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1. Purpose of Report

(i) To provide the information and findings of the ETRO consultation that trialled the amendment to the parking restrictions on parts of Queens Road, Eldorado Road and Christchurch Road to:
   - 8am Monday – Friday 8pm (24 hours) Permit holders (Z14); or Voucher parking (Max stay 12 hours, no return within 10 hours);

(ii) To detail the representations made during the statutory 6 month consultation period between 3rd September 2018 - 2nd March 2019 (and any others received outside of that 6 month period); and

(iii) To make a recommendation on whether the Council should proceed to make the ETRO permanent.

2. Recommendation

It is recommended that, for the reasons given in this report and after consideration of the consultation responses and relevant data gathered, that the Council make the ETRO permanent.

3. Background and Purpose of the Scheme

The Railway Zone 14 permit scheme (Z14) was implemented in West Cheltenham in August 2017. Throughout the consultation on Z14, the Council (GCC) had continued engagement with Great Western Railway (GWR) as a key stakeholder. The discussions outlined how the wider Z14 permit scheme would remove the all-day commuter parking from the roads surrounding Cheltenham Railway Station (CRS). This was supported by GWR who shared plans for their car park expansion works.

Following the implementation of Z14, GCC and GWR continued to discuss the planned car park extension works and to establish the level of demand for longer stay parking in the immediate vicinity of CRS. To mitigate the disruption from the construction and full/partial closure of the station car park, it was agreed that GCC would look to off-set the loss of all-day car parking spaces at CRS, within the recently created Z14 by way of an experimental traffic order (ETRO). This ETRO also aimed to establish the demand for longer stay parking in the immediate vicinity of CRS. This scheme adheres to LTP objectives of encouraging more sustainable transport usage throughout the county and improving access to modes of public transport.

The shared use bays; permit holder and limited waiting four hours restriction in Z14, meant that all day parking was not available to non-residents such as rail commuters. GCC proposed to vary the parking restrictions on three roads within Z14, to introduce permit holders or voucher parking only shared bays through an ETRO, which meant that non permit holders could park for up 12 hours with no return within ten hours, Monday to Friday.

The GWR construction plan outlined the suspension of approximately 70 spaces in September 2018. The ETRO allocated approximately 100 vehicle spaces (less than 10% of the approximate 1400 spaces in Zone 14) to allow for long stay parking near CRS.

As a result, the parking restrictions on parts of Queens Road, Eldorado Road and Christchurch Road were altered experimentally to introduce:

- 8am Monday – Friday 8pm (24 hours) Permit holders (Z14) or voucher parking (Max stay 12 hours, no return within 10 hours).

The experimental arrangement meant that residents still needed a permit to park in the parts of road covered by the ETRO for periods longer than 12 hours and also within all other permit areas within Z14.
The ETRO meant that virtual vouchers could be activated (by text or via the MiPermit app) for non-residents parking for up to 12 hours, in the three specified roads.

Monitoring

Throughout the ETRO, GCC have been able to monitor the usage of the vouchers, the PCNs issued and the Permits purchased and activated. This has shown that the number of daily (Free) vouchers activated has risen from 16 in September 2018 to 100 by September 2019. The steady increase in demand, shown below reflects the fact that car park works have taken longer than planned and commuters have had to cope with a much-reduced car park during the construction works. On occasions demand has dipped, during key events such as the summer holiday period and the March races, when commuters tend to avoid travelling. The partial closure of the CRS car park has not always suspended the total number of parking spaces originally anticipated; therefore the steady increase in voucher uptake suggests that a certain amount of demand will remain for longer stay parking in this area in the future.

To manage the impact of the trial on local residents the Council has monitored and enforced the new parking rules. A total of 812 PCNs (fines) were issued over the 16 month ETRO monitoring period (Sep 2018 – Jan 2020) in the three roads. With the split by road being, 246 Eldorado Road; 255 Queens Road and 311 Christchurch Road. There is a higher than average figure for Eldorado Road, given it accounted for only approximately 20% of the voucher bays.

Monitoring has shown that the voucher take up has been consistently used in all locations. With the wider Zone 14 permit uptake maintaining a consistent level (25% average) take up over the same period.

The monitoring results suggests there is turnover and occupancy of the voucher spaces, indicating that a demand exists, during the ETRO period. This demand is expected to continue following completion of the car park as the CRS continues to increase its operational capacity. Coupled with this, the fact the voucher spaces account for less than 10% of the Zone 14 capacity, confirms that there is no impact on the wider zone access, to justify abandoning the ETRO. Based on permit uptake for the entirety of zone 14 being approximately 25%, this illustrates that there remains ample on street provision.

Law and Policy

Section 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 sets out the legal basis for making ETROs. The specific section of the Act which the County Council used for the implementation of the ETRO is Section 1:

(c) for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians),

(d) for preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property,

(f) for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs.
Thorough consideration has been given to the factors set out in Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 in proposing this ETRO. This requires the local authority to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic (including pedestrians). In carrying out this exercise the County Council must have regard to:

(d) The importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles.

Any changes were made in accordance with the Local Authorities’ Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. Under this procedure, local authorities are expected to consult local community groups and the Police together with other organisations listed where appropriate, such as the other emergency services and transport operators.

Traffic Authorities have the flexibility to implement restrictions that are appropriate for an individual road, reflecting safety and road user needs whilst taking into account all local considerations.

ETROs can only run for a maximum of 18 months, no matter how many times they are amended. This particular ETRO expires on 3rd March 2020 so a decision is required before that date to either abandon the ETRO or make it permanent. A permanent Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) would need to be in exactly the same format as the last advertised version of the ETRO, based on the legislation and regulations.

Thorough consideration has also been given to the County Council’s duties under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. A copy of the Statement of Due Regard is included in Appendix A.

4. Proposals

The Experimental Traffic Regulation Order amends the parking restrictions experimentally on parts of Queens Road, Eldorado Road and Christchurch Road, all within Railway Zone 14 permit scheme, to the following:

- 8am Monday – Friday 8pm (24 hours) Permit holders (Z14) or voucher parking (Max stay 12 hours, no return within 10 hours).

5. Consultation

As this TRO is Experimental, consultation is carried out once the ETRO is in place. In opposition to this, a permanent Traffic Regulation Order is proposed as a design or plan and then consulted upon before deciding whether to implement the scheme. Therefore, formal statutory consultation was carried out in accordance with The Local Authorities’ Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 (REG 96), from the 3rd September 2018 to the 2nd March 2019. This included consultation with the Police, emergency services, Road Haulage Association and Freight Transport Association as well as the local County Councillor, local borough councillors and Gloucestershire County Council’s standard consultees. Notices were placed in the local newspaper, on site and on the GCC website, as well as being placed on deposit at the Gloucestershire County Council offices, Shire Hall, Gloucester; Cheltenham Borough Council, Municipal Offices and Cheltenham Library, Clarence Street, Cheltenham

No representations were received from statutory consultees during the ETRO statutory 6 month consultation period.

Please see Appendix B for a copy of the formal notice.

Responses during the consultation have been closely monitored. All responses both in support for the scheme and objecting to the scheme have been recorded as part of the ETRO even if they were received after the statutory 6 month consultation period, with the next section summarising the representations made along with the County Council’s response. General comments, that were deemed as neither support nor an objection were also closely recorded and considered.

6. Representations of Support, Objection and Enquiry

A total of 71 representations were gathered during the consultation period, 7 of which were received after the statutory 6 month consultation period but still taken into consideration as part of this report. After the 71 representations were collated and duplicates filtered, it was found that there were 38 representations from individuals. Of these, 9 were general enquiries, 1 was in support and 28 were objecting to the proposed
changes. The Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) also received and responded to a complaint from one local resident. They closed their investigation after finding no fault in the Council’s actions.

The responses to the representations are detailed in Table 7-1 and the LGOs response detailed in Table 6-2 below. Representations are categorised by theme. It is important to note that some respondents made comments regarding several themes via one or multiple submissions, so the totals given below are not indicative of the total number of representations mentioned above.

**Table 6-1 Consultation Comments and Council Response**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Total by Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents objected to the fact that they are required to pay for permits to park on their street when commuters can park for up to 12 hours for free in the same spaces. They felt that resident permits should be free as well.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response from the County Council**

The proposed scheme will secure suitable and adequate parking provision in the neighbourhood for local residents and businesses.

The ETRO has been implemented, on a small area of the zone affecting three out of the eighteen roads within the wider Z14 area. Permits and visitor vouchers can therefore be utilised as normal in all other roads.

The 12 hour vouchers in the three roads within Z14 where the ETRO has been implemented are open to anyone who wishes to apply (Visitors, commuters, etc.). The 12 hour with no return period is designed to stop people parking through the day and then overnight. Permit holders can continue to use the bays for any period of time, as per the current regulations.

Please note that GCC recognised that annual permits within zone 14 were renewed on August 2018 due to the Zone 14 being implemented in August 2017. The ETRO came into effect on September 2018. Although this was by no means a deliberate act by GCC in terms of timeframes, it was felt that GCC would identify permit holders that purchased an annual permit in August 2018, prior to the ETRO commencement and offer them a refund of the remaining year along with immediate termination of their permit if they so wished. We identified 16 properties that met the criteria set by GCC for a refund. Only one individual asked for this to be carried out, and it was in a timely manner. We received no further responses to this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Total by Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commuters increase competition for parking, sometimes making it difficult for residents to park in their own streets, and also impacting access to clubs/meeting for the elderly/those with mobility impairments.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response from the County Council**

The ETRO has been implemented on a small area of the zone affecting three out of the eighteen roads within the wider Z14 area. Resident’s permits remain valid across the whole of Z14. The bay markings and linings were not changed as part of this ETRO, as they had already been implemented as part of the whole Zone 14 scheme. The only change to any selected bays was to the restrictions (by signage), therefore, the placement of the bays had already been considered appropriate for parking restrictions.

When selecting the areas for the ETRO, previous parking study results were taken into account in order to maintain spaces for residents. Previous parking studies have shown that there are available parking spaces for commuters on the roads allocated as part of the ETRO. Voucher spaces account for less than 10% of the Zone 14 capacity, and the ETRO voucher system is designed to manage and monitor usage. The 12 hour limited waiting with no return period is designed to stop people parking through the day and then overnight. Permit holders can continue to use the bays for any period of time, as per the current regulations.

The selected bays for the ETRO were positioned in roads where the existing Zone 14 restrictions could operate along with the allocated spaces for the ETRO, to minimise displacement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Total by Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concerns were raised around enforcement of the voucher bays and that they could be</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
misused for this reason.

Response from the County Council

The ETRO bays are fully enforceable and compliant with all relevant legislation, regulations and guidance. Patrol and Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) issue data can be shared evidencing this. Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) are issued with an approved handheld device to see whether a vehicle is parked correctly and adhering to the restrictions. GCC currently have an enforcement contract in place with APCOA who enforce on the county council’s behalf. The contract has the ability and flexibility for CEOs to patrol at all hours across 364 days a year (excluding Christmas Day). Patrols continue to take place throughout the morning and in to the evening.

Response from the County Council

The 12 hour vouchers in the three roads within Z14 where the ETRO has been implemented are open to anyone who wishes to apply, including visitors. When visiting a household in Z14, visitors can still apply for the 24hr visitor voucher. Households are entitled to 50 of these per a year.

Response from the County Council

This ETRO is located within a wider permit zone, Zone 14. Permit holders can park throughout the entire zone with a valid permit. The streets identified to be included in the ETRO were determined by utilising evidence that there is parking availability in the ETRO streets as evidenced by previous monitoring of the area. The roads are wide enough to safely accommodate parked vehicles which will not impede traffic flow in the area or cause safety concern for all road users, including pedestrians. The selected bays for the ETRO were then positioned in roads where the existing Zone 14 restrictions could operate along with the allocated spaces for the ETRO, to minimise displacement.

On reflection, GCC feel that the ETRO bays are proposed at sensible locations that are safe, accommodate demand and also promote the County Council’s strategy, as stated in the Local Transport Plan (LTP) to encourage more sustainable means of travel throughout the county.

Response from the County Council

As this is an ETRO, a different process is undertaken regarding consultation compared to permanent TROs. An ETRO comes into place one week after notice is given, and a 6 month consultation period commences from when the ETRO becomes active. However, changes can be made to the order in response to concerns raised at any point whilst the ETRO remains active (max 18 months).

All comments received to date have been duly considered and responded to. All relevant information, including how and where to comment to, remains on the GCC website, and are available on deposit at Gloucestershire County Council Shire Hall offices and also at Cheltenham Borough Council Offices and Cheltenham Library during the life of the ETRO. Although the statutory 6 month consultation period ended in March 2019, any comments received after that date were still considered and covered in this report.

Response from the County Council

A number of complaints were raised about the consultation process, mostly around the lack of notice given as the consultation period started once the ETRO had been put in place.

Response from the County Council

Three residents raised concerns that the change in regulations including the associated signing and lining could impact the value of their properties.
Response from the County Council

The fact the voucher spaces account for less than 10% of the Zone 14 capacity is seen as proportionate. The permit and visitor vouchers within the Z14 area are still valid and operational across the wider zone. All properties within the zone are eligible for a maximum of two permits per household or Business. Additionally, residential properties are eligible for 50 visitor vouchers per year.

The 12 hour with no return period is designed to stop people parking through the day and then overnight. Enforcement will be monitoring the use of the ETRO vouchers to target enforcement and monitor the situation.

Due to legislation constraints, any restrictions are only enforceable with the correct signs and lines as prescribed in TSRGD 2016. As part of the ETRO, no lineage was included as that was already implemented as part of the wider Zone 14 scheme. All signage, for the ETRO scheme is compliant with TSRGD 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Total by Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One resident raised concerns that the change in regulations could lead to the introduction of pay &amp; display parking.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response from the County Council

Feedback will be considered and no other alterations are planned imminently.

Table 6-2 Complaint to Ombudsman and Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point of complaint 1</th>
<th>Response from Ombudsman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questioned why the Council chose an ETRO.</td>
<td>The Council has explained that it chose to use an ETRO because a TRO is a permanent change and only allows for roads to be closed or restricted. As the impact during the various stages of works at the station car park was unknown, an ETRO allowed flexibility to make changes such as restricting the duration of parking, if needed, during the process. I see no fault here. The Council has given a clear and logical rationale for the choice of an ETRO and that was a matter for the Council to decide.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point of complaint 2</th>
<th>Response from Ombudsman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The change in parking arrangements has been agreed to the benefit of the car park operator but to the detriment of residents.</td>
<td>Under section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the Council has a duty to provide “suitable and adequate” parking facilities on the highway. As some users of the station car park would likely be displaced by the temporary reduction in spaces in the car park, it was entirely appropriate for the Council to consider what steps were appropriate to accommodate motorists displaced by the works.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point of complaint 3</th>
<th>Response from Ombudsman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Council has not properly taken residents’ views into consideration.</td>
<td>There was no requirement to undertake prior consultation for an ETRO. However, the Council met residents in response to their concerns. The Council has explained that the first six months of the ETRO was classed as the objection period, and anyone could make representations as to its indefinite continuation. It says it responded to all representations received in this six-month period. Most related to the loss of parking bays and the fact that the new 12-hour parking would be free, while residents would have to pay for 24-hour parking. The Council says that, although the original objection period has expired, all relevant information,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
including how and where to make a representation, remains on its website, at its offices, those of the Borough Council, and at the local library.

I see no fault here. The Council has considered representations. It has not yet reached a final decision and has stated that it will still consider any further representations received prior to a final decision being made.

**Point of complaint 4**

Does not consider that the Council took proper account of the impact on residents when introducing the ETRO.

**Response from Ombudsman**

The Council has explained that, when introducing the ETRO, officers considered the following:  
- There are more than 1,400 parking places within the CPZ.  
- Residents’ permits take-up for this CPZ is significantly lower than in other CPZs, implying that there was spare on-street capacity.  
- The re-allocation of up to 100 on-street parking places represents fewer than 10% of the total available parking places within the CPZ.  
- The CPZ roads were assessed based on width, the ratio of off-street parking provision and proximity to local amenities.  
- The roads selected were within a reasonable walking distance of the station, where existing permit holder restrictions could operate alongside the free 12-hour voucher parking to minimise displacement.  
- The introduction of the 12-hour parking vouchers is offset by the removal of the four-hour unrestricted parking.  
- Each road selected is next to a road not selected for the ETRO, so any resident permit holders displaced should be able to park in nearby roads.  
- All the roads in the ETRO should be within the same CPZ to avoid confusion.

I appreciate that the individual may disagree with the Council’s choice of roads for the order, but it has provided a clear rationale as to how it reached that decision. I see no fault in how it has done so, so it is not for the Ombudsman to question the merits of that decision.

**Point of complaint 5**

The Council should have considered alternative arrangements which would have had less impact on residents. Says that a road close to the station is to be let on a long lease to allow teachers to park. Says this could have been opened up temporarily, and all the additional parking accommodated.

**Response from Ombudsman**

The Council has explained that the gated road in question is not a highway maintainable at public expense so there is little scope for it to use this. The use of the road is a matter for the Borough Council to decide.

**Point of complaint 6**

Complains that anyone can use the vouchers, not just commuters. Says that local contractors are parking there and abusing the scheme. Says that the operator manages the issue of vouchers and the Council could have made it a condition that vouchers only are issued to motorists with rail tickets.

**Response from Ombudsman**

There is no requirement to have a rail ticket to park in the station car park, so it is not clear what grounds there would be to restrict the issue of vouchers on that basis. Besides, this approach would likely prove more costly and time-consuming to administer. It was for the Council to decide what changes to make to the ETRO. It may in any event amend the order, if needed. I see no fault here.

**Point of complaint 7**

Says that part of the car park site was cleared in autumn 2018 but there was then a long delay before any significant works took place. Considers that the Council should have set a strict time limit for the works to be carried out so as not to inconvenience residents unnecessarily.

**Response from Ombudsman**

The Council’s role in these matters is to take reasonable steps to ensure that there is adequate on-street parking for displaced commuters and other car park users while the car park’s capacity is reduced. I do not consider that it was for the Council to seek to impose a timetable on the works, when the
development of the site is not a matter within its control. Moreover, this would be of little benefit if works overran because parking provision would still be needed. The Council is in any event able to vary the order if the impact on residents is felt to be excessive. I see no fault here.

### Point of complaint 8

Complains that the Civil Enforcement Officers’ (CEOs) shifts do not allow them to enforce the 12-hour parking restrictions.

#### Response from Ombudsman

The Council has explained that the parking places are fully enforceable and compliant with legislation, regulations and guidance. All permits and vouchers are virtual and CEOs are issued with a hand-held device which enables them to see whether a vehicle is parked correctly and adhering to restrictions. The Council’s contract with its enforcement company allows for CEOs to patrol at all hours across 363 days of the year (excluding Christmas Day and Easter Sunday).

The Council has provided evidence of regular patrols with the earliest from around 8.00am and the latest around 8.30pm and showing that PCNs have been issued to non-compliant vehicles. These patrols will enable the CEOs to establish that there is a 12-hour voucher valid at the time of the visit. However, I consider that the absence of patrols between 8.30pm and 8.00am means that, in many cases, CEOs may not be able to establish whether vehicles have overstayed the 12-hour period or returned within 10 hours of a previous visit.

That said, it seems likely that most visitors will be either commuters and / or will park during the day, rather than leaving vehicles overnight. So, unless there is a problem with parking bays being occupied overnight and unavailable to residents, it is not clear to me that it would be a good use of resources to undertake parking enforcement when there are no significant parking pressures.

### Point of complaint 9

Complains that the changes have put considerable pressure on parking in the ETRO area and adversely affected those wanting to visit friends, relatives or businesses.

#### Response from Ombudsman

The Council has reviewed the number of 12-hour vouchers being issued in the ETRO area. The statistics provided show that of the approximately 100 places available, typically around 50 to 70 were occupied at some stage in the day by those using 12-hour vouchers once the scheme was established.

The Council also ran a report in May 2019 which showed that 394 residents’ permits were active that day (though there may also have been business and visitors permits in use), compared with 1,400 bays across the whole CPZ. Lastly, the Council has noted that double the number of visitors’ vouchers have been activated across the whole CPZ since the ETRO has been in place, which suggests that there is available parking.

The statistics that the Council has provided suggest that the resident is correct to say that the introduction of 12-hour vouchers has increased the pressure on parking in the streets involved (though these statistics may also include friends and family visiting residents). However, an increase in parking is to be expected, given that the ETRO was intended to provide longer-term parking close to the station.

The statistics (although a one-day snapshot) also suggest that there is capacity within the wider CPZ for resident permit holders to park.

It will be for the Council to decide what next steps to take in respect of the ETRO having regard to its use and any objections or representations received.

### Point of complaint 10

Complains that the Council treated residents unfairly by introducing the free parking scheme shortly after residents had paid to renew their permits.

#### Response from Ombudsman

The Council has explained that the timing of the introduction soon after residents renewed their permits in August 2018 was not deliberate. However, it recognised that this might appear unfair and identified the 16 properties that had renewed before the ETRO came into effect. All residents were offered a refund, and only one of the 16 accepted.

I see no fault here. I see no grounds to suggest that the timing was intended to disadvantage residents and the Council has in any event taken action to address any perceived injustice.
7. Due Regard
The County Council has considered due regard to the three aims of the general equality duty under the Equalities Act 2010 in relation to the nine groups with protected characteristics and considers that the scheme does not adversely affect any of the groups with those protected characteristics.
The full due regard statement is contained in Appendix A.

8. Summary
The information provided within this report supports the position on which the County Council can base a decision on.
The council has demonstrated a consistent approach to addressing the concerns of all those in the affected area, and considers the responses given address the concerns raised.

9. View of the Case Officer
This report demonstrates that the introduction of the ETRO has been fully consulted upon in accordance with Gloucestershire County Council procedures and followed necessary statutory procedures as set in the Local Authorities’ Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England & Wales) Regulation 1996.
It is therefore recommended the ETRO is made permanent in the same format as it was last advertised.
Furthermore, the following recommendations are made:

- When the Cheltenham Railway Station Car Park fully reopens, GCC will continue to review the use of these bays and the outlying areas of this scheme and will consider if any further amendments are required. If changes are proposed then a separate consultation process will be carried out, which will involve stakeholders and local residents.
- GCC have received comments regarding parking concerns from residents of Kensington Avenue. These concerns will be fully considered if amendments are made to the area, as stated above.

10. Recommendations by Senior Case Officer (Gloucestershire County Council)

- I am satisfied that the proposed ETRO has been correctly advertised in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the procedures laid down in that Act.
- The necessary statutory procedures as set out in the Local Authorities’ Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England & Wales) Regulation 1996 have been followed, and guidance, including the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 have been considered.
- After considering all of the points raised from the consultation, I am satisfied that all points have been answered and all clarifications have been completed.
- After considering all of the available data, I am satisfied that there is a demand for longer stay on street parking in the immediate area surrounding Cheltenham Railway Station and that this demand will continue once the car park developments have been completed. I am also satisfied that there is ample permit holder capacity within Zone 14.
- I note that Great Western Rail have been consulted with throughout this process and that GCC will continue to collaborate with them following this scheme being made permanent.
- After considering all the representations in this report I recommend that the ETRO is made permanent under delegated authority. I further recommend that there is no requirement to take this decision to a Traffic Regulation Committee.
- The scheme’s Statement of Reason and Due Regard statement have been reviewed and updated throughout the scheme period and I am satisfied that the scheme supports Local Transport Plan objectives whilst not adversely affecting and groups with protected characteristics, covered under the Equalities Act 2010.
11. Decision by Parking Manager (Gloucestershire County Council)

I have considered the report and your recommendations. I have also considered all of the representations that we have received in relation to this matter along with supporting data, and whether it is necessary to refer the schemes to the Traffic Regulation Committee. Under delegated authority I authorise the Head of Legal Services to proceed as follows:

- Confirm the ETRO by making its effect on a permanent basis as advertised.

Signed:

Date: 14.02.2020

Name and Title of Officer:

Alexis Newport, Parking Manager, Network & Traffic Management, Gloucestershire County Council
Appendices:

A  Due Regard Statement
B  ETRO Documents