

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

**The Metropolitan Borough of Solihull  
(Yew Tree Lane, Silhill Ward) (Limited Waiting) 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 limited waiting restriction ‘2 hours no return within 2 hours, Monday to Saturday’ on the existing parking bay adjacent to the shops 49 – 63 Yew tree Lane to discourage all day parking and encourage a turnover of customers to the shops.

**2. Background**

2.1. Through the council’s established Traffic Regulation Order Framework process Yew Tree Lane 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 9632 in Appendix A.

**3. Matters for Consideration**

3.1. The proposals were formally advertised on 7<sup>th</sup> November 2026 and the closing date for receipt of representations was 28<sup>th</sup> November 2025.

3.2. Three representations to the Order were received during the consultation period, one fully supportive, one supportive but requesting the time be extended and one objection requesting that the time be extended. The comments and suggestions received have been fully considered. The tables below summarise these representations.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Officers Comments/ Response (refer to paragraph)</b>
I am concerned that this limitation would have a detrimental impact on my business, as many of our appointments—particularly colour services—regularly exceed three hours. Given the current downturn in trade, it is vital that the time limit be extended to three hours to accommodate the needs of our clients.	3.3
Furthermore, I respectfully request that the proposed “no waiting at any time” zone be extended to cover the driveway between shops 55 and 57. Without this adjustment, vehicles will inevitably park in the space between the shops, restricting access for deliveries and staff parking at the rear, creating further operational difficulties. This would undermine the effectiveness of the restriction and render it unfit for purpose.	3.4
Please be advised that, following the removal of several traffic bollards, vehicles have begun driving along the footpath. Drivers are entering through the first driveway to park and then attempting either to reverse or to drive directly off the pavement. This practice of using the footpath as a roadway is a matter of serious concern and poses a significant safety hazard. Could you confirm whether this issue will be addressed within your proposal?	3.5

<p>This is a positive move. My main concern was the parking, I've brought this issue up many times with no joy. This is a welcoming way forward for the businesses on that block of shops , as they have suffered for.</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>I've also suggested that the parking bays should be on an angle to provide more bays.</p>	<p>3.6</p>
<p>Two hours seems more than enough , but any longer would also have the same impact on the business. You can easily do everything you need in that period and the hairdresser is by appointment.</p>	<p>3.3</p>
<p>I accept the changes proposed. However, a restriction of 2hrs with no return within 2hrs maybe cause an issue with patients collecting their prescriptions. I think a window of 3hrs parking within no return within 2 hrs maybe more appropriate. This way patients that may present early morning between 9-10am may only park for a few minutes and return back before 12 and would avoid getting caught in the restriction timeframe. Patient do not park outside the pharmacy for long period.</p>	<p>3.3</p>

**Officer Comments/Responses**

- 3.3. Two representations have requested that the limited waiting time of two hours be extended to three hours, with the third stating that an extension would have the same impact. In view of these comments the restriction will now be '3 hours, no return within 2 hours, Monday – Saturday'.
- 3.4. Double yellow lines will be installed adjacent to the driveway between numbers 55 & 57 as show in the proposal.
- 3.5. Engineering works such as installing bollards are not within the scope of these proposals.
- 3.6. Marking parking bays at an angle (echelon parking) is not possible at this location as the it would mean that vehicles would encroach onto the main carriageway.

**Ward Members' Views**

The Ward Members for Silhill 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 modified to 'Limited waiting restriction '3 hours no return within 2 hours, Monday to Saturday' with a 'No Waiting at any Time' restrictions adjacent to the access between the two bays.

**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 9632 in appendix B is implemented.

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

**Signature:** ...P.S.Tovey..... **Date:** .....13<sup>th</sup> February 2026.....

**Paul Tovey**  
**Head of Highway Management**