

Traffic Regulation Order Report:

Proposed Waiting Restrictions: Various Roads, South Cerney, Gloucestershire.

Version 1 – February 2026

Revision	Description	Author
1	First Issue	LO

Contents

1. Purpose of Report.....	3
2. Recommendation.....	3
3. Background and Purpose of the Scheme	3
4. Law and Policy	3
5. Traffic Data	4
6. Consultation on the proposed TROs.....	4
7. Objections/Support.....	5
8. Details of Representations and Case Officers Response.....	5
9. Equality Impact Assessment.....	7
10. Summary.....	7
11. View of the Case Officer.....	8
12. Recommendation by the Senior Case Officer	8
13. Decision by the Traffic Regulation Order Manager	9
Appendices.....	10

Traffic Regulation Order Title:

GLOUCESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL ON STREET PARKING ORDER 2017 (VARIOUS ROADS, SOUTH CERNEY) (COTSWOLD DISTRICT) (VARIATION) ORDER 2025

Case Officer: Lewis Oxenham, Traffic Engineer, ADL Traffic & Highways Engineering Ltd.

Senior Case Officer: Tom Hayward, Director, ADL Traffic & Highways Engineering Ltd.

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1. To provide background information on the proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) entitled above.
- 1.2. To provide details of representations made in relation to the TRO. A copy of the representations received is included in the appendices at the end of this report.
- 1.3. To make a recommendation to the Traffic Regulation Order Manager on the way forward.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1. That, for the reasons given in this report and after consideration of the representations made, GCC now:
 - Makes the order as advertised in January/February 2026.

3. Background and Purpose of the Scheme

- 3.1. It is proposed to introduce No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Lines) on various roads in South Cerney and No Waiting Mon-Fri 8am-6pm (Single Yellow Line) restrictions on Broadway Lane.
- 3.2. Concerns have been raised by the County Councillor and the Parish Council regarding inappropriate parking within the vicinity of junctions and accesses, as well as where it causes severe visibility issues for road users and pedestrians. The restrictions have been proposed in order to prevent inconsiderate and inappropriate parking, double parking, parking close to junctions where it causes obstructions for vehicles (including emergency service vehicles) and cyclists, as well as where it affects pedestrian sight lines. The proposals also supplement Rule 243 of the Highway Code, which stipulates that parking within 10 metres of or opposite a junction is prohibited.

4. Law and Policy

- 4.1. The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 sets out the legal basis for making TROs. The proposal meets with Section 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 which allows GCC to make an order to:
 - avoid danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising,
 - for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians); and
 - for preserving and improving the amenity of the area through which the road runs.

- 4.2. Thorough consideration has been given to the factors set out in Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 in proposing this TRO. This requires the local authority to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic (including pedestrians). In carrying out this exercise GCC must have regard to the:
- a) Desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises.
 - b) The effect on the amenities of any locality effected and (without prejudice to the generality of this paragraph) the importance of regulating and restricting the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles, so as to preserve or improve the amenities of the areas through which the road(s) run.
 - c) The strategy prepared under Section 80 of the Environment Act 1995 (the national air quality strategy).
 - 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.
 - e) Any other matters appearing to the local authority to be relevant.
- 4.3. Any changes are made in accordance with the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. Under this procedure 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.
- 4.4. GCC is required to advertise the draft TRO it intends to make, to allow a period for representations of support or objection to be submitted. After this consultation, GCC must consider any representations received and having done so, to either:
- a) Resolve to make a TRO in the form originally intended and advertised; or
 - b) Modify the TRO from the originally advertised and re-consult where necessary; or
 - c) Abandon the proposal altogether.
- 4.5. Significant modifications to the proposed TRO would need to be consulted on with those that maybe affected to provide further opportunity for representations to be made.
- 4.6. 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.

5. Traffic Data

- 5.1. Site observations during a site assessment were made by the Case Officer when considering the parking proposal, prior to the TRO process being started. Careful consideration was given to the design of the proposed waiting restrictions, in order to achieve the most appropriate scheme based on the parking situation observed at the time.

6. Consultation on the proposed TRO

- 6.1. Residents and businesses directly affected by the proposals were consulted over a four-week period from 25th June 2025 to 23rd July 2025. A letter and plan were posted directly to properties which explained the proposals and the reasoning behind them. Consultees were able to respond via email or post. A copy of these letters can be found in Appendix A.
- 6.2. In response to the comments received during the resident's consultation, additional lengths of No Waiting at Any Time restrictions were added to the proposals. These are both on Broadway Lane, immediately opposite its junctions with Berkeley Close and The Leaze.

- 6.3. Statutory consultation on the updated proposals was undertaken between 29th July 2025 and 19th August 2025. A letter and plan were emailed to the Statutory Consultees explaining the proposals and the reasoning behind them. Consultees were able to respond via email or post.
- 6.4. Formal public consultation (Notice of Proposal) was undertaken between 15th January 2026 and 6th February 2026 with Notices placed on site, in the local newspaper (Wilts & Glos Standard), on the County Council’s Website and on deposit in the Map Room at Shire Hall, Gloucester, and Cirencester Bingham Library (see Appendix B). The representations made can be found in Appendix C.

7. Objections/Support

- 7.1. The Statutory Consultees responded as follows:

Name	Comments
County Councillor	No comments received formally but has been involved throughout the TRO process.
Cotswold District Council	No comments received
Freight Haulage Association	No comments received
Road Haulage Association	No comments received
Police	No comments received during the NOP process but confirmed they would support the proposals during the statutory consultation.
Fire & Rescue	No comments received
Ambulance Service	No comments received
Parking Enforcement Team	No comments received
Local Highway Manager	No comments received during the NOP process but confirmed they would support the proposals during the statutory consultation.
South Cerney Parish Council	No comments received during the NOP process but confirmed they would support the proposals during the statutory consultation.
Stagecoach	No comments received during the NOP consultation but confirmed that they had no objection during the statutory consultation.

- 7.2. Other responses received during the Public Consultation (Notice of Proposal):

11 responses were received from members of the public. Of these, 8 were generally in support of the proposals but requested modifications, and 3 stated an objection to the proposal.

8. Details of Representations and Case Officers Response

- 8.1. The representations received in response to the proposed waiting restrictions can be grouped into several key themes, as outlined below:

One respondent stated that they were objecting to the proposals since they would cause displacement issues from the industrial estate into other parts of South Cerney, including Pochard Way, The Leaze, Oak Way and Berkeley Close. They also did not believe that Double Yellow Lines were required on the entrance to the industrial estate as the road is wide enough to allow access as well as accommodate parked vehicles.

Another objector was also concerned about the risk of displacement, particularly within Nightingale Way and the surrounding residential roads within the Cerney on the Water development. The objector urges the Council to reconsider the scope of the scheme to include these roads to make sure that any changes do not negatively impact other surrounding residential streets.

One respondent opposed the plans on the basis that they do not prevent vehicles parking outside the Co-op supermarket. This objector mentions that when vehicles are parked on the road and within the part-time loading bay, the High Street is reduced to one lane. The objector does not believe that No Waiting at Any Time restrictions will help this. The inability of buses to pass when deliveries to Co-op are being made will not be helped by these proposals. The objector also mentions that residents of the High Street rely on parking being available on the carriageway in order to access their homes. Finally, the objector believes that the restrictions won't be effective due to a lack of enforcement.

Three respondents did not object to the proposals but were concerned that vehicles would be displaced onto other sections of carriageway in the surrounding area, including on The Leaze, The Mallards and Nightingale Way. Multiple respondents mention that Lakeside Business Park is where the parking issues are originating from.

Four respondents requested that the proposals were extended to cover other areas. This includes past the bus stop near The Leaze on both sides of Broadway Lane. A respondent states that parked cars often bring traffic to a complete standstill. Respondents mention that their driveways are often obstructed by parked vehicles. One requests 'Keep Clear' lettering over their driveway, and one respondent requests a white H-bar marking over their driveway. One respondent requests a longer length of No Waiting at Any Time restrictions outside One Stop in Broadway Lane.

Whilst one respondent stated that they fully support the No Waiting at Any Time restrictions, they state that these should be enhanced with measures such as speed bumps or priority chicanes in order to reduce vehicle speeds.

In response to the representations surrounding parking displacement, some displacement of parking is inevitable, but vehicles will likely be displaced evenly, rather than into one location or road. The proposed No Waiting at Any Time restrictions are largely on junctions and narrow sections of carriageway where parking would cause major visibility issues and potentially obstruct the highway. From a road safety perspective, it is preferable to allow vehicles to park on straight sections of carriageway with good visibility rather than within close proximity to junctions, bends and crossing points. The proposals help supplement Rule 242 of the Highway Code, which states that vehicles may not be left in positions where they cause an unnecessary obstruction of the road, and Rule 243 of the Highway Code, which prohibits parking within 10 metres of a junction. In response to the respondent querying the presence of No Waiting at Any Time restrictions on the entrance to the industrial estate, parking here would be in contravention of Rule 243 of the Highway Code as mentioned above. Parking on junctions also causes visibility issues for vehicles attempting to navigate the junction.

In response to the objector concerned that the restrictions won't prevent vehicles from parking outside of the Co-op supermarket, this section of the High Street is largely straight, with good forward visibility. It is therefore appropriate for vehicles to park on this section of the High Street. There is an access to the rear of the supermarket allowing deliveries to be unloaded off the carriageway. As the restrictions only cover the junction of High Street and Broadway

Lane, as well as a very short section of the High Street, disruption to residents wishing to park on the carriageway should be minimal. There are several unrestricted sections of carriageway in the immediate surrounding area that vehicles can safely be parked on.

In response to the comments regarding enforcement, the restrictions will be enforced in alignment with GCC's parking enforcement strategy.

In response to those respondents requesting 'Keep Clear' lettering or white lining over their access to discourage other vehicles to park here, residents are able to apply for a white 'H-bar' marking over their access. The application process can be completed by visiting <https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/apply-for/highways-licenses-permits-and-permissions/disabled-marked-bay-and-h-marking/>.

In response to those requesting that the No Waiting at Any Time restrictions are extended further and installed at other locations within South Cerney, it is important to maintain a balance between restricting parking where it is deemed inappropriate, whilst also not implementing parking restrictions where they can be deemed "over-restrictive". GCC, as the highway authority, has a duty to maintain safety for all road users. The proposals align with this balance.

In response to the representation requesting traffic calming measures such as speed cushions and priority chicane build-outs, these are outside the remit of this scheme. The remit of this scheme is to complete the Traffic Regulation Order process in order to install waiting restrictions on various roads within South Cerney if deemed necessary. Any other requests will need to be raised with the local Parish Council or the Local County Councillor.

The proposal aligns with GCCs duties under Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, in that the restrictions proposed would ensure the expeditious, convenient, and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on the highway.

Therefore, it is imperative that the restrictions are implemented as advertised for the reasons outlined above.

9. Equality Impact Assessment

- 9.1. GCC has given due regard to the 3 aims of the general equality duty under the Equalities Act 2010 in relation to the 9 groups (Age, Disability, Sex, Race, Gender reassignment, Marriage and Civil partnership, Pregnancy & Maternity, Religion and/or Belief and Sexual orientation, along with other groups (such as long term unemployed, socio-economical deprived groups, community cohesion, human rights)) with protected characteristics and the making of this TRO would not adversely affect any of the groups with those protected characteristics (please see Due Regard Statements in Appendix D).

10. Summary

- 10.1. It is proposed to introduce No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Lines) on various roads in South Cerney and No Waiting Mon-Fri 8am-6pm (Single Yellow Line) restrictions on Broadway Lane.

- 10.2. Concerns have been raised by the County Councillor and the Parish Council regarding inappropriate parking within the vicinity of junctions and accesses, as well as where it causes severe visibility issues for road users and pedestrians. The restrictions have been proposed in order to prevent inconsiderate and inappropriate parking, double parking, parking close to junctions where it causes obstructions for vehicles (including emergency service vehicles) and cyclists, as well as where it affects pedestrian sight lines. The proposals also supplement Rule 243 of the Highway Code, which stipulates that parking within 10 metres of and opposite a junction is prohibited.
- 10.3. Representations were received during the Notice of Proposal (Public Consultation) process from members of the public with regards to the proposed restrictions.
- 10.4. All representations have been outlined and responded to within this report in Section 8 in alignment with GCC's duty under the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.
- 10.5. In considering the assessment under Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the proposed Order meets GCC's obligations in that they would ensure the expeditious, convenient, and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on the highway.

11. View of the Case Officer

- 11.1. This report demonstrates that the introduction of the proposals is consistent with National Guidance and has been fully consulted upon in accordance with Gloucestershire County Council procedures and followed necessary statutory procedures, as set out in the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England & Wales) Regulations 1996.
- 11.2. 3 objections have been raised from members of the public during the Notice of Proposal (Public Consultation) process, which is a small proportion of those consulted throughout the proposal area. It can, therefore, be considered that the proposals are deemed to be acceptable to the vast majority.
- 11.3. The final proposals (as shown in Appendix B) have been designed, taking into account the representations received during informal engagement, but also balancing this with the Council's duties under Sections 1 and 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- 11.4. It is considered that the restrictions proposed meet GCC's objectives and therefore, it would be beneficial that GCC makes the TRO as advertised in January/February 2026.

12. Recommendation by the Senior Case Officer

- 12.1. I am satisfied that the TRO has been correctly advertised and consulted upon in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the procedures laid down in that Act.
- 12.2. The necessary statutory procedures as set out in the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England & Wales) Regulations 1996 have been followed, and guidance, including the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 have been considered.
- 12.3. Although some objections to the TRO have been received, I am satisfied that they have been duly considered and that a balance has been drawn between any objections, positive feedback and safety of all road users.

- 12.4. After considering all background information, representations and data supplied in this report, I recommend that all upheld formal representations are considered as minor in nature.
- 12.5. I recommend that the TRO is made permanent as originally advertised January/February 2026.

13. Decision by the Traffic Regulation Order Manager

13.1. I have considered the report, recommendations and whether to hold a Traffic Regulation Committee. I have also considered all the representations that we have received in relation to this matter in making my decision. I have decided that Gloucestershire County Council should:

- Make the order as advertised in January/February 2026.

13.2. As a result of the above I give authorisation for the Assistant Director of Legal Services to act on my decision pursuant to delegations approved in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972 and subsequent legislation.

Signed: 

Hannah Bassett-Louis – Traffic Regulation Order Manager

Date: 12th February 2026

Appendices

Appendix A – Informal Residents Consultation Letters

Appendix B – Advertised Waiting Restriction Order Package

Appendix C – Representations received during the Notice of Proposal Public Consultation

Appendix D – Statement of Due Regard