

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

**The Metropolitan Borough of Solihull
(Various Roads, Solihull) (Total Prohibition of Pavement, Footway and Verge Parking and
Total Prohibition of Waiting) Order 2025**

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:

The Cars estate – Smiths Wood & Castle Bromwich
Hurst Lane North – Castle Bromwich
Hamar Way estate – Chelmsley Wood
Campden Green – Lyndon
Eastbury Drive estate – Lyndon
Damson Wood estate – Elmdon & Silhill
Balsall Street East – Meriden
Brook Lane - Olton

2. Background

Concerns have been raised about dangerous and inappropriate parking on grass verges, open spaces and pavements at several locations around the borough.

To prevent nuisance to pedestrians, particularly those with mobility difficulties or visual impairment, damage to the structures of the pavement or grass verge, and unsightly environmental damage, a 'Prohibition of Verge and Pavement Parking' was proposed. A pavement also includes footways, and any hard surfaced area forming part of the adopted public highway maintainable at public expense.

The proposals as advertised are detailed on plans 9595a -9595h in appendix A.

3. Matters for Consideration

- 3.1. The proposals were formally advertised on 21st February 2025 and the closing date for receipt of representations was 14th March 2025.

4. Representations and responses by location

4.1. Several representations to the Order were received during the consultation period, these have been separated by location and fully considered. The table below summarises the percentage of representations received and if they were supportive or not.

Location	Approximate number of properties affected	Total Representations received		For		Against		Unclear and / or questions	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
The Cars estate. Smiths Wood & Castle Bromwich	1030	17	1.65%	4	0.39%	8	0.78%	5	0.49%
Hurst Lane North. Castle Bromwich	60	1	1.67%	-	-	-	-	1	1.67%
Hamar Way estate. Chelmsley Wood & Bickenhill	570	16	2.81%	-	-	15	2.63%	1	0.175%
Campden Green - Lyndon	100	9	0.09%	3	0.03%	4	0.04%	2	0.02%
Eastbury Drive estate. Lyndon	200	32	16%	25	12.5%	3	1.5%	4	2%
Brook Lane – Olton	70	47	67%	5	7%	42	60%	-	-
Damson Wood estate. Elmdon & Silhill	1210	29	2.37%	2	0.14%	22	1.08%	5	0.41%
Balsall Street East. Meriden	50	5	10%	5	10%	-	-	-	-

4.2. The table below summarises the feedback received from councillors and the officer's recommendation based on this feedback and representations received from residents.

Location	Plan number	Feedback received from ward members	Officer recommendation
The Cars estate. Smiths Wood & Castle Bromwich	9595a	Smith's Wood councillors are not supportive and would like to defer subject to SCH providing additional parking. A Castle Bromwich ward councillor feels that the Castle Bromwich area of The Cars estate should be implemented.	DEFER
Hurst Lane North. Castle Bromwich	9595b	Two councillors are supportive. No response from third.	IMPLEMENT
Hamar Way estate. Chelmsley Wood & Bickenhill	9595c	Due to local feedback, all three councillors no longer support this proposal.	ABANDON
Campden Green - Lyndon	9595d	All three councillors would like to defer or abandon.	ABANDON
Eastbury Drive estate. Lyndon	9595e	All three councillors are supportive.	IMPLEMENT
Brook Lane – Olton	9595f	Due to local feedback, all three councillors no longer support this proposal.	ABANDON
Damson Wood estate. Elmdon & Silhill	9595g	Two Elmdon councillors do not support due to feedback. Would like additional parking created. No response from third. Silhill councillors no longer support due to feedback.	ABANDON
Balsall Street East. Meriden	9595h	All three councillors are supportive.	IMPLEMENT

4.3. The councillors for Campden Green and Damson Wood estate have requested that additional parking facilities are provided. Due to the Council's current financial position, Highways are unable to create additional parking facilities on the public highway as it is not considered to be essential expenditure. Garage areas and green areas are the responsibility of different departments, and they would have to be approached directly.

Ward Members' Views

See table 4.2.

Officer Recommendation

The representations received in respect of the proposed Traffic Regulation Order have been fully considered.

It is recommended that the proposed Traffic Regulation Order be implemented, abandoned or deferred as stated in table 4.2.

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 9595b, 9595e and 9595h be implemented as advertised as shown in appendix B.

The traffic order detailed on plan 9595a be deferred (appendix C).

The traffic orders detailed on plans 9595c, 9595d, 9595f & 9595g be abandoned (appendix D).

The recommendation as set out above is hereby approved:

P.S.Tovey

24th November 2025

Signature:

Date:

Paul Tovey
Head of Highway Management