas.	3.7
<p>I write in support of these proposals; our property is located opposite a green. Please can it be confirmed that the proposed SYL will be laid down on both sides of the road?</p> <p>I am concerned that drivers may interpret the proposed restrictions in such a way as to reinforce permission to park and escort children to school. Please can you be clear if:</p> <p>A) no waiting means no waiting or parking any time during the times shown? B) No waiting means vehicles can usually stop to drop off and pick up passengers because there will be a single yellow lines marked on the pavement at right angles to its edge? C) No waiting means no loading or unloading at all times shown because there will be pairs of small yellow lines marked on the pavement at right angles to its edge?</p>	3.8 3.9
<p>I am writing in support of the proposed parking restrictions for Lawnswood Avenue. I think they are fair and will eliminate the double parking that currently exists. I totally agree with the no waiting at any time on the corners of Radbourne, Eastcote, Newnham and Freasley as these are especially dangerous where visibility is reduced for other drivers and pedestrians.</p> <p>I have a couple of questions:</p> <p>1 when will the restrictions be put in place? 2 is it against the law for cars to park on the footpath as this is commonplace currently for parents picking their children up? 3 when the restrictions are in place will a traffic warden routinely be in place to monitor parking?</p>	n/a 3.10 3.11 3.7
<p>We support the proposed changes.</p> <p>For Newnham Rise, the cars for the school run already park half on the pavement on one side opposite our house. The road is narrower than Lawnswood Avenue (i.e., 4.7 metres for Newnham and 5.5 metres for Lawnswood). When the law is changed to stop cars parking on the pavement then Newnham Rise will become the same parking problem that affected Lawnswood. The Cadent gas van parked permanently half on the pavement on Lawnswood near the Newnham corner will become a permanent fixture in Newnham Rise. My car is not large and is nearly 2 metres wide. 2 cars parked opposite each other make it impossible to drive up the road. We would like the parking restriction to be continued into Newnham Rise on at least one side of the Rise.</p> <p>Some parents come very early to collect their children and leave their engines running. We support the campaign to reduce this pollution.</p>	n/a 3.4 & 3.11 n/a
I wish to give my wholehearted support to the proposal to introduce parking restrictions in Lawnswood Ave.	n/a

<p>On numerous occasions due to parked cars, I have been unable to manoeuvre sufficiently to get onto, or off the drive at the house. Once on the drive I am then unable to leave to attend appointments and effectively feel under curfew. The problem with parking has increased enormously and drivers have now taken to parking on pavements which prevents access for wheelchair/ pushchair users, thus forcing us to walk in the road. I have felt for a long time that due to the parking chaos in this road at school times, it will only be a matter of time before someone is knocked down or there is a serious head on collision. I therefore feel that parking restrictions are essential.</p>	3.5 & 3.11
<p>I strongly welcome and support the proposed parking restrictions.</p> <p>A big concern is the idling engines. The parents and children have been made aware (at least courtesy of Blossomfield school) of how this affects air quality but there are many vehicles that do it, some of which arrive 45 minutes before school finishes. It concerns me that the Blossomfield children who are often outside will be inhaling these fumes. I have to make sure the windows are closed in the house, especially if my 1-year-old is having a nap which is particularly awkward in the summer.</p> <p>I have noticed the restrictions do not apply to the whole of Newnham Rise, but I feel they should as it's the closest road that cars will park in under the new scheme. It's quite a narrow road and still in very close proximity to the school for idling engines.</p>	n/a 3.12 3.4
<p>As a resident on the road, I believe this will be a great benefit. There are many parents who are extremely inconsiderate and sometimes even block the drives. People park in a way which also causes roadblocks on both sides of the road. Again, being extremely inconsiderate and not using their common sense.</p> <p>Having the red route on the road will definitely bring safety too.</p>	n/a 3.13
<p>I fully support the proposed parking restrictions in Lawnswood Avenue.</p> <p>I note your commitment to "young lungs" which if used correctly should greatly improve air quality and reduce the potential damage to the children.</p> <p>I have noticed over the years that there has been very little enforcement activity in this area and the current double yellow lines already here are completely ignored. If these changes do go ahead, please let me know your enforcement plans. If enforcement is not robust then the restrictions will be a complete waste of money and time as they will be ignored</p> <p>I would also ask if SMBC would consider reducing the current speed limit in the immediate area of the school to 20mph.</p>	n/a n/a 3.7 3.14
<p>I sincerely hope these plans come to fruition</p> <p>Drivers going way too fast on the bend opposite Newnham Rise where cars are parked on the bend opposite Newnham rise making it very unsafe for drivers and pedestrians.</p> <p>Many often park over the dropped curb of our driveway and neighbours too. In addition, they park on the pavements obstructing pedestrians and double-parking restricting access for any emergency vehicles or buses etc.</p>	n/a 3.14 n/a
<p>I express my strong support for the proposed parking restrictions on Lawnswood Avenue. I believe the proposals are justified and will solve a lot of the major parking issues that have plagued Lawnswood in recent years.</p> <p>In particular the inside of the bend, directly opposite Newnham Rise is a blind bend and I have witnessed dozens of near misses during the school rush. The proposed single yellow line will allow a much safer angle of visibility for pedestrians and for passing cars to see the many children on bikes and scooters.</p> <p>Double parking is a massive issue, as parents parking on both sides of the road leads to obstructions for vehicles, pedestrians and creates safety concerns for young children.</p> <p>The speed at which many cars approach the bend (from both directions) is absurd considering the busy state of the school rush. I would recommend considering the area for a 20mph zone for the safety of pedestrians.</p> <p>In regard to illegal parking, we have even had several instances of parents illegally parking on the private driveways of some homes here on Lawnswood. Additionally, I have confronted parents on 3 occasions for parking over a dropped kerb, restricting access to our own home.</p>	n/a 3.16 3.14 3.5 & 3.11

Representations (objections)	Officers Comments/ Response (Refer to paragraph)
<p>On a small but important point, it is not clear what improvement the Council is seeking to achieve by the removal of the double yellow lines from the corners of Eastcote and Newnham and replacing them with time-controlled lines. The junctions of these two side roads with Lawnswood are dangerous at all times. Your removal of the existing double lines will increase the danger to motorists coming out of those side roads, because their line of sight will be impaired by any parked vehicles on the corners. I would urge the retention of the existing 'No waiting at any time' markings. The same applies to Freasley.</p>	3.17
<p>On the general idea of restricted time parking on Lawnswood, I feel this is a good idea, but it does not go far enough. The effect of your proposal will be to move the existing parking from Lawnswood to nearby areas where you do not propose any new limits on parking, such as the 60 or 70 yards of Radbourne up to where it joins Solihull Road, Newnham Rise, Freasley Close, and even Blenheim Road. Is this what you refer to as 'displacement'?</p>	3.18
<p>The proposals will therefore make a very bad situation in Newnham etc much worse. At present, one side of Newnham is used by the school runners for parking, in a narrow cul-de-sac, cutting the available space on the pavements by inconsiderate parking so that push chairs and wheelchairs find it extremely difficult to get by. In addition, large vehicles such as refuse collection find it impossible to negotiate safely. The absence of any proposal to put yellow lines on the whole of Newnham will only serve to tempt the school runners to park wherever they like on Newnham, such as grass areas, and both sides of the road, making it impossible for any emergency vehicles to access the properties in the Rise. I would therefore urge the Council to put down yellow lines to time restrict parking in the whole of Newnham, and also Freasley Close, which would be the next target for parking.</p>	3.4 3.11, 3.15 & 3.18
<p>If there are any fatalities in Newnham etc owing to the inability of the emergency services to obtain access due to the Council's lack of parking restrictions if the present proposals go ahead, I will inform the coroner, the police, the media, and any other relevant body that the Council were warned of this possibility in this email and chose to take no action.</p>	3.4 3.11 & 3.15
<p>There is at present a small problem at midday on Lawnswood, with the parking of parents of children who do not attend the school for the full day. Perhaps the Council can check with the school as to the numbers involved, to see if it warrants any midday restriction on parking.</p>	3.19
<p>Alternative Proposals As I have said, the Council's proposals merely remove the problem from one street or road to others nearby. The following proposal is aimed at removing the problem from all streets On Lawnswood, between numbers 90 and 104, there is a grassed area. I propose the Council tarmacs all or a part of this area, to convert it into a car park for the school runners. That would take the parked cars off the streets and provide a spot nearer to Blossomfield School for the parents driving their children to school. Entrances and exits could be made on Lawnswood and by the scout hut, to avoid bottle necks at the start and end of the school run. The parking would also assist voters when the scout hut is used for elections. I appreciate there is a capital outlay in these difficult times for the Council. This could be recovered over time by a small daily parking charge at this new car park.</p>	3.3 & 3.18
<p>Enforcement It is self-evident that any new plan should have enforcement, and not just the occasional, intermittent attendance of existing traffic wardens.</p>	3.7
<p>I suggest you canvas the residents of streets near to Blossomfield School to obtain the services of a part-time (preferably volunteer and unpaid) warden, to whom you can issue armband and cap, mobile (to record illegal parking), and the necessary documentation to book illegally-parked cars. The volunteer can decide when and where he/she patrols to increase the uncertainty for any would-be parkers. Any fines raised would help to meet the original cost of the car park mentioned above.</p>	3.20

<p>I have an objection over the proposed "Parking Restrictions, Lawnswood Avenue, Shirley East". I view this new restriction as shifting the problem one place to another.</p>	3.18
<p>I do have young girl living at the property, her young lungs will have to be considered.</p>	3.12
<p>I face high difficulty in parking and approach to my property as the residents on the opposite side have no driveway and continue to on street parking. With this new proposed restriction ending just before my house, I can foresee there will be lot of inappropriate cars parking in front the property making my school and office run difficult and air quality around my house will more polluted.</p>	3.5
<p>As workaroud, I hereby request the parking restriction to be extended until the approach to Blenheim Road.</p>	3.4
<p>The current congestion at busy times clearly forces drivers to reduce speed. If the proposals are implemented, then the average speed of vehicles on this section of Lawnswood Avenue is likely to increase significantly. This will be combined with an increased number of pedestrians (who will have to walk from further along the road). As a result, I feel that the proposals have the potential to adversely impact certain aspects of road safety. In spite of taking great care while driving I have seen several "near misses" on the bend on Lawnswood Avenue between Newnham Rise and Freasley Close. This is mainly because of speeding drivers, some of whom are clearly driving greatly in excess of the speed limit on this section of road where visibility is restricted. I feel that this is a dangerous section of road and that the council needs to consider this as part of its proposed changes.</p>	3.15
<p>The council has made no comment whatsoever on the issue of road safety. The plan makes no provision for traffic calming or other measures to improve pedestrian safety or prevent speeding. Will the council consider installing speed bumps, pedestrian crossings or similar given that children will now have to walk from further away? Children are also likely to have to cross additional roads in order to get to school.</p>	3.22
<p>Parents dropping off/collecting children sometimes park on the large grass verge at the top of Newnham Rise, which has led to it being churned up. Can the council implement measures here to try to discourage parents from parking on this piece of grass? This is likely to get worse if the proposals are implemented and more parents attempt to park on this grass at busy times.</p>	3.3
<p>My objections are as follows, - The proposals will increase the traffic into the cul-de-sacs off Lawnswood Avenue. As with all roads of this type the traffic has to exit the same way as it entered, and this in and out movement of vehicles has already caused hazards and problems with the inconsiderate parking across driveways, on grassed areas, on pavements, damage to residents' vehicles and property, and parking in the current no waiting areas. These proposals will lead to even more instances of vehicles parked on both sides of the narrow cul-de-sacs and an increase in the above problems. Emergency vehicles would also be hampered if unable to gain access, or locate the driver, with this type of inconsiderate parking. There will be an increase in problems for delivery vehicles attempting to gain access during these times. There appears to have been no thought given to the obvious increased impact on the residents of Newnham Rise and Freasley Close. They will have even more of the above inconvenience, and possible friction with some of the drivers who currently have no consideration or thought for the residents, or where they park. - I would request that the complete length of Newnham Rise and Freasley Close is included in the 8.30 - 9.30 am & 2.30 - 4 pm restrictions.</p>	<p>3.4, 3.5 & 3.18</p> <p>3.15</p> <p>3.4 & 3.18</p>

<p>The proposals are a small step in the right direction; however, they do not go far enough & merely move the problem from Lawnswood Avenue to Newnham Rise which is totally unacceptable. The road is currently congested morning & night with parents dropping off & picking up children with residents unable to access or leave their own properties during this period.</p>	3.4 & 3.18
<p>Why has all of Newnham Rise not been included or made a resident only parking area?</p>	3.23
<p>The existing double yellow lines at the junction of Lawnswood Avenue / Newnham Rise are ignored on a daily basis. Newnham Rise is a particularly narrow road, currently vehicles park on one side only, although it has been known for double parking to occur, with vehicles parked half on the pavement, half on the road. This inconsiderate parking makes walking down the footpath virtually impossible and if the proposal proceeds as drafted, it will no doubt become the norm to park on both sides of the road & on the grassed areas, which would very quickly become churned up and then be an eyesore, both of which are totally unacceptable and would make it even more difficult to get in or out of the road.</p>	3.7 & 3.18
<p>Residents currently have to schedule deliveries around the school day which is not acceptable.</p>	3.21
<p>The junction of Lawnswood Avenue & Newnham Rise is also used as a turning point by numerous parents which also causes congestion.</p>	3.24
<p>The no waiting on Lawnswood Avenue should be extended to cover both sides of the road the restrictions do not extend to cover activities that go on after 4:30 at the school which creates as many problems as normal school parking.</p>	3.4
<p>The proposals are useless without any form of enforcement. There is currently virtually no enforcement & those responsible for carrying out this usually ignore poorly parked vehicles rather than engage with the occupants. What enforcement will be in place?</p>	3.7
<p>Finally, the school are a "neighbour" and not a particularly good one, they could & should be doing more to discourage the inconsiderate behaviour of parents rather than the not interested, couldn't care less attitude that they currently have.</p>	3.25
<p>As part of the induction process to the school parents should be reminded that the school is located within a residential area and that the those who live near the school should be treated with respect, it is hardly respectful nor good for the environment if parents sit in their vehicles with them idling for thirty minutes plus whilst waiting for school to finish. I also understand that over 90% of those who attend the school live within walking distance, there is therefore no need for children to be taxied back & forth when it is quite feasible to walk.</p>	3.25
<p>I would suggest that a representative of the council visits the location & sees the position on the ground.</p>	3.26
<p>I am responding because I am one of the parents, so that makes me part of the nuisance. Look, it's not my intention to be a nuisance however I live about 1mile away. Every morning I drop off my daughter at nursery then I drop of my son at Blossomfield School for the 9am start. I then have to drive to work. Unfortunately, walking is not an option, I have to drive. Then if I have to drive, I then need to find a place to park so I can drop off my son, and he's only 5yo so I can't just throw out the car and let him sort himself out. By stopping the parking, you're just moving the problem to another road.</p>	3.6
<p>Now in my defence, the nuisance is really between 8:40 to 8:55. That's because there is a crowding at that time waiting for the school to open their classes for the children to enter. It's really a peak of disruption of 15 minutes and by 9am the road is empty again. Same thing in the afternoon.</p>	
<p>Furthermore, I've been dropping my son off for about 6 months now. I have rarely seen a local resident struggling to get in or get out of their house. This is because working people a most probably already gone to work or themselves doing drop offs at another school at the same time. Then the parents who are local residents themselves walk to the school and wait with us who are driving until classes open. By the time they want leave for work the road is clearing up again.</p>	

<p>I am writing to object. I am a parent of a child who attends Blossomfield Infant and Nursery school. I object to a parking ban which may take place on roads neat to the school as this will mean I am having to walk further with my young child and back once he has been dropped off. The extra added time means I can't make it to work on time. From September my daughter will also be starting the nursery at the school. She will only be 3 years old when she starts, and I fear the longer walk to school on busy roads could be dangerous for us and others. we don't live close enough to the school to walk so we would just be parking on another road. Your ban would not be solving the traffic/parking issues around the school as the traffic/parking will just move to another road which will already be a lot busier than the roads you are looking to impose a parking ban on which will be unsafe for everyone.</p>	<p>3.6</p>
<p>As a parent of Blossomfield Infant School, I wish to object the proposal that has be placed.</p> <p>My reason for objecting is due to the fact that there is not enough ample parking on road around the proposed area. The children are of young ages and safety of the children is paramount. The school hasn't just recently been built and the school collection hours are only a small amount of time during the school year. I understand the frustration of the residents that live around. However, I do not think it is fair on the parents that park responsibly.</p>	<p>3.6</p>
<p>In relation to the proposed total prohibitions of waiting – no waiting at any time in and around Blossomfield School I would like to log my OBJECTIONS for the following reasons.</p> <p>As a full-time working mum of 2 young children, one who attends Blossomfield School and another at another nursery it would be a struggle to get both children to school/nursery on time and get to work on time if made to park further away or walk to school (we live a half hour walk away).</p> <p>It would also be more unsafe to walk a further distance with 2 young children.</p> <p>I have never encountered any problems parking near to the school or witnessed anyone parking in an unsafe manner.</p> <p>Working for the Police I fully understand problems that can occur around schools with parking and maybe an alternative in terms of zigzags at certain points on some of the roads to avoid any potential future problems.</p> <p>The majority of parents are under pressure every day, trying to get their children to school on time, and then get to work themselves. There are no nearby carparks, other than a very small carpark near to the park as an alternative option.</p> <p>I would have to adjust my hours at work, working less hours, which in turn would have a detrimental effect on the work I do, to accommodate getting my children to school/nursery on time if the restrictions were allowed.</p>	<p>3.6</p>
<p>I am a parent of a child who attends the primary school on Eastcote Close, when on the AM and PM school run, I not only have my child who attend the school with me but also his younger siblings who are aged 2 and 6 months old. I arrive for the school run early so that I can park in a safe place where it is easy and safe for me to get to the school with my 3 children. My child has been attending the school for 18 months and I have never needed to cross a single road with my young children during this time to get to school.</p> <p>The parking restrictions you are planning to put in place mean I will have to cross busy roads with my young children to get to school. At the moment the road where I park only has school traffic. Your restrictions will mean I am having to park on a road where there is not only school traffic but also traffic from other schools and people commuting to and from work which is putting my children and others at risk of being involved in a collision. I understand the roads you are planning to bring restrictions can get busy at school times, but you will only be moving the traffic and parking to an already busier road this will also put my children's safety at risk.</p> <p>I am also due to start back at work after maternity leave soon which will mean I will need to drop my children to different childcare settings, With the added time of getting back to my car with my young children I am unlikely to get to work on time which could possibly result in my contract being terminated if I can't start om time. I also live 1.6 miles away from the school which means if I was to walk to school this would take a normal person30minutes, but with three young children would take me more than an hour which would not be possible when I have several childcare drop offs.</p>	<p>3.6</p>

<p>The traffic around school is awful during school drop off and pick up with drivers mounting pavements to avoid waiting for cars to pass. I do believe something needs to change; however, the current plans would just displace the cars to other areas.</p> <p>I need to use my car for the school run and choose to park by the scout hut on Stockley Crescent - as do many other parents. This small car park is already full every morning and evening so cannot take further cars. Without the identification of another suitable parking place where do you propose the cars will park?</p> <p>Parents at Blossomfield often have children at Shirley Heath which is a 20-minute walk away - 45+ minutes if walking with children. The school days start 30 minutes apart, you can't get between the 2 schools on foot in 30 minutes with children in tow. I live a 25-minute walk from Blossomfield school however this walk takes me 60 minutes with children. How do you propose to encourage walking to school if school start times prohibit this? Driving to school is a necessity for many, how are you going to enable parents to leave the car at home?</p> <p>What struck me from the plan is the scale of the problem, the fact that restrictions are recommended for as far down Lawnswood Avenue as Freasley Close means that there are a substantial number of cars that will be displaced by these measures. Parking on Radbourne road is not helped by the traffic calming measures which takes up several potential parking spaces - similarly on Yoxall Road. Without a firm plan on where cars can park I believe you are just displacing the congestion. People are not parking on Lawnswood Avenue out of laziness and not wanting to walk but out of necessity, either because they have 2 or more school/nursery drop offs or work to get to.</p> <p>What I would welcome is more consultation with parents on what could potentially work and exploring ideas together rather than just restricting access to the school. Parents who already need to be at more than 1 school and workplaces all between 8:30-9am don't need further barriers to what is already a hectic routine. I'd like to hear about what consultation, if any, you have made with parents and what other solutions you have considered.</p> <p>Shirley Heath - Blossomfield car sharing? Once Shirley Heath drop off completed many cars would have space in their cars for another child. Could this be encouraged with car sharing children allowed to access Lawnswood road? A bus service from Shirley Heath to Blossomfield so parents only have 1 drop off? Walking bus from Shirley Heath but potentially arriving late to Blossomfield school? These are just a few very quick ideas that sprung to mind, it would be useful to know whether the council has considered any alternative options to just restricting parking</p>	<p>3.18</p> <p>3.6 & 3.28</p>
<p>I would like to object to above proposal on the grounds that this will not only make it very difficult for parents who have to drive to school but it will also create traffic / parking congestion in alternative roads, so the problem will not go away it will be relocated.</p> <p>I do not disagree that there is an issue with parking on Lawnswood Avenue, but it is the minority of parents that park inconsiderately. You occasionally have parking patrols outside school, give them the authority to give out tickets / fines. This will stop bad behaviour. Also provide details of where parents can send photos of cars parked inconsiderately and follow up with tickets / fines to deter this behaviour. Double yellow one side of the road to avoid people parking only on both sides??</p>	<p>3.18</p> <p>3.7 & 3.27</p>

- 3.3 Providing physical measures such as removal of grass verges to provide parking is outside of the scope of these proposals.
- 3.4 There is a demand for parking at school drop off and pick up times. A 'No Waiting' restriction on both sides of Lawnswood Avenue would be overly restrictive and lead to poor compliance. In addition, the current proposal does not extend to the areas highlighted in the representations and modifying the Order accordingly in line with the requests would be a substantial change to the originally advertised proposal, however these areas can be considered by future prioritisation and programming if the concerns raised are subsequently borne out.
- 3.5 There are other mechanisms to deal with the obstruction of private driveways including the use of informal access protection markings, also known as H-bars. Any resident who feels they would benefit from such a marking should contact the council accordingly. Further details can be found at the following location on the council's website:
<https://www.solihull.gov.uk/hmarkings>

- 3.6 The proposal would see the installation of a single yellow line on one side of the carriageway only to discourage obstructive parking, the opposite side of the carriageway will remain unrestricted and available for any motorist to utilise for parking on a first come first served basis.
- 3.7 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.
- 3.8 The single yellow line is proposed the eastern and north-eastern side of the carriageway only as detailed on the consultation plan.
- 3.9 The restrictions will be clearly signed in accordance with current legislation and guidance so that they can be interpreted correctly.
A, B & C are a correct description of the restrictions.
- 3.10 If the proposals are approved, the restrictions are likely to be implemented within three months of the date of this report.
- 3.11 It is not currently against the law for a vehicle to be parked on a footway, it is however against the law for a vehicle to cause an obstruction on a footway or drive along a footway. The police currently have the responsibility to enforce this under various statutory provisions. Where a yellow line parking restriction has been proposed, it would apply to the full width of the highway including the adjacent verge and footway. The council's Civil Enforcement Officers can therefore take enforcement action in certain circumstances with regard to footway parking.
- 3.12 Solihull Council is committed to improving air quality. Although the borough's air is within national air quality objectives, the council is working closely with schools to tackle this significant priority.
- 3.13 A Red Route has not been proposed for this location. Red routes are intended to be used strategically to deal with traffic problems assessed on a whole—route basis, not to deal with issues on relatively short lengths of road.
- 3.14 A 20 mph speed limit is to be proposed for Lawnswood Road and a consultation undertaken in the near future.
- 3.15 Colleagues in the emergency services and the waste management team have been consulted as part of this process. No objections have been received in relation to the proposals as advertised.
- 3.16 The aim of the proposals is to discourage parking on one side of the carriageway thus addressing any instances of double parking.
- 3.17 The double yellow lines are not going to be removed at these locations. The addition of a 'No Loading' restriction will significantly enhance the council's ability to enforce the restrictions at this location, enabling a more proactive approach which will encourage improved compliance with the restrictions.
- 3.18 It is acknowledged that the proposals as set out may result in some displacement parking into adjacent side roads. The proposals will however discourage obstructive parking on critical junctions, which should aid the flow of traffic and ease concerns over congestion and access restrictions to emergency vehicles caused by obstructive parking.
- 3.19 The intention of these proposals is to address obstructive parking during the main school drop off and pick up times. The parking at midday does not warrant any further action.
- 3.20 Parking enforcement is a legal process and therefore requires a trained Civil Enforcement Officer.
- 3.21 It is accepted that at school times deliveries may be affected by the increased activities in the area. We would encourage deliveries to continue to be scheduled outside these times where possible, however the scheme does aim to regulate parking and improve traffic flows.

- 3.22 Providing traffic calming measures is outside of the scope of these proposals.
- 3.23 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>
- 3.24 Parking restrictions cannot stop manoeuvres such as turning in a junction, instances of dangerous driving can be reported to the police who have full powers of enforcement to deal with such matters.
- 3.25 The school will be made aware of your comments.
- 3.26 An engineer from SMBC will visit a site as part of every scheme. A survey is undertaken to ascertain the issues. The design is then drawn up taking into consideration all stakeholders affected.
- 3.27 Parking enforcement is a legal process and as such it is not possible to issue tickets/fines based on photos taken by members of the public.
- 3.28 The introduction of the scheme may result in school related parking being displaced across a wider area, however, parking in a safe and appropriate location remains the choice of the individual motorist. Our Sustainable Travel Team will contact the school to discuss initiatives to promote more active travel which could include looking at Park & Stride and Walking Busses schemes as well as promoting more walking, scooting and cycling to the school.

4. Ward Members' Views

- 4.1 The Ward Members for Shirley East were informed of the proposals. No objections were received.

5. Officer Recommendation

- 5.1 The representations received in respect of the proposed traffic regulation order have been considered and responded to accordingly in section 3 of the report.
- 5.2 It is recommended that the proposed Traffic Regulation Order be implemented as originally advertised as detailed on Plan 9021 in Appendix A.

6. Democratic Services

- 6.1 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.

7. Risk Implications

- 7.1 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.
- 7.2 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 hereby approves implementation of the traffic regulation order, as advertised and detailed on drawing no. 9021 in Appendix A.

It is further recommended that the proposed 20mph speed limit order for this location be given priority in the Cabinet report to be presented in July 2022.priorities.

The recommendation as set out above is hereby approved:

P.S.Tovey

22nd April 2022

Signature:Date.....

**Paul Tovey
Head of Highway Management**