

# Traffic Regulation Order Report:

## Proposed Waiting Restrictions: Various Roads in the Vicinity of the Blackbridge Sports Centre, Gloucester.

Version 1 – August 2025

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. Equality Impact Assessment.....	8
10. Summary .....	8
11. View of the Case Officer.....	8
12. Recommendation by the Senior Case Officer .....	9
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 IN THE VICINITY OF THE BLACKBRIDGE SPORTS CENTRE) (GLOUCESTER CITY) (VARIATION) ORDER 2025**

**Case Officer: Will Cox, Senior 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 April/May 2025.

**3. Background and Purpose of the Scheme**

- 3.1. It is proposed to introduce additional No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions on sections of the carriageway at Podsmead Place, Laburnum Road, Chaucer Close, Poplar Close, Sycamore Close & Redwood Close, Gloucester.
- 3.2. The proposals are in association with the ongoing development at the Blackbridge Sports Field and aim to address the potential for future access and egress issues for vehicles navigating these roads and junctions, following the completion of the sports centre development. The proposal seeks to prevent inconsiderate and inappropriate parking, double parking and parking where it causes obstructions for vehicles (in particular for emergency service vehicles). It 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 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 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.
- 5.2. As part of the planning process, the applicant conducted a parking survey that accounted for the proposed waiting restrictions. The survey data has been reviewed and used to inform decisions throughout the TRO process.

## **6. Consultation on the proposed TROs**

- 6.1. Residents and businesses directly affected by the proposals were consulted over a four-week period from 20<sup>th</sup> November 2024 to 20<sup>th</sup> 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. In response to feedback received during this consultation, the proposal was scaled back, where deemed appropriate and safe to do

so, in order to provide greater unrestricted parking provision. The proposals consulted upon during this informal consultation can be found in Appendix C.

- 6.2. Statutory consultation for the proposed restrictions in the scheme was undertaken between 11<sup>th</sup> February 2025 and 4<sup>th</sup> March 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. Formal public consultation (Notice of Proposal) was undertaken between 10<sup>th</sup> April 2025 and 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2025 with Notices placed on site, sent to properties directly affected by the proposals, in the local newspaper (Gloucester Echo & Citizen), on the County Council's Website and on deposit in the Map Room at Shire Hall, Gloucester (see Appendices A & B). The representations made can be found in Appendix D.

## 7. Objections/Support

- 7.1. The Statutory Consultees responded as follows:

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

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

22 responses were received from members of the public. Of these, four were non-committal and 18 stated an objection to the proposal.

## 8. Details of Representations and Case Officers Response

- 8.1. The majority of the representations received raised concerns over the loss of on-street parking, as a result of the proposals. Many objectors stated that they rely on the provision of on-street parking, as they do not have access to off-street parking. Objectors state the proposed No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Lines) restrictions would drastically reduce on-street parking, inconveniencing residents by forcing them to park further from their homes and potentially causing a migration of parking to surrounding areas. There are also concerns that the restrictions will lead to increased neighbourly tensions as residents compete for limited parking spaces. Many responses stated that the 10 allocated parking bays that were introduced as part of the development, to mitigate the loss of parking under these proposals, are insufficient.

Objectors also stated the proposed restrictions raise accessibility concerns, particularly for elderly residents, individuals with disabilities, and families with young children. Objectors state these groups would face difficulties as they would be forced to park further away from

their homes or local amenities. Objectors also stated that the restrictions would prevent them from manoeuvring onto their driveways and that they would be subject to a contravention of the restrictions, each time they did so. Additionally, one resident mentioned that the inability to park near their garage would prevent them from charging an electric vehicle at home, thereby affecting their employment options and daily mobility. Representees also argued that large vehicles, including construction lorries and refuse trucks, have navigated the estate safely for years without incident.

Several residents proposed alternative safety measures such as; residents parking, converting grass verges into additional parking bays, speed humps, clearer 20mph signage, and improved visibility at blind corners.

Finally, residents expressed that their concerns were ignored through the planning process and that this TRO is an extension of that. Residents also referred to a letter that they received regarding the lining works which were scheduled to begin before the public consultation period had ended. Residents stated this undermined the legitimacy of the process.

8.2. In response to the representations, following a thorough review of all feedback received, discussions with the GCC Highway Legal Agreements & Highway Development Management teams, it has been recommended to GCC to proceed with the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) advertised in April/May 2025 for the following reasons:

- The restrictions have been proposed as a result of a planning permission condition in the interests of highway safety.
- The TRO's objectives include preventing inconsiderate and inappropriate parking, double parking, and parking that obstructs vehicles travelling along the roads, turning or manoeuvring (particularly emergency and refuse vehicles). The restrictions also aim to prevent parking close to junctions, accesses and improve sight lines supplementing Rule 243 of the Highway Code (no parking within 10 metres of or opposite a junction). The proposal also aims to prevent obstruction to the access to the sports centre in the turning head at the end of Laburnum Road. The proposal aligns with these objectives.
- As part of the development, 10 new parking bays are proposed on private land behind the public footway on the eastern side of Laburnum Road. These bays are intended to offset the loss of legitimate on-street parking space resulting from the introduction of waiting restrictions near the turning head and site access. They will be available for residents who currently rely on on-street spaces in that area. Overall, this addition will increase the total legal parking provision on Laburnum Road compared with what would be lost due to the development. To ensure these new bays remain accessible and unobstructed, "No Waiting at Any Time" (Double Yellow Line) restrictions are proposed along the adjacent straight section of carriageway to the east of Laburnum Road and north of the sports centre access.
- A number of residents raised concerns to the Local Planning Authority (Gloucester City Council) during the planning process regarding parking, particularly at junctions with Laburnum Road and at the bend on Laburnum Road. This TRO proposal seeks to address these concerns.
- As part of the planning process, the applicant conducted a parking survey that accounted for the proposed waiting restrictions. The survey identified a total of 85 safe and suitable public on-street parking spaces within the study area. During the survey, a maximum of 46 spaces were occupied on a weekday (Tuesday) and 57 on a Saturday, equating to parking stress levels of 54.1% and 67.1%, respectively. Therefore, the introduction of the TRO, should have negligible impact on the parking availability in the area and should not result in a significant

migration of parking to other areas. Note: *For calculating the available car parking spaces, areas in front of garages/parking spaces and the turning heads along Sycamore Close, Redwood Close and the western side of Laburnum Road were not included in the calculation of the car parking stress levels but were recorded as informal/obstructive parking. Parking along the northern side of Laburnum Road where residential properties front the road have been omitted, as it is considered parking on both sides of the carriageway would restrict the free flow of traffic.*

- There are the following exemptions to No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Lines) restrictions which should go a long way at mitigating some concerns raised through this TRO consultation:
  - o Loading and Unloading: You can stop for as long as is necessary to continuously load or unload goods from a vehicle (e.g. shopping, tools, furniture etc.)
  - o Passenger Boarding and Alighting: You can stop to allow passengers to board or alight.
  - o Disabled Badge Holders: Badge Holders can park on Double Yellow Lines for up to 3 hours, provided it is safe to do so and does not cause obstruction.
  - o You can stop to make a manoeuvre onto a driveway or into a garage. The restriction is No Waiting at Any Time and restricts parking, not stopping.
- Comments received relating to the planning process fall outside the remit of this TRO scheme, which is separate from the planning process which has already concluded.
- Comments suggesting the introduction of residents' parking schemes, the creation of additional parking spaces through the removal of grass verges, or the implementation of traffic calming measures such as speed humps fall outside the scope of this TRO. This consultation specifically relates to proposed waiting (yellow line) restrictions.
- Electric vehicle charging cables should not overhang the footway as they are a tripping hazard and cables running across footpaths can cause pedestrians to trip and fall, as well as obstruct the footway for people using wheelchairs. On-street EV chargers are currently being implemented as part of a GCC county wide initiative to allow for safe on-street charging.
- Comments regarding improvements to the 20mph speed limit signage should be reported via "FixMyStreet" <https://fixmystreet.goucestershire.gov.uk/> in the first instance. Requests for any other type of traffic calming or restriction or extensions to the existing restrictions should be directed to your Local County Councillor in the first instance.
- GCC were unaware of the letter sent to residents by the developer regarding the installation of the waiting restrictions and had not authorised any lining works by the developer, as the TRO consultation process has not been completed. As soon as GCC became aware of this, the lining works were halted until the outcome of the TRO consultation has been decided, in order to prevent any undermining of the statutory TRO process.
- The proposal aligns with GCC's 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 proposed 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 E).

## **10. Summary**

- 10.1. It is proposed to introduce additional No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions on sections of the carriageway at Podsmead Place, Laburnum Road, Chaucer Close, Poplar Close, Sycamore Close & Redwood Close, Gloucester.
- 10.2. The proposals are in association with the ongoing development at the Blackbridge Sports Field and aim to address the potential for future access and egress issues for vehicles navigating these roads and junctions, following the completion of the sports centre development. The proposal seeks to prevent inconsiderate and inappropriate parking, double parking and parking where it causes obstructions for vehicles (in particular for emergency service vehicles). It 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).
- 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 TRO meets GCC's obligations in that it 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. 18 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 A) have been designed, taking into account the representations received, 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 April/May 2025.

## **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, the planning process 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 April/May 2025.

## **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 April/May 2025.
- 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: 9<sup>th</sup> October 2025

## **Appendices**

**Appendix A** – Advertised TRO Proposal Plan

**Appendix B** – Draft Legal Documents for TRO

**Appendix C** – TRO Proposal Plan for Informal Resident and Business consultation

**Appendix D** – Representations received during the Notice of Proposal Public Consultation

**Appendix E** – Statement of Due Regard