

Meeting date: 17 March 2021
Report to: Cabinet Member for Environment & Highways
Subject/report title: **PETITION SUMMARY**
Report from: Head of Highway Management
Report author/lead contact officer: Paul Tovey
Tel: 0121 704 6479
Email: ptovey@solihull.gov.uk



Wards affected:

- All Wards | Bickenhill | Blythe | Castle Bromwich | Chelmsley Wood |
 Dorridge/Hockley Heath | Elmdon | Kingshurst/Fordbridge | Knowle |
 Lyndon | Meriden | Olton | Shirley East | Shirley South |
 Shirley West | Silhill | Smith's Wood | St Alphege

Public/private report: Public

Exempt by virtue of paragraph: N/A

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To provide an update on two petitions received for the Environment and Highways portfolio, and where appropriate, agree the associated recommendations.

2. Decision(s) recommended

- 2.1 The Cabinet Member is asked to:

- (a) Note the petitions received and the proposed programme for investigating and responding to them as detailed in Appendix 1
- (b) Agree to refer both petitions to be considered in accordance with the statutory Traffic Regulation Order process and the Council's Scheme of Delegated Authority to the Head of Highway Management.

3. Matters for Consideration – Petitions 1 & 2, Request to stop the implementation of a Traffic Regulation Order outside house numbers 64-80 Arbury Hall Road / Request to stop the implementation of a Traffic Regulation Order on the Meadow Close side of Swallows Meadow

- 3.1 On 23 January 2021, Howard Nichols submitted a petition on behalf of residents of

Meadow Close objecting to the implementation of a Traffic Regulation Order on the Meadow Close side of Swallows Meadow.

3.2 On 24 January 2021 Mr Nichols submitted a petition on behalf of residents of Arbury Hall Road objecting to the implementation of a Traffic Regulation Order outside house numbers 64-80 Arbury Hall Road.

3.3 These petitions were generated in response to the statutory Traffic Regulation Order consultation process as part of a wider set of proposals for the Cranmore area, as shown in Appendix 1. The objective of the parking restrictions is to help manage the impact of all-day parking in this residential area, which is adjacent to the A34 Stratford Road.

4. What options have been considered and what is the evidence telling us about them?

4.1 In accordance with the Council's scheme of officer delegated powers, the responsibility for considering representations received in respect of proposed Traffic Regulation Orders sits with the Head of Highway Management.

4.2 This scheme was identified and prioritised as part of the 2019/20 Traffic Regulation Order prioritisation process. After consultation with Ward Members, who helped develop the set of proposals, the parking restrictions were formally advertised on the 7th January. At the time of drafting the report, a total of 17 representations had been received in addition to these two petitions.

4.3 It is therefore recommended that both petitions are referred to and be considered as part of the overall representations procedure to ensure all of the views received are considered at the same time.

5. Reasons for recommending preferred option

5.1 Following a number of complaints concerning the length of time it took to progress certain requests for parking restrictions to be introduced, in some cases over 12 months, a review was undertaken in 2013 to help streamline the process under the overarching guidance as set out in the Department for Transport's regulations.

5.2 The review included a Lean process review, carried out by officers, and oversight by Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Board. As a result, the Council's Scheme of Officer Delegation was amended and the authority to advertise and implement such Traffic Regulation Orders was delegated to the Head of Highway Management.

5.3 It is therefore recommended that these two petitions and any future petitions received in response to advertised Traffic Regulation Order proposals, should be managed and responded to via the Traffic Regulation Order process. A reference to any such petitions received can also be included in the regular summary reports, as set out in Appendix 2, to provide the Cabinet Member with an oversight of the number of petitions being received.

6. Implications and Considerations

6.1 State how the proposals in this report contribute to the priorities in the [Council Plan](#):

Priority:	Contribution:
<p>Economy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revitalising our towns and local centres. 2. UK Central (UKC) and maximising the opportunities of HS2. 3. Increase the supply of housing, especially affordable and social housing. 	<p>The Council's priorities have been taken into consideration when making the recommendations contained within this report. It is considered that there are no direct implications as a result of the recommendations of this report.</p>
<p>Environment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Enhance Solihull's natural environment. 5. Improve Solihull's air quality. 6. Reduce Solihull's net carbon emissions. 	<p>The Council's priorities have been taken into consideration when making the recommendations contained within this report and there are no significant environmental implications.</p>
<p>People and Communities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Take action to improve life chances in our most disadvantaged communities. 8. Enable communities to thrive. 9. Sustainable, quality, affordable provision for adults & children with complex needs. 	<p>Safety and accessibility is at the heart of everything the Council does when considering making changes to how the public highway operates. This includes the safety of children, young people and our most vulnerable road user groups.</p> <p>The views received from residents will be taken into consideration through the formal Traffic Regulation Order representation process.</p>

6.2 Consultation and Scrutiny:

6.2.1 The matters arising from these petitions have not been subject to review by any of the Council's Scrutiny Boards. With any proposed changes the associated statutory consultation process will be followed.

6.3 Financial implications:

6.3.1 The cost associated with managing the petition will be funded from the Highway Management staff revenue budget and any costs associated with the parking restriction scheme mentioned in the petition will be managed through the associated capital works allocation.

6.3.2 There are no significant financial implications associated with this report.

6.4 Legal implications:

- 6.4.1 None as a consequence of this report. The associated statutory Traffic Regulation Order consultation process is being followed, which provides opportunity for public and stakeholder consultation and a mechanism to appeal to the Secretary of State for Transport should anyone consider the Council has not followed the correct legal process.

6.5 Risk implications:

- 6.5.1 The Corporate Risk Management Approach has been complied with to identify and assess the significant risk associated with this decision/project. This includes (but is not limited to), financial, 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.

However, based on the information provided, no significant risks have been identified.

6.6 Equality implications:

- 6.6.1 None as a consequence of this report.

7. List of appendices referred to

- 7.1 Cranmore area Traffic Regulation Order Plan – Appendix 1.
7.2 Petition Update March 2021 - Appendix 2.

8. Background papers used to compile this report

- 8.1 None.

9. List of other relevant documents

- 9.1 None.