

Traffic Regulation Order Report:

Proposed Waiting Restrictions: Various Roads in the Cleavelands Development, Bishops Cleeve, Gloucestershire.

Version 1 – March 2026

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	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. Modification	6
10. Equality Impact Assessment	8
11. Summary.....	9
12. View of the Case Officer.....	10
13. Recommendation by the Senior Case Officer	10
14. Decision by the Traffic & Active Travel Manager.....	10
Appendices.....	12

Traffic Regulation Order Title:

GLOUCESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL ON STREET PARKING ORDER 2017 (VARIOUS ROADS IN THE CLEVELANDS DEVELOPMENT) (PARISH OF BISHOPS CLEEVE) (TEWKESBURY BOROUGH) (VARIATION) ORDER 2025

Case Officer: Will Cox, Senior Traffic Engineer, ADL Traffic & Highways Engineering 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 Traffic & Active Travel 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 modified in December 2025/January 2026.

3. Background and Purpose of the Scheme

- 3.1. This scheme involves the introduction of Waiting Restrictions on various roads in the vicinity of the medical centre within the Cleavelands development.
- 3.2. The proposals are in association with the ongoing residential and commercial development at Cleavelands to the north-west of the A435 Bishops Cleeve Bypass (planning ref - 20/00245/FUL).
- 3.3. 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 inconsiderate and inappropriate parking, double parking and parking where it causes obstructions for vehicles (in particular for emergency service vehicles accessing the medical centre). The proposal also aims to prevent parking close to junctions and where it affects sight lines. These restrictions would also supplement Rule 243 of the highway code (no parking within 10 metres of or opposite a junction).

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 form 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 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 informally engaged with over a four-week period from 20th November 2024 to 20th December 2024. 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.

- 6.2. Statutory consultation for the proposed restrictions in the scheme was undertaken between 6th January 2025 and 27th January 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.
- 6.3. Public consultation (Notice of Proposal) was undertaken between 6th March 2025 and 27th March 2025 with Notices placed on site and delivered to directly affected properties, advertised in the local newspaper (Gloucester Echo & Citizen), placed on the GCC website and hard copies were put on deposit at Shire Hall and Bishops Cleeve Library (see Appendices A & B).
- 6.4. The representations made during the public consultation (Notice of Proposal) can be found in Appendix C.
- 6.5. The modification consultation (Notice of Modification) was undertaken between 8th December 2025 and 5th January 2026 with Notices placed on site, delivered to directly affected properties and emailed to the members of the public who made a representation to the original proposal, as well as to the statutory consultees. The modified proposal was also advertised on the GCC website and hard copies were placed on deposit at Shire Hall and Bishops Cleeve Library. The Notice of Modification Documents and proposal plan can be found in Appendix D.
- 6.6. The representations made during the modification consultation (Notice of Modification) can be found in Appendix E.

7. Objections/Support

- 7.1. The Statutory Consultees responded as follows:

Name	Comments
County Councillor	Offered no objections to the proposal
Freight Haulage Association	No comments received
Road Haulage Association	No comments received
Police	Supports the proposal
Parish Council	Supports the proposal
Fire & Rescue	No comments received
Ambulance Service	No comments received
Parking Enforcement Team	No comments received
Stagecoach	Supports the proposal
Local Highway Manager	Offered no objections to the proposal
Borough Council	No comments received

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

13 responses were received. Of these responses, all issued their support for the proposal but 11 requested extensions to the length of the extents of the proposal.

8. Details of Representations and Case Officers Response

- 8.1. The responses stated that they were supportive of the proposals, but that they did not go far enough, citing incidents of collisions, damage to parked vehicles, near misses, parking over dropped kerb crossings and poor visibility caused by parked vehicles along the section of the

Road known as Sapphire Road south-east of the existing proposals up to the Bishops Cleeve Bypass (A435). The representations stated that the proposals should be expanded to include additional No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Lines) along the length of the Road known as Sapphire Road up to the Bishops Cleeve Bypass (A435) junction. One response also requested a Keep Clear Box outside of the medical centre entrance.

- 8.2. In response to these representations, GCC advertised a modification to the original proposal to address the concerns raised regarding additional No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Lines) along the length of the Road known as Sapphire Road up to the Bishops Cleeve Bypass (A435) junction. The details of this modification can be found in Section 9.

In response to the request for a Keep Clear Box outside of the medical centre entrance, this falls outside the remit of this TRO scheme, which is for waiting restrictions introduced under a TRO.

9. Modification

- 9.1. Following the conclusion of the public consultation, it was identified that certain elements of the originally advertised proposal extended beyond the boundaries of the adoptable public highway, as defined under the developer's Section 278 agreement. Consequently, GCC revised the proposal by removing the restrictions that fell outside this adoptable area. This ensured that all remaining measures are enforceable under the relevant highway legislation and can be effectively implemented and enforced.
- 9.2. After considering the representations to the proposal outlined in Section 8 above, GCC re-consulted on a modification to the originally proposed restrictions. The modification included additional No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions south-eastwards on sections of the Road known as Sapphire Road to its junction with the Bishops Cleeve Bypass (A435). These restrictions were proposed to address concerns raised from residents surrounding all day commuter parking along this section of carriageway, which was reported to cause obstruction and create difficulty for road users navigating the road. The modification also included the introduction of a Limited Waiting Bay 8am-8pm 3 Hours No Return 1 Hour outside of the shops along this section of carriageway, to preserve some parking spaces for visitors to the nearby shops, whilst encouraging regular turnover of vehicles in these bays.
- 9.3. During this modification consultation 10 responses were received. Two were from Statutory Consultees and eight were from members of the public. Of these responses, one was in support, one offered no objections, five were objections and three made requests to extend the length of the proposed restrictions.
- 9.4. The objections received centred around two main themes. Firstly, objections raised concerns about the proposed introduction of a Limited Waiting Bay (8am–8pm, 3 hours, no return within 1 hour) outside the shops on Sapphire Road. The objectors stated that this arrangement would not solve the existing problem of parked vehicles obstructing visibility for both drivers and pedestrians attempting to cross the road. They felt the road would be significantly safer if this section was kept free of parked vehicles at any time and requested the Limited Waiting Bay be removed and replaced with No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Lines) restrictions.

Secondly, objections were received about the introduction of the modification proposals and the impact this would have on employees who work in the businesses operating along Sapphire Road. The objectors state the proposals will leave them with no suitable place to park, forcing them into surrounding residential streets and creating additional pressure there.

They also state the restrictions would also reduce accessibility for clients, potentially impacting local businesses due to the lack of alternative parking options. Objectors also expressed safety concerns about having to walk longer distances to their vehicles in the dark if they cannot park near their workplace. The objectors requested that alternative parking solutions be considered to mitigate the loss of parking on-street outside of the businesses.

- 9.5. In response to the objections relating to the introduction of the Limited Waiting Bay, the extent of the limited waiting restrictions had intentionally been designed to be minimal and is proposed to preserve some parking spaces for visitors to the nearby shops, whilst also encouraging regular turnover of vehicles in these bays to prevent all day parking. There are no formal crossing points along the section of carriageway where the parking bay is proposed, and the bay is positioned in such a way that it does not obscure visibility for users utilising the existing informal dropped kerb crossing points on Sapphire Road. It is noted that these existing informal crossing points are currently frequently obstructed by parked vehicles, however, the No Waiting at Any Time restrictions proposed should keep these clear.

These parking bays were primarily retained to maintain a parking presence along the carriageway in order to manage vehicle speeds. Without parked vehicles acting as a natural form of traffic calming, vehicle speeds are likely to increase along this section of carriageway, given its wide straight nature, which introduces additional road safety concerns. Under Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 GCC has a duty to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off street. The proposal aligns with these duties through the removal of parking at locations where it is unsafe and to allow parking where it is safe to act in a capacity to reduce vehicle speeds, through natural traffic calming to improve road safety in the vicinity of the shops. On this basis, the proposal is considered appropriate and proportionate.

In response to the objections relating to the removal of parking for employees of businesses located on Sapphire Road, GCC is not responsible for providing designated parking spaces for business staff, either on or off the publicly maintainable highway. However, GCC has ensured that sections of the carriageway in the vicinity remain unrestricted where it is safe for vehicles to park, thereby meeting its duties under Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, while also providing suitable and adequate parking facilities on the highway.

These parking restrictions have been proposed in response to representations received during the original Notice of Proposal (Public Consultation) in March 2025. The representations highlighted concerns raised from residents surrounding all day parking along this section of carriageway, which has been reported to cause obstruction and create difficulty for road users navigating the road. Therefore, the No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions have been proposed to prevent inappropriate parking along sections of the carriageway where it is unsafe and obstructs visibility, while still allowing parking in locations deemed safe. This approach provides a natural form of traffic calming, helping to reduce vehicle speeds and improve overall road safety in the vicinity of the shops. GCC, as the highway authority, has a duty to maintain safety for all road users and the introduction of these No Waiting at Any Time restrictions will allow civil enforcement officers to keep these areas clear of obstruction.

The extent of the limited waiting restrictions is proposed to preserve some safe and adequate parking spaces for visitors to the nearby shops and businesses, which should allow for the businesses to continue to accommodate clients, whilst also encouraging regular turnover of vehicles in these bays to prevent all day parking.

GCC are not responsible for deployment of police patrols but will liaise with the management company of the buildings regarding the potential for the introduction of any additional lighting along the frontages (and possibly the rear) of the buildings. On this basis, the proposal remains appropriate and proportionate.

9.6. The three representations which requested extensions to the proposals each made separate requests in different areas. The first request was to reinstate the proposals originally advertised during the Notice of Proposal on Cartmel Drive. The second request was to extend the length of the No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Lines) restrictions northwards of the junction with Cartmel Drive to cover the carriageway outside of their property. The final request was to introduce additional restrictions on the section carriageway near to the Sapphire Road and Cape Ruby Close junction, in response to safety concerns they have about this section of carriageway.

9.7. In response to the first request, it is not possible to accommodate this proposal as following the conclusion of the original formal public consultation, it was identified that certain elements of the proposal extended beyond the boundaries of the intended adoptable publicly maintainable highway, as defined under the developer's highway works agreement. Consequently, GCC modified the proposal by removing the proposed restrictions that fell outside this adoptable area. This ensures that all remaining proposals would be enforceable under the relevant highway legislation and can be effectively implemented and enforced. The developer or its management company will be responsible for this section of carriageway as it will remain a private road. The representee should speak with the developer or its management company about whether they would be prepared to install Double Yellow Lines on these sections of carriageway as a visual deterrent for parking here. However, these restrictions would not be enforceable by GCC Civil enforcement officers.

In response to the second and third requests outlined above in Section 9.6, it is not possible to accommodate these proposals as these sections of carriageway extend beyond the boundaries of the intended adoptable publicly maintainable highway, as defined under the developer's highway works agreement. Therefore, the developer or its management company will be responsible for this section of carriageway as it will remain a private road. The representees should speak with the developer or its management company about whether they would be prepared to install Double Yellow Lines on these sections of carriageway as a visual deterrent for parking here. However, these restrictions would not be enforceable by GCC Civil enforcement officers.

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 the Due Regard Statement in Appendix F).

11. Summary

- 11.1. This scheme involves the introduction of Waiting Restrictions on various roads in the vicinity of the medical centre within the Cleavelands development.
- 11.2. The proposals are in association with the ongoing residential and commercial development at Cleavelands to the north-west of the A435 Bishops Cleeve Bypass (planning ref - 20/00245/FUL).
- 11.3. 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 inconsiderate and inappropriate parking, double parking and parking where it causes obstructions for vehicles (in particular for emergency service vehicles accessing the medical centre). The proposal also aims to prevent parking close to junctions and where it affects sight lines. These restrictions would also supplement Rule 243 of the highway code (no parking within 10 metres of or opposite a junction).
- 11.4. Representations were received during the Notice of Proposal (Public Consultation) process from residents with regards to the proposed restrictions.
- 11.5. Following the conclusion of the public consultation, it was identified that certain elements of the originally advertised proposal extended beyond the boundaries of the adoptable public highway, as defined under the developer's Section 278 agreement. Consequently, GCC revised the proposal by removing the restrictions that fell outside this adoptable area. This ensured that all remaining measures are enforceable under the relevant highway legislation and can be effectively implemented and enforced.
- 11.6. After considering the representations to the proposal outlined in Section 8 above, GCC re-consulted with directly affected members of the public on a modification to the originally proposed restrictions. The modification included additional No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions south-eastwards on sections of the Road known as Sapphire Road to its junction with the Bishops Cleeve Bypass (A435). These restrictions were proposed in order to address concerns raised from residents surrounding all day commuter parking along this section of carriageway, which was reported to cause obstruction and create difficulty for road users navigating the road. The modification also included the introduction of a Limited Waiting Bay 8am-8pm 3 Hours No Return 1 Hour outside of the shops along this section of carriageway, in order to preserve some parking spaces for visitors to the nearby shops, whilst encouraging regular turnover of vehicles in these bays.
- 11.7. Representations were received during the Modification Consultation process from residents with regards to the proposed restrictions.
- 11.8. All representations have been outlined and responded to within this report in Sections 8 & 9 in alignment with GCC's duty under the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.
- 11.9. In considering the assessment under Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the proposed Waiting Restriction 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.

12. View of the Case Officer

- 12.1. This report demonstrates that the introduction of the proposals is consistent with National Guidance and have 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. 5 valid objections have been raised from members of the public during the Notice of Proposal (Public Consultation) & Modification Consultation process, which is a small proportion of those consulted throughout the proposal area. Therefore, it can be considered that the proposals are deemed to be acceptable to the vast majority.
- 12.3. The final proposals (as shown in Appendix D) 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 5 Objections were received.
- 12.4. It is considered that the restrictions proposed meet GCC's objectives and therefore, it would be beneficial that GCC makes the order as modified in December 2025/January 2026.

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 were received during the original Public Consultation and the Modification re-consultation, 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. 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.
- 13.5. I recommend that the order should be put forward to be made as modified in December 2025/January 2026 under delegated authority.

14. Decision by the Traffic & Active Travel Manager

- 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 order as modified in December 2025/January 2026.

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: 

Nathaniel Davis – Traffic & Active Travel Manager

Date: 02/07/2026

Appendices

Appendix A – Public Consultation (Notice of Proposal) Proposal Plan

Appendix B – Notice of Proposal Documents

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

Appendix D – Notice of Modification Documents

Appendix E - Representations received during the Notice of Modification Consultation

Appendix F – Statement of Due Regard