Traffic Regulation Order Report:

Proposed Waiting, Stopping, Loading & Disabled Badge Holder Restrictions: Various Roads, Tetbury, Gloucestershire.

Version 1 – May 2023

Revision	Description	Author
1	First Issue	WC

Contents

1. **Purpose of Report** 3
2. **Recommendation** 3
3. **Background and Purpose of the Scheme** 3
4. **Law and Policy** 5
5. **Traffic Data** 6
6. **Consultation on the proposed TROs** 6
7. **Objections/Support** 6
8. **Details of upheld Objections and Case Officers Response** 8
9. **Modification** 10
10. **Equality Impact Assessment** 10
11. **Summary** 10
12. **View of the Case Officer** 12
13. **Recommendation by the Senior Case Officer** 13
14. **Decision by the Assistant Director: Traffic and Transport** 13

Appendices 14

Traffic Regulation Order Title:

GLOUCESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL ON STREET PARKING ORDER 2017 (VARIOUS ROADS) (TOWN OF TETBURY) (COTSWOLD DISTRICT) (VARIATION) ORDER 2023

Case Officer: Will Cox, Assistant Engineer, Traffic Regulation Orders Ltd.

Senior Case Officer: Hannah Bassett-Louis, TRO Manager, Gloucestershire County Council.

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 Assistant Director: Traffic and Transport on the way forward.

2. Recommendation

2.1. That, for the reasons given in this report and after consideration of the representations made, Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) now:

- Makes the order as advertised in November/December 2022, with the exceptions of West Street, where the modified proposal should be made following feedback from residents, and Fox Hill which should not be progressed to be made, as it has been removed from the scheme following a further review on traffic flows.

3. Background and Purpose of the Scheme

3.1. GCC have been asked to review the parking in Tetbury by the Town Council who identified various parking issues and anomalies in the town. These proposals are designed to address these issues and ensure that GCC meets its obligations as local highway authority under Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 – namely to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic (including pedestrians). Therefore, it is proposed to make the following changes to the on-street parking restrictions in the Town of Tetbury, Gloucestershire:

- The introduction of a No Waiting at Any Time restriction on the following roads:

B4014 Hampton Street	Lowfield Road	Highfield Road	Upton Gardens
St Marys Road	Grove Gardens	Coronation Road	Chavenage Lane
Magdalen Road	Priory Way	A433 London Road	Cutwell
West Street	Old Brewery Lane	Cottons Lane	The Green
Cirencester Road	Northfield Road	A433 Bath Road	Berrells Road
Court Field	Five Trees Close	Silver Street	Gumstool Hill
Fox Hill			

- The introduction of a new section of daytime restriction and the replacing of a short length of existing daytime restriction with a limited waiting bay in The Ferns.
- The introduction of a new daytime restriction; amending the times of the existing daytime restriction and removing sections of daytime restriction on St Marys Road.
- The introduction of No Stopping on School Keep Clear markings in Magdalen Road and the removal of the existing advisory School Keep Clear markings on St Marys Road.
- The introduction of new loading restrictions and the formalising of the existing Loading restriction on Long Street to make it enforceable.
- Amending the max stay times for the disabled badge holders only bay in the Market Place
- Amending the length of the existing No Waiting at Any Time restrictions on Long Street & London Road to match what is existing on-street as an administrative exercise.
- Amending the lengths of the existing limited waiting bays on Silver Street to match what is on-street as an administrative exercise.
- The removal of waiting restrictions on Helena Court from the Order as an administrative exercise due to road not being publicly maintained highway (i.e. un-adopted).

3.2. The measures around junctions are primarily proposed to improve the navigability of these roads and to improve road safety generally for vehicles (including cyclists) and pedestrians. This will be achieved by preventing inappropriate parking close to junctions, or where it causes obstruction for passing vehicles (including emergency service vehicles), congestion and obscures visibility for pedestrians attempting to cross the various roads. The proposals would also supplement Rule 243 of the Highway Code (i.e., no parking within 10 metres of a junction).

3.3. A short section of the existing daytime restriction in The Ferns would be removed to allow parking where it is safe to do so. The current daytime restriction prevents people using the street as overflow parking for the Doctors Surgery. It is therefore proposed to introduce a marked bay with waiting limited to 2 hours with no return within 2 hours instead, allowing parking in a safe location.

3.4. The proposed changes for Magdalen Road and St Marys Road are to manage the parking around the primary school, particularly during school start and finish times. The existing School Keep Clear markings on Magdalen Road are to be formalised in order to prevent stopping close to the school entrance Monday to Friday 8am-4pm. This should provide safer, unobstructed access to the school entrance for the entirety of the school day. The existing advisory restrictions in the layby outside the school will be replaced with a waiting restriction that will only allow waiting during the school start and finish times. This will allow parents to use the layby to drop off & collect their children close to the school and without having to cross the road, block driveways or cause obstruction to passing traffic. Changes to the times of the existing daytime restrictions are proposed to control parking during the busiest times of the school day.

3.5. A new loading restriction will be introduced on parts of Long Street to ensure that traffic is not hampered by large delivery vehicles during the busiest times of the day, whilst allowing businesses to receive goods during off-peak times. The times of the existing loading restrictions (as currently marked on-street) are to be made to be No Loading at Any Time restrictions so that they are enforceable. This restriction along this section will ensure loading is kept to one side of the road so that vehicles do not block the road at its narrowest point.

3.6. The existing disabled parking bay in the Market Place will be amended to bring the maximum stay in line with the maximum stay for a disabled badge holder using the adjacent limited waiting bays. Currently the disabled bay has a shorter maximum stay of 1 hour than the 3 hours which a disabled badge holder can stay in a regular limited waiting bay. By amending this maximum stay, it will make the maximum stay for a disabled badge holder consistent across all 3 bays in the Market Place.

3.7. Finally, as a purely administrative exercise, the existing No Waiting at Any Time restriction in Helena Court needs to be removed from the TRO because it is a private road and not publicly maintainable highway. This comes at the request of the land owner.

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; and
- for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians).

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

5.2. There have been no recorded traffic collisions where the restrictions are proposed, in the previous three years.

6. Consultation on the proposed TROs

6.1. Consultations with Residents, Statutory Consultees and the Public have previously taken place. Objections were received and the proposals were scaled back to their current form in response to these.

6.2. Public consultation (Notice of Proposal) was undertaken between 17th November 2022 and 15th December 2022 with Notices placed on site and delivered to directly affected properties, advertised in the local newspaper (Wilts & Gloucestershire Standard), placed on the GCC website and hard copies were put on deposit at Shire Hall (see Appendices A & B). Following the conclusion of the consultation, all objectors were provided with a response to their objection and given a further 21 days to uphold their objection. 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
Freight Haulage Association	No comments received
Road Haulage Association	No comments received
Police	No comments received
Parish Council	No comments received
Fire & Rescue	No comments received
Ambulance Service	No comments received
Parking Enforcement Team	No comments received
Local Highway Manager	No comments received

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

<u>West Street</u>

Two responses were received, of these one was a request for additional restrictions at the Church Street/West Street junction (See section 9). The other was an objection which was upheld.

<u>The Ferns</u>

No responses were received.

Hampton Street/Chavenage Lane

No responses were received.

Lowfield Road & Highfield Road

No responses were received.

St Mary's Road

No responses were received.

Magdalen Road

No responses were received.

Priory Way

No responses were received.

Long Street

One Objection to the proposal was received but was not upheld.

Market Place

One response requesting a consideration of a 7.5t weight restriction was received.

Silver Street/Gumstool Hill Junction (Market Place)

Two objections to the proposal were received, of which one was upheld.

The Green

12 responses were received. Of these 10 were objections to the proposal and two further raising concerns about the proposals. Three objections were upheld.

Gumstool Hill

One response requesting additional No Waiting at Any Time restrictions was received.

Cirencester Road

No responses were received.

Bath Road

No responses were received.

Cutwell

One response in support of the proposal was received.

Helena Court

No responses were received.

Fox Hill

Six responses were received. Of these five were objections to the proposal and the other raised concerns with the increases in vehicle speeds if the proposal went ahead.

Town Wide

One response commenting on several proposals was received. The respondent stated that they did not object to the proposals.

8. Details of upheld Objections and Case Officers Response

West Street

8.1. The objector who upheld their objection stated that residents may have difficulty with unloading and loading vehicles, should the proposals be implemented. Additionally, they mention that there is already nowhere to park on West Street and there is also a lack of free or affordable parking in Tetbury. They also state that the issue here isn't the road width, but instead the use of West Street as a shortcut and a "free-for-all" car park and that parked vehicles are the only speed deterrent, in absence of an appropriate speed limit being in place in West Street.

8.2. In response to the objection, the measures are primarily proposed to improve the navigability of these roads and to improve road safety generally for vehicles (including cyclists) and pedestrians. This will be achieved by preventing inappropriate parking close to junctions, or where it causes obstruction for passing vehicles (including emergency service vehicles), congestion and obscures visibility for pedestrians attempting to cross the various roads. This would also supplement Rule 243 of the Highway Code (i.e., no parking within 10 metres of a junction). It is imperative that the restrictions are implemented in order to prevent double parking, given the road's narrow nature. Sections of West Street will remain as unrestricted and will therefore continue to provide free parking in the location in question. These proposals are purely about parking restrictions to allow the safe passage of vehicles/other road users. Any other moving traffic restrictions (Speed) will be monitored and investigated separately. In response to comments surrounding difficulties to do with Loading and Unloading, these actions are permitted on No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions and so loading and unloading arrangements would not need to change here.

Silver Street/Gumstool Hill Junction (Market Place)

8.3. The objector stated that the proposal should be modified to extend the No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions outside of No.11 & 13, Market Place, as it was proposed in the 2019 proposals. They state that the extension is required to ensure the road drain/gully can always be accessed as a blockage in this drain leads to excess water flowing down Silver Street, which causes their property to be splashed by vehicle spray.

8.4. In response to the objection, the proposal is to amend the lengths of the existing limited waiting bays on the County's TRO mapping system in order to match what is on-street. This is proposed as an administrative exercise. Following a review, it was deemed that the 2019 proposal was "over-restrictive" as if No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) Restrictions were implemented here, then there would be a reduction in the parking available in the area. It is commonplace to find drain gullies within parking bays across the country in urban areas, therefore, its drainage function and maintenance regime are not considered to be a reason for implementing parking restrictions. The limited waiting restrictions have a time restriction of 1 hour, therefore, gully cleansing would still be possible, given that a vehicle would only be permitted to wait for a duration of 1 hour. Additionally, a Temporary TRO could be applied for in order to suspend the parking bay for routine drain clearance to be undertaken. Therefore,

under this proposal it maximises the available parking provision available on street, as well as giving opportunities for drain clearance to be undertaken.

The Green

8.5. The objectors who upheld their objections stated that there is already a limited number of parking spaces in The Green and the removal of the two car length parking spaces under this proposal will put increased pressure on the parking available. They state that the proposed No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) Restrictions at the pinch point outside No. 20 are not required to prevent obstruction (particularly to emergency vehicles), as the blocks of stone could be removed from the grass verge and the verge cut back by 1m to be replaced by a hard surface and that emergency vehicles would come in from the other direction to mitigate the need to turn around. It was also stated that the swept path analysis undertaken (see Appendix G) was pessimistic and not an accurate reflection of the current situation, as the vehicles used are larger than an average car and did not reflect existing parking habits. They stated that if smaller vehicles and the current parking habits were used in this analysis, then no obstruction to oncoming emergency vehicles would then be caused. The objectors also referred to the advisory disabled parking bay outside of No. 20 causing a pinch point and that it should be cut back so that it doesn't protrude into the carriageway. Additionally, one of the objectors stated that the loss of the parking spaces will increase vehicle speeds and traffic through The Green, as it will allow it to be used as a rat run which would reduce pedestrians' and cyclists' safety. Two of these objectors stated they support the proposal for No Waiting at Any Time restrictions outside of No.2.

8.6. In response to the objection, the measures are primarily proposed to improve the navigability of these roads and to improve road safety generally for vehicles (including cyclists) and pedestrians. This will be achieved by preventing inappropriate parking close to junctions, or where it causes obstruction for passing vehicles (including emergency service vehicles), congestion and obscures visibility for pedestrians attempting to cross the various roads. This would also supplement Rule 243 of the Highway Code (i.e., no parking within 10 metres of a junction). It is not possible for GCC to remove the blocks of stone or to cut back the area of grass, as this is not publicly maintainable. The swept path analysis was created using observations from existing parking habits. The vehicle size used in this swept path is larger than average, as there is currently nothing to prevent the largest vehicles from waiting here and it is important to consider the worst-case scenario, particularly when considering emergency service vehicle access, as using a smaller vehicle could lead to unintended consequences. As shown in the swept path, a fire engine would not be able to access properties further into The Green via Silver Street. Therefore, it is imperative that the restrictions are implemented in order to prevent obstruction to emergency service vehicles in an emergency. The advisory disabled bay outside of No.20 will be removed through the works for this TRO scheme (if successful), as it is no longer required. Therefore, this parking space will return to the community and there will only be a net loss of one car length of parking space as a result of this TRO. In response to comments surrounding an increase in vehicle speeds, it is unlikely that vehicle speeds will significantly increase if this section of road is clear of parked vehicles, as the sections of carriageway are narrow and remain unrestricted outside of the proposal area. Therefore, vehicles will remain parked in these locations (where it is safer for them to do so) and as such, should continue to act as a form of natural traffic calming, slowing vehicle speeds in The Green.

9. Modification

9.1. After considering the representations outlined in paragraph 8 above, GCC consulted directly affected residents on a modification to the original extent of the proposed restrictions on West Street, by introducing additional No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions at its junction with Church Street. This was in order to address the concerns raised regarding obstruction at this location and vehicles mounting the pavement to navigate around inappropriately parked vehicles here.

9.2. Additionally, another modification was made to remove the proposed No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions on Fox Hill as following a further review it was deemed that vehicles parked here do not influence traffic flows.

9.3. This modification consultation was undertaken between 19th April 2023 and 10th May 2023 with Notices placed on site and emailed to the members of the public who made a representation on the above as well as directly affected properties. The proposal was also advertised on the GCC website and hard copies were placed on deposit at Shire Hall. One comment of support for the West Street Modification Proposal was received and No objections were raised following the conclusion of the consultation. The Notice of Modification Documents can be found in Appendix D.

10. Equality Impact Assessment

10.1. 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 F).

11. Summary

11.1. GCC has been asked to review the parking in Tetbury by the Town Council who identified various parking issues and anomalies in the town. These proposals are designed to address these issues and ensure that GCC meets its obligations as local highway authority under Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 – namely to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic (including pedestrians). Therefore, it was proposed to make the following changes to the on-street parking restrictions in the Town of Tetbury, Gloucestershire:

- The introduction of a No Waiting at Any Time restriction on the following roads:

B4014 Hampton Street	Lowfield Road	Highfield Road	Upton Gardens
St Marys Road	Grove Gardens	Coronation Road	Chavenage Lane
Magdalen Road	Priory Way	A433 London Road	Cutwell
West Street	Old Brewery Lane	Cottons Lane	The Green
Cirencester Road	Northfield Road	A433 Bath Road	Berrells Road
Court Field	Five Trees Close	Silver Street	Gumstool Hill

Fox Hill			

- The introduction of a new section of daytime restriction and the replacing of a short length of existing daytime restriction with a limited waiting bay in The Ferns.
- The introduction of a new daytime restriction; amending the times of the existing daytime restriction and removing sections of daytime restriction on St Marys Road.
- The introduction of No Stopping on School Keep Clear markings in Magdalen Road and the removal of the existing advisory School Keep Clear markings on St Marys Road.
- The introduction of new loading restrictions and the formalising of the existing Loading restriction on Long Street to make it enforceable.
- Amending the max stay times for the disabled badge holders only bay in the Market Place
- Amending the length of the existing No Waiting at Any Time restrictions on Long Street & London Road to match what is existing on-street as an administrative exercise.
- Amending the lengths of the existing limited waiting bays on Silver Street to match what is on-street as an administrative exercise.
- The removal of waiting restrictions on Helena Court from the Order as an administrative exercise due to road not being publicly maintained highway (i.e. un-adopted).

11.2. The measures around junctions were primarily proposed to improve the navigability of these roads and to improve road safety generally for vehicles (including cyclists) and pedestrians. This will be achieved by preventing inappropriate parking close to junctions, or where it causes obstruction for passing vehicles (including emergency service vehicles), congestion and obscures visibility for pedestrians attempting to cross the various roads. The proposals would also supplement Rule 243 of the Highway Code (i.e., no parking within 10 metres of a junction).

11.3. A short section of the existing daytime restriction in The Ferns would be removed to allow parking where it is safe to do so. The current daytime restriction prevents people using the street as overflow parking for the Doctors Surgery. It is therefore proposed to introduce a marked bay with waiting limited to 2 hours with no return within 2 hours instead, allowing parking in a safe location.

11.4. The proposed changes for Magdalen Road and St Marys Road are to manage the parking around the primary school, particularly during school start and finish times. The existing School Keep Clear markings on Magdalen Road are to be formalised in order to prevent stopping close to the school entrance Monday to Friday 8am-4pm. This should provide safer, unobstructed access to the school entrance for the entirety of the school day. The existing advisory restrictions in the layby outside the school will be replaced with a waiting restriction that will only allow waiting during the school start and finish times. This will allow parents to use the layby to drop off and collect their children close to the school and without having to cross the road, block driveways or cause obstruction to passing traffic. Changes to the times of the existing daytime restrictions are proposed to control parking during the busiest times of the school day.

11.5. A new loading restriction will be introduced on parts of Long Street to ensure that traffic is not hampered by large delivery vehicles during the busiest times of the day, whilst allowing businesses to receive goods during off-peak times. The times of the existing loading restrictions (as currently marked on-street) are to be made to be No Loading at Any Time restrictions so that they are enforceable. This restriction along this section will ensure loading is kept to one side of the road so that vehicles do not block the road at its narrowest point.

11.6. The existing disabled parking bay in the Market Place will be amended to bring the maximum stay in line with the maximum stay for a disabled badge holder using the adjacent limited waiting bays. Currently the disabled bay has a shorter maximum stay of 1 hour than the 3 hours which a disabled badge holder can stay in a regular limited waiting bay. By amending this maximum stay, it will make the maximum stay for a disabled badge holder consistent across all 3 bays in the Market Place.

11.7. Finally, as a purely administrative exercise, the existing No Waiting at Any Time restriction in Helena Court needs to be removed because it is a private road and not publicly maintainable highway. This comes at the request of the land owner.

11.8. Representations were received during the Notice of Proposal (Public Consultation) process from residents with regards to the proposed restrictions.

11.9. 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.

11.10. Two modifications to the proposals were consulted on in response to the representations made in section 8 of this report. One was to remove Fox Hill from the proposals and the other was to propose a further length of No Waiting at Any Time restriction along West Street. One comment of support for the West Street Proposal and no objections were received for these modifications.

11.11. In considering the assessment under Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the TRO 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.

12. View of the Case Officer

12.1. This report demonstrates that the introduction of the proposals is consistent with National Guidance and has been fully consulted upon in accordance with GCC policies and procedures and followed necessary statutory procedures, as set out in the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England & Wales) Regulations 1996.

12.2. Five objections have been raised and upheld across the proposal areas from members of the public during the Notice of Proposal (Public Consultation) process, which is a small proportion of those consulted throughout the proposal areas. It can therefore be considered that the proposals are deemed to be acceptable to the vast majority.

12.3. The final proposals (as shown in Appendix E) have been designed, taking into account the representations received and modifications made, but also balancing this with GCC's duties under Sections 1 and 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and with the fact that only five objections were received and upheld.

12.4. It is considered that the restrictions proposed meet GCC's objectives and therefore, it would be beneficial that the TRO be made as advertised in November/December 2022, with the exceptions of West Street, where the modified proposal should be made following feedback from residents, and Fox Hill which should not be progressed to be made, as it has been removed from the scheme following a further review of traffic flows.

13. Recommendation by the Senior Case Officer

13.1 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.

13.2 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.

13.3 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.

13.4 I fully support the inclusion of the modified proposal at the West Street/Church Street junction and the removal of Fox Hill from the proposal, to try and mitigate some of the objections whilst still maintaining safety for all road users.

13.5 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.

13.6 I recommend that the TRO is made permanent as originally advertised in November/December 2022, with the exceptions of West Street, where the modified proposal should be made following feedback from residents, and Fox Hill which should not be progressed to be made, as it has been removed from the scheme following a further review on traffic flows, under delegated authority.

14. Decision by the Assistant Director: Traffic and Transport

14.1 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 TRO as advertised in November/December 2022, with the exceptions of West Street, where the modified proposals should be made following feedback from residents, and Fox Hill which should not be progressed to be made, as it has been removed from the scheme following a further review on traffic flows.

14.2 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: 

Philip Williams – Assistant Director: Traffic and Transport

Date: 18th August 2023

Appendices

Appendix A – Advertised Waiting, Loading, Stopping & Disabled Badge Holder Restriction Order Package Proposal Plans

Appendix B – Notice of Proposal Documents

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

Appendix D – Notice of Modification

Appendix E - Final Waiting, Loading, Stopping & Disabled Badge Holder Restriction Package Proposal Plans

Appendix F – Statement of Due Regard

Appendix G – Swept Path Analysis