

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

**The Metropolitan Borough of Solihull (Denise Drive, Eileen Gardens and Hillside Drive,
Kingshurst) (Total Prohibition of Waiting) Order 2026**

**20 July 2026
LEAD OFFICER: Jane Williams**

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To consider representations received in response to a proposed permanent Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to introduce a 'No Waiting at Any Time' restriction (double yellow lines) at the junctions of Denise Drive/Eileen Gardens, Hillside Drive/Eileen Gardens, and along the bend connecting the two junctions.
- 1.2 The restriction is intended to discourage obstructive parking and maintain access for waste vehicles, emergency services and residents.

2. Background

- 2.1. Through the council's established Traffic Regulation Order Framework process, this location was identified as a priority location in the 2026/27 works programme to be considered for the introduction of new or amended parking restrictions.
- 2.2. The Council's Waste Management Team have reported repeated access issues on Denise Drive due to parked vehicles, and residents have raised concerns about inappropriate parking at the Eileen Gardens/Hillside Drive junction.
- 2.3. The proposals as advertised are detailed on plan 9807 in Appendix A.

3. Matters for Consideration

- 3.1. The proposals were formally advertised on 19th June 2026 and the closing date for receipt of representations was 10th July 2026.
- 3.2. Eleven representations were received during the consultation period: nine objections, one representation in support and one representation expressing concerns regarding the proposal but without clearly supporting or objecting to it. The comments and suggestions received have been fully considered. The tables below summarise these representations.

Representations	Officers Comments/ Response (refer to paragraph)
There is already an ongoing problem with the major shortage of parking spaces in this area. Removing more spaces without replacing these restrictions with additional parking will just force residents to use surrounding streets for parking hence creating congestion across the surrounding areas rather than solving the problem, this will increase and push the parking issues into surrounding neighbouring roads which in turn will cause more congestion affecting more residents. Along with other concerns, the inability to parking near one's home directly impacts on the desirability and value of our properties. It could also create disadvantages for residents with mobility issues. It does not seem reasonable to impose removing existing parking before replacing them with practical alternatives. If the council believe that these restrictions are necessary solutions such as creating additional parking bays, by making better use of land available for example grass verge in Eileen Gardens.	3.3 & 3.4 3.5 3.6
For nearly a decade, I have utilized the yellow-marked area just past our driveway for parking. This arrangement has never caused an obstruction, and vehicles of all sizes—including emergency services and delivery vehicles—have always maintained completely unimpeded access. Forcing vehicles away from this area will compel my family to park significantly further up Eileen Gardens. Transporting two very young children over an extended distance, alongside work and childcare equipment, introduces unnecessary logistical hardship and, more importantly, elevates roadside safety risks for young minors. The current proposal appears to lack a clear assessment of where displaced vehicles are expected to relocate. By simply removing existing parking spaces without providing an alternative, the council will inevitably force vehicles further up or down an already heavily congested road network. Rather than resolving access issues, this displacement will create severe bottlenecks elsewhere, effectively guaranteeing that waste collection vehicles, delivery drivers, and emergency services will find it impossible to navigate Eileen Gardens or Hillside Drive safely. Rather than enforcing blanket restrictions that penalize residents, I urge the council to consider proactive civil infrastructure solutions to widen the road and increase capacity: Repurposing Grass Verges: I strongly suggest removing the underutilized grass area situated in front of numbers 24 to 34 Eileen Gardens and converting it into formal parking bays. These bays could be allocated to specific house numbers or designated for general public parking to alleviate current congestion.	3.5 3.5 & 3.6 3.3, 3.4, 3.6 & 3.7 3.5 & 3.8
I also work in waste collection, so I understand the importance of ensuring refuse vehicles can access residential streets safely. From my own experience driving large vehicles and getting round the location in question myself many times, I do not believe double yellow lines are necessary along the entire proposed stretch. If there are genuine concerns about access, then I believe they could be addressed by introducing restrictions only on the two curved corners where the bollards are located. Those are the only areas where parking could realistically affect visibility or manoeuvrability.	3.3 & 3.9

The current proposal goes far beyond what is needed and will remove a large amount of essential parking for local residents. There is already a severe shortage of parking in this area, and taking away these spaces without providing any alternative will simply force vehicles onto neighbouring roads. This will make surrounding streets even more congested, increase frustration between neighbours, and create problems that currently do not exist. If the council believes restrictions are required, I would urge you to consider a far more proportionate approach by limiting double yellow lines to the small sections where access is genuinely affected, rather than introducing extensive restrictions that remove valuable parking for residents.	3.4, 3.6 & 3.7 3.3
.....where no. 45 and eight other properties are located. Collectively, the households on our path have two or more vehicles each, and the stretch of road where the proposed double yellow lines are planned is currently the only practical place for many of us to park. Removing the only available on-street parking without providing an alternative will create significant problems for residents. Many households rely on multiple vehicles for work, school runs and other daily commitments, and there is simply nowhere else for us to park. Me and my husband work full time with 3 very young children, removing this parking space would mean us having to walk multiple blocks just to get home. While I understand the council's concerns regarding access for refuse vehicles and emergency services, introducing double yellow lines without first addressing the existing lack of parking is unfair to the residents who live here. If the council believes these restrictions are necessary, then suitable alternative parking must be provided before they are introduced. Possible solutions could include: • Creating designated parking bays on the nearby grass verge where appropriate. • Funding or assisting with the conversion of the pathway serving our homes into an access road, allowing residents to park on their own front gardens. • Exploring any other practical parking solutions that would replace the spaces being removed. Introducing these restrictions without any alternative parking provision will simply move the problem elsewhere and leave residents with nowhere to park.	3.3 & 3.4 3.3, 3.5 & 3.8 3.6
We find that most problems are caused by visitors like delivery drivers, people visiting residents and even care workers. It must also be emphasised that most people living here do not have drives so have no alternative but to park on the road. Whilst I agree that parking on corners is prohibited within the Highway Code the proposed yellow lines are more than that and, in my opinion, go further than that and are including roads that are neither on a bend or on a junction. It takes away at least 6 parking spaces for no logical reason. It can be difficult just looking at a plan but it is clear that it includes an area that is on a road passing by various houses. In summary I object to the proposal on the basis that it is ill conceived and that residents are unable to park anywhere else and therefore, will have no alternative but to park on double yellow lines.	3.10 3.3, 3.4 & 3.5 3.4 & 3.5 3.11

The plan received would potentially get rid of many parking spaces currently available - where are we supposed to park instead? In my experience any issues that have happened in the past have not been caused by residents but my visitors, carers and delivery drivers who do have the understanding that we have and the respect that we show to others. In short, these proposals cannot go ahead as we will have no choice but to park on double yellow lines. Many of us need our cars as we are responsible for the care of others be it children or elderly parents and need to be close to our homes.	3.3, 3.4 & 3.5 3.10 3.11
Parking in these locations occurs because there is simply insufficient off-road and on-street parking available for residents. Many properties, including my own, do not have driveways, leaving residents with very limited alternatives. Residents are not choosing to park in these locations out of convenience; they are doing so because there is often nowhere else available. The proposed restrictions may make access easier for council vehicles and refuse collection services; however, they will further reduce the already limited parking available to residents. As a result, vehicles will be displaced into surrounding streets, increasing competition for parking spaces and potentially creating further tensions within the community. I am concerned that the proposal focuses on restricting parking rather than addressing the underlying issue of inadequate parking provision. Before implementing these restrictions, I would ask the Council to explain what alternative arrangements are being proposed for residents who will lose access to existing parking spaces. In particular, has the Council undertaken a parking capacity assessment to determine where displaced vehicles will park if these restrictions are introduced? If such an assessment has been carried out, I would welcome the opportunity to review the findings. If not, I would question how the wider impact on residents has been properly considered. Furthermore, I am concerned about the consultation process itself. My household did not receive notification of this proposal and only became aware of it because a neighbour in Eileen Gardens shared the information with us. This raises questions as to whether all affected residents have been properly informed and given the opportunity to express their views.	3.3 & 3.5 3.3, 3.4 & 3.6 3.5 & 3.8 3.3, 3.4 & 3.6 3.12
Throughout that time I have never known there to be any ongoing issues with emergency vehicles, refuse collection vehicles or other large vehicles being unable to access our street. There is already a major shortage of parking in this area. Removing more parking spaces without providing any additional parking will simply force residents to park on nearby roads creating congestion across the surrounding streets rather than solving any problem. The parking issue will not disappear it will just be pushed into neighbouring roads creating congestion affecting many more residents. Many families in this area rely on more than one vehicle for work and family commitments. There simply is not enough parking available elsewhere to accommodate everyone. It does not seem reasonable to remove existing parking before putting practical alternatives in place. If the council believes restrictions are required , I would ask that they first explore alternative solutions, such as creating additional parking bays, making better use of available land I.e. grass verge in Eileen Gardens.	3.9 & 3.13 3.3, 3.4, 3.5 & 3.6 3.8

I believe these proposals will have a significant negative impact on the people who live here. Parking is already extremely limited, and removing a large section of the available parking without first providing an alternative will only make an already difficult situation much worse. The issue is not simply that residents who currently park in the affected area will lose spaces. Those vehicles will inevitably be forced onto neighbouring roads, creating congestion throughout the surrounding streets. Residents who currently have no issues finding somewhere to park will also be affected, as the demand for the remaining spaces will increase dramatically.	3.3, 3.4, 3.5 & 3.6
I am also extremely concerned about the impact this proposal could have on the value and future saleability of our home. One of the main reasons we purchased our property was because, although it has no driveway, there was always the ability to park on the road close to the house. Since buying our home, we have invested a significant amount of money renovating and improving it. If these proposals go ahead, there will be little to no parking available anywhere near our property, making it much less practical for both ourselves and any future owners. I believe this could make our home far less attractive to prospective buyers. A property without a driveway and with no reliable nearby parking is understandably much harder to sell, and I am concerned these restrictions could have a serious negative impact on both the marketability and value of our home. It seems unfair that residents could see one of their biggest financial investments negatively affected when practical alternatives have not been properly explored.	3.4
I fully appreciate the need to ensure access for emergency services and refuse collection, but I do not believe removing residents' only practical parking option is the right solution without first addressing the lack of parking provision. If the council considers double yellow lines to be necessary, then suitable alternatives should be put in place beforehand. For example, the council could: * Create designated parking bays on the grass verge where appropriate. * Explore converting unused land into resident parking. * Consider funding or supporting improvements to the pathway serving our homes so residents could park safely on their own properties. * Work with residents to find a practical solution that balances access requirements with the genuine parking needs of the community.	3.5 & 3.8
I also feel that the council should carry out a proper assessment of how many households rely on on-street parking before making a final decision. Many families in this area have multiple vehicles due to work commitments, shift patterns and family responsibilities, and there is simply nowhere else for those vehicles to go.	3.3
Removing parking without replacing it will not solve the problem; it will simply move it onto surrounding roads, creating further congestion and inconvenience for an even greater number of residents. This will affect not only those directly living on the roads where the restrictions are proposed, but also residents on neighbouring streets, as everyone will be competing for the same limited parking spaces.	3.6

I'm writing to support the proposals to introduce 'No Waiting at Any Time' parking restrictions in the Eileen Garden, Hillside Drive & Denise Drive areas.	NA
There is most definitely a need for parking control in this area as confirmed by your Waste Management Team and more recently and more worryingly, by the fact that a fire engine was unable to get past vehicles parked on Eileen Gardens near the junction with Hillside Drive just this week.	NA
Whilst acknowledging the need for the introduction of parking control, I am however concerned that the proposals will only serve to move the accessibility issues away from the junctions with Hillside Drive and Denise Drive to further along Eileen Gardens, between Hillside Drive and Cooks Lane. This stretch of road is already subject to a lot of on-street parking on both sides of Eileen Gardens, with limited legal on-street parking available due to all houses along that stretch having dropped-kerb access. This limited area already suffers from a high volume of cars being parked partially on the footpath. Unfortunately, many of the drivers who park in such a way tend to park almost fully across the footpath, causing pedestrians, including parents with push-chairs, young children on foot and also senior citizens to have to walk into an (at times) busy road, with limited visibility.	3.6 & 3.14
The parking issue is further exacerbated by the fact that some residents of Denise Drive do not have vehicular access, so tend to park on that section of Eileen Gardens on a regular basis. This causes particular problems for users of the walkway from Denise Drive to Eileen Gardens (pathway between 20 & 22 Eileen Gardens) as cars are parked very close to the alleyway, blocking the footpath on Eileen Gardens. With all this in mind, I would welcome your ideas on how you intend to prevent the problem of more motorists parking on both sides of this section of Eileen Gardens and therefore blocking safe access for commercial and emergency vehicles	3.7
As ever, with any implementation of parking restrictions, its success will be very dependent on how well it is enforced. A perfect example of the complete failure of parking restrictions to work exists already in Eileen Gardens. Some while ago double yellow lines were introduced at the junctions of Cooks Lane with Eileen Gardens and Hillside Drive. I am unaware of any enforcement that has taken place at either of these junctions and the parking restrictions are flouted by parents of pupils at Tudor Grange Academy on a daily basis. At these junctions, not only do motorists park on the double yellow lines but they also regularly park fully on the footpath at these junctions, making access and egress both difficult and dangerous and also endangering pedestrians yet again.	3.15
Due to the narrow road and vehicles from surrounding streets parking opposite our drive and other drives it has always been a nightmare getting on and off our driveway. Also, vehicles getting through can be an issue. There are already parking restrictions at the junctions of Eileen , Hillside and cooks lane due to the school collection and drop off times I feel the new parking restrictions will cause pinch points between the new restriction and the ones already in place. I think it will still cause issues with service vehicles getting through.	NA NA 3.7

Officer Comments/Responses

- 3.3. The introduction of waiting restrictions at this location will result in the loss of some on- street parking places. However, in accordance with the Highway Code, motorists should not be parking in this area as it is located at junctions and on a bend which results in a hazard being created for other road users.
- 3.4. The concerns raised are noted. However 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, where it does not cause an obstruction or contravene any restrictions, is generally accepted, it cannot be relied on as a dedicated source of parking for properties without adequate parking provision.
- 3.5. It is not the Council's responsibility to provide owners of private motor vehicles with a parking space on the public highway. If a resident wishes to own a vehicle, then they are responsible for parking it safely, and in accordance with the Highway Code's advice.
- 3.6. It is acknowledged that the proposals as set out may result in some displacement parking. The proposals will, however, discourage obstructive parking at critical locations, which should aid the flow of traffic, reduce congestion and improve access for waste collection and emergency vehicles by discouraging obstructive parking.
- 3.7. The situation will be monitored and if necessary, further action taken to mitigate any issues.
- 3.8. Providing physical measures, such as carriageway widening or the conversion of grass verges to parking areas, is outside the scope of these proposals.
- 3.9. As stated in the consultation documentation, the original request originated from our Waste Management Team, who have been unable to carry out waste collection duties on several occasions due to obstructive parking.
- 3.10. The type of road user is not material to this proposal, as any vehicle parked at this location has the potential to obstruct access.
- 3.11. Vehicles parked in contravention of a waiting restriction may be issued with a Penalty Charge Notice (PCN).
- 3.12. The consultation was undertaken in line with the statutory legal process.
- 3.13. We have been informed that on 7 July 2026 a fire vehicle was unable to proceed through this location due to obstructive parking, requiring officers to make enquiries at nearby properties to identify the owner of the obstructing vehicle.
- 3.14. The Government has recently published the results of their pavement parking consultation, which could see local authorities given additional Civil Parking Enforcement powers to issue PCNs for "unnecessary obstruction" of pavements without a specific TRO (Traffic Regulation Order), but this will require secondary legislation and at present no timeline for this has been published. With that in mind, obstructive and footway parking outside of restricted areas remains the responsibility of West Midlands Police and they can be contacted on the non-emergency 101 telephone number, or it may be reported using the West Midlands Police website.
- 3.15. Enforcement is carried out in line with our commitments across the whole borough. If the proposals are subsequently implemented there will be a period of proactive enforcement activity aimed at improving compliance with the new restrictions.

Ward Members' Views

- 3.16. The Ward Members for Fordbridge were informed of the proposals. No representations were received.

Officer Recommendation

- 3.17. The representations received have been fully considered and responded to within Section 3 of this report.
- 3.18. The principal concerns raised relate to the loss of on-street parking and the potential displacement of vehicles to surrounding roads. Whilst these concerns are acknowledged, the evidence received from the Council's Waste Management Team and the reported obstruction of a fire vehicle demonstrate that parking at this location is adversely affecting access and highway operation. The proposed restrictions are therefore considered necessary and proportionate in the interests of highway safety and access.
- 3.19. It is recommended that the proposed Traffic Regulation Order be implemented as advertised.

Democratic Services

- 3.20. 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

- 3.21. 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.
- 3.22. 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

- 3.23. The Head of Highways is asked to approve that the Traffic Regulation Order as detailed on the plan 9807 in appendix A is implemented.

The recommendation as set out above is hereby approved:



Signature: **Date:** 21/07/2026

Dean Ward
Head of Highways