

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

**The Metropolitan Borough of Solihull
(Streetsbrook Road & Bryanston Road, St Alphege ward)
(Prohibition of Waiting at any Time) Order 2025**

**13 February 2026
LEAD OFFICER: Jane Williams**

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To consider representations received to a permanent Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to introduce a 'Prohibition of Waiting at any Time' restriction, (double yellow lines), to discourage obstructive parking at the junction of Streetsbrook Road and Bryanston Road in accordance with the advice given to motorists in the Highway Code.

2. Background

- 2.1. Through the council's established Traffic Regulation Order Framework process Bryanston Road has been identified as a priority location in the 2025/26 works programme to be considered for the introduction of new or amended parking restrictions.

The proposals as advertised are detailed on plan 9751 in Appendix A.

3. Matters for Consideration

- 3.1. The proposals were formally advertised on 7th November 2026 and the closing date for receipt of representations was 28th November 2025.
- 3.2. Five representations to the Order were received during the consultation period, four supportive with additional requests and one objection. The comments and suggestions received have been fully considered. The tables below summarise these representations.

Representations	Officers Comments/ Response (refer to paragraph)
We live at number █ Bryanston Rd and welcome the proposed parking restrictions in Bryanston Rd and Streetsbrook Road however we have concerns that the double yellow lines finish halfway between numbers 1 and 2 Bryanston Road which are opposite each other which would cause parking displacement outside our own house as well as neighbours at numbers 1 and 3 Bryanston Road. There is already issue. The issues include difficulty entering and exiting our driveway, reduced visibility when cars park too close to the dropped kerb as can be demonstrated on the images below and difficulty in manoeuvring on and off the driveway. Can consideration be given to extending the double yellow lines or parking restrictions during the day past our house and the houses opposite as we all have dropped kerbs almost opposite each other and if cars are displaced further along Bryanston Road, it will reduce our visibility even further when exiting our driveway.	3.3

I would like to support the proposals for parking restrictions for the following reasons. Living on Streetsbrook Road at the corner of Bryanston Road it gets extremely busy especially in the morning during peak times. Vehicles use the slip Road as a short cut before joining the main road outside our property. Bryanston Road is also used as a cut through. This causes congestion made worse by traffic having to negotiate parked cars. There have been times when it has been difficult to reverse off our driveway due to cars being parked outside our house. This may be due to taxis taking a break or cars being parked and left for several hours this along with traffic backing up to get onto the main Streetsbrook Road often causes queuing outside our house. The junction of Streetsbrook road and Bryanston is used as a meeting point for workers to meet and then go off leaving their cars parked for the day. I strongly feel that yellow lines should be extended further down Bryanston Road as cars parking outside houses there cause obstruction leading to further congestion.	3.3 3.3 & 3.4
We are pleased that you have recognised this area requires the installation of double yellow lines to prevent parking on the approaches and exits to the junction. We observe on a daily basis, the serious road safety incidents that are caused by parked cars in Bryanston Rd on the approach to Streetsbrook Rd. Everyday there are cars parked outside No. 1, 2, & 4, Bryanston Rd, sometimes unbelievably on both sides simultaneously, so that a car coming from Streetsbrook Rd is often confronted with a car travelling in the opposite direction and severely restricted space for either car to safely manoeuvre. The situation is significantly worse if there are several cars traversing the junction, which again is a daily occurrence. It is not uncommon to see several cars tailing back into Streetsbrook Rd due to the obstruction of an oncoming car blocking the way caused by the parked cars. Your proposals will hopefully help matters; however, we strongly urge you to extend the length of the double yellow lines in Bryanston Rd to a point past the driveways of No's 1,2,3 & 4. This will allow some vital extra space for cars to safely queue when they turn into Bryanston Rd and have to stop immediately. Whilst we appreciate that parking spaces are a premium, due to the multiple dropped kerb driveway entrances at this location, such an extension will only reduce the parking by another 2- 4 cars. If you do not restrict cars parking in between the driveways at this short location, you will still have cars stopping abruptly, driving on the footpath and also tailing back into Streetsbrook Rd, which, as you will be aware, are common causes of road traffic safety incidents on urban highways. Thank you for your consideration and the opportunity afforded us in advance to assist with our local knowledge on this matter. It would be a nuisance and inefficient for all parties if a likely second visit is subsequently required for the traffic management and road marking contractor to return and extend the parking restriction past the current proposal.	NA NA 3.3 3.5
I would like to express my support for the council's intention to improve road safety in the area and address inappropriate parking near the junctions. I appreciate the reasoning behind the proposal and agree that the current situation can cause visibility and access issues. However, I have a concern regarding the proposed double yellow lines on Bryanston Road. I live at Bryanston Road, and I am worried that your restricted parking order will simply displace vehicles further along into Bryanston Road, resulting in an increase in cars parking on Bryanston Road. Bryanston Road is approximately only 5m wide and if vehicles began parking on both sides in this section, this could create significant access issues, particularly for emergency services.	NA 3.5

I have a young family, and an increase in kerbside parking directly outside our home would reduce visibility and potentially increase the risk to children and pedestrians. The narrowness of the road means that if parking shifts further down, cars are likely to mount and obstruct pavements, which would further limit safe space for pedestrians. I therefore kindly ask that the Council review the extend of the proposed restriction and consider the impacts I have raised in order to prevent the displacement effect and maintain safe access for residents and emergency vehicles.	3.5
Our section of Streetsbrook Road will still be left totally unrestricted for parking and that any vehicles including large delivery vehicles will continue to be legally allowed to park on both the carriageway and the verge and pavement area without limit of time on a far more dangerous section of Streetsbrook Road than the roads opposite. This despite the restricted visibility when exiting our driveway due to a fast bend, our drive being situated opposite a bus stop and also abutting a designated cycle path/foot way and without any working speed cameras. In effect the current parking problem which may be irritating to residents but where it seems cars are regularly left in a safer and far less busy section of road on the slip road opposite known as Streetsbrook Service Road while the car owners hop on the bus for their daily work in Solihull will potentially now be moved directly across to the unrestricted far side of Streetsbrook Road main carriageway outside properties numbered 478 to 484 and upwards to the detriment and further safety concerns of our households and other adjoining properties. If it is the case that with our concerns noted the order would then have included parking restrictions for our address, I think this consultation process should now be interrupted and a revised order issued to that effect as I feel it would be unfair and discriminatory to continue without taking ail my earlier concerns into account. I see that only my house number is shown on the plan for this side of the road, but I sincerely hope that you have posted copies of the order to other residents on this side of the road who may be affected. note there are notices pinned up at various points across the road, but it is too dangerous to walk over from this side to read them. So, in conclusion we are now left with an unfair and possibly discriminatory decision-making process by the Council. In that there has been a decision made to set up an order to help some residents who have been inconvenienced with indiscriminate parking in the relatively safe and quiet location of a service road and side roads off the main carriageway only to leave the road on the opposite side as unrestricted and even more vulnerable to dangerous parking practises. So reiterate that in its present form strongly oppose this Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 on Road Safety Grounds and must now request that you review my previous correspondence with the Council which though absolutely relevant has clearly been ignored or lost and was certainly not taken into consideration prior to determining this order whilst the Council were acknowledging the views of the other residents on the opposite section of this junction.	3.5 & 3.7 3.5 & 3.7 3.8, 3.9 & 3.10 3.7 & 3.11 3.8

Officer Comments/Responses

- 3.3. The proposal aims to protect junction visibility and improve safety. Extending restrictions further along Bryanston Road would require additional consultation and may reduce available parking. Current design balances safety and parking availability.

- 3.4. 'Rule 201 of the Highway Code states 'When using a driveway, reverse in and drive out if you can'. This is safer for the driver and all other public highway users including pedestrians and cyclists.
- 3.5. 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.
- 3.6. Delivery drivers are allowed to stop on double yellow lines if they are loading or unloading (delivering).
- 3.7. Obstructive parking in the absence of waiting restrictions can be reported to the police authority who have full powers of enforcement.
- 3.8. The objector states that they have reported and requested waiting restrictions at this location, after extensive searches no request from this resident or any other household at this location has been located. If it has been reported to police, then SMBC would not have received this notification.
- 3.9. It is unlikely that the proposals would have included this part of Streetsbrook Road as it is rare that anyone would park here for any length of time.
- 3.10. We are satisfied that the statutory process has been adhered to, the proposals were advertised in the local media and notices posted on street where the restriction is proposed. Letters were sent to those directly affected by the restrictions, which is not a part of the statutory process but which SMBC do as a courtesy.
- 3.11. To ensure that all requests received for new or amended parking restrictions are considered in a fair and comparable manner, the council has adopted a framework process. The framework review is undertaken annually and allocates a ranking to each location based on environment, safety and functional criteria to help identify the priorities for the available resources (staff and financial).

Ward Members' Views

The Ward Members for St Alphege were informed of the proposals.

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.

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 the modified plan 9751 in appendix A is implemented.

The recommendation as set out above is hereby approved:

Signature: ...P.S. Tovey.....**Date:** 13th February 2026.....

Paul Tovey
Head of Highway Management