

Traffic Regulation Order Report:

Proposed Waiting & Stopping Restrictions: Various Roads, Abbeydale, Abbeymead & Barnwood Wards, City of Gloucester, Gloucestershire.

Version 1 – April 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	4
5. Traffic Data	5
6. Consultation on the proposed TRO.....	5
7. Objections/Support.....	5
8. Details of Representations and Case Officers Response.....	7
9. Equality Impact Assessment.....	16
10. Summary.....	16
11. View of the Case Officer	17
12. Recommendation by the Senior Case Officer	17
13. Decision by the Assistant Director - Traffic & Transport.....	18
Appendices.....	19

Traffic Regulation Order Title:

GLOUCESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL ON STREET PARKING ORDER 2017 (VARIOUS ROADS, ABBEYDALE, ABBEYMEAD AND BARNWOOD WARDS) (CITY OF GLOUCESTER) (VARIATION) ORDER 2026

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 Assistant Director - Traffic & Transport 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:
 - Make the Order as advertised in February 2026, with the exception of Abbots Road area, where the decision will be deferred, at the request of the Local County Councillor, so that further research can be undertaken before a final decision is made.

3. Background and Purpose of the Scheme

- 3.1. In order to improve road safety and amenity for both vehicles and pedestrians on the roads in question, it is proposed to introduce waiting and stopping restrictions on parts of various roads in the Wards of Abbeydale, Abbeymead & Barnwood in the City of Gloucester. These come at the request of the County Councillor and are being funded through their highways local funding.
- 3.2. The proposed restrictions aim to prevent inappropriate and inconsiderate parking, double parking, parking close to junctions and parking where it causes obstructions to vehicles, including emergency service vehicles. The proposals also aim to prevent stopping on Mead Road in the vicinity of Abbeymead Primary School, in order to provide safer, unobstructed access to the school entrance and crossing points throughout the duration of the school day.
- 3.3. Additionally, the proposals will prevent parking close to junctions, bends, narrow sections of carriageway, and where it affects sight lines for vehicles and pedestrians, supplementing Rule 243 of the Highway Code (no parking within 10 metres of or opposite a junction). These measures also aim to improve road safety and amenity in the affected areas.

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 across multiple site assessments 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 and stopping 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 from 2nd December 2024 to 10th January 2025. A letter and plan which explained the proposals and the reasoning behind them were posted directly to properties affected by the proposals. Consultees were able to respond via email or post. A copy of these letters can be found in Appendix D.
- 6.2. In response to feedback garnered during the informal residents and businesses consultation, officers met with the Local Highway Manager and discussed the feedback received. It was agreed to make amendments to the proposals as a result of the feedback garnered and to cease to progress the proposal at Robin Close. Revised proposal plans were drawn up, and the Local Highway Manager discussed these revised proposals with the County Councillor, who agreed to the changes and removal of Robin Close, based on the feedback received.
- 6.3. Statutory consultation for the proposed restrictions in the scheme was undertaken between 2nd June 2025 and 23rd June 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 5th February 2026 and 27th February 2026 with Notices placed on site, delivered to directly affected properties, 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 Appendix A & C). The representations made can be found in Appendix E.

7. Objections/Support

- 7.1. The Statutory Consultees responded as follows:

Name	Comments
Abbey County Councillor	Did not formally respond to the consultation but has been involved throughout the TRO process and requested the TRO through their Highways Local funding. The County Councillor also met with officers at Shire Hall in May 2026 to discuss the Public Consultation feedback. They stated they no longer supported the proposal at Abbots Road as drafted and wanted to defer a decision until further

	monitoring has been carried out. They were in support of the remainder of the proposals.
Barnwood & Hucclecote County Councillor	No comments received
Freight Haulage Association	No comments received
Road Haulage Association	No comments received
Police	Offered no objections to the proposal
Fire & Rescue	No comments received
Ambulance Service	No comments received
City Council	No comments received
Parking Enforcement Team	Offered no objections to the proposal but suggested that some informal parking places be left on Upton Lane to prevent increased chances of speeding. In response GCC received objections from residents during the informal consultation that leaving these areas unrestricted would cause them difficulty navigating their driveways. Therefore, GCC has proposed these restrictions to prevent this obstruction whilst noting that there remains sections of unrestricted carriageway to act as a natural form of traffic calming.
Local Highway Manager	Supports the proposal

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

Kimberland Way

Two responses were received, one in support (requesting extensions to the extents of the proposal) and one objection to the proposal.

Abbots Road, Trinity Road & Friary Road

Six responses were received, two in support (with one requesting extensions to the extents of the proposal) and four objections to the proposal.

Roman Road & Valerian Close

Two responses were received, one in support (requesting extensions to the extents of the proposal) and one non-committal response.

Upton Lane

Three responses were received, two were objections to the proposal and one was a non-committal response.

Longborough Drive

Three responses were received, all of which were in support for the proposal. However, two requested extensions to the extents of the proposal.

Stewarts Mill Lane

Seven responses were received, of which three were in support (with one requesting extensions to the extents of the proposal) and four were objections to the proposal.

Mead Road

No responses were received.

The Wheatridge

No responses were received.

General

One general non-committal response was received.

8. Details of Representations and Case Officers Response

Kimberland Way

- 8.1. One response raised an objection to the proposals, stating that insufficient consideration had been given to the displacement of parking onto surrounding roads, particularly The Plantation. They highlighted issues with on-street parking near the traffic calming feature, which they state restricts driveway access, reduces visibility, impedes traffic flow and could obstruct emergency vehicles, as well as creating safety concerns for children crossing to the adjacent park. Another respondent stated support for the proposed restrictions on Kimberland Way. However, they also expressed concerns that the restrictions may displace parking onto Dancers Hill & The Plantation, potentially worsening existing hazards near the traffic calming and cycle crossing. They suggested extending the restrictions, refreshing road markings, and improving signage to address visibility and safety issues for vehicles exiting nearby driveways.
- 8.2. In response to the objection & representation, the proposals at these locations come at the request of the County Councillor (following requests made to them by residents) and are being funded through their highways local funding. The restrictions 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 roads. This would also supplement Rule 243 of the Highway Code (i.e. no parking within 10 metres of or opposite a junction).

GCC acknowledge that the introduction of restrictions has the potential to displace parking onto surrounding roads, including The Plantation and Dancers Hill. Parking behaviour on adjacent roads, including areas near traffic calming features, driveway accesses, and pedestrian crossing points, has been reviewed as part of the assessment. During multiple site visits, inappropriate parking was not regularly observed, and the assessments indicate that parked vehicles in these locations would not obstruct emergency service vehicles navigating the roads. Consequently, at present, on-street parking in these locations does not meet the necessary threshold to warrant inclusion within this TRO. GCC will monitor the displacement of parking into the surrounding roads and will review the parking restrictions in

the area, if deemed necessary. Requests relating to refreshed road markings and signage will be referred to the Highway Maintenance team for consideration as these are outside the remit of this TRO.

Abbots Road, Trinity Road & Friary Road

- 8.3. The objections primarily related to the perceived necessity of the proposed restrictions. The objectors stated that there is not an existing problem with parking or with obstruction of sight lines at the locations affected by the proposals. It was also suggested that the introduction of the restrictions would result in displaced parking into nearby streets, which do not currently experience parking issues.

Objectors requested further information on the rationale for the proposals and the evidence used to support their introduction. One objection specifically raised concerns that the proposals could increase the risk of incidents, citing observations that vehicles frequently fail to stop at the internal Abbots Road junction. It was suggested that the removal of parked vehicles, which are considered by objectors to provide a degree of informal traffic calming, could exacerbate this issue. The objector, therefore, considered that additional traffic calming features should be introduced if the proposals were to proceed.

Concerns were also expressed regarding the availability of parking for visitors, carers and tradespeople. One objection queried the justification for the proposed No Waiting at Any Time restrictions between the Trinity Road junction and Minster Gardens, noting that the Highway Code advises against parking within 10 metres of a junction and that the proposed restrictions extend beyond this distance.

Further objections related to the cost of the scheme, with requests for clarification on the overall cost and suggestions that the allocated funding should be directed towards pothole repairs. Objectors also sought information on the frequency of enforcement and the associated enforcement costs. In addition, it was suggested that a 20mph speed limit should be implemented, as parked vehicles are perceived to act as a form of traffic calming and their removal may result in increased vehicle speeds.

Another response was received in support of the proposals but requested further extensions to the proposals. The respondent stated that given this route is the only vehicular access to the area and on-street parking can lead to congestion and access difficulties, the restrictions should be extended further along both sides of the carriageway from Abbeymead Avenue towards the Abbots Road internal junction.

- 8.4. Following the conclusion of the consultation, officers met with the Local County Councillor and the Local Highway Manager at Shire Hall to consider the feedback received. Based on the consultation responses received, together with local engagement, the Local County Councillor indicated that they no longer supported the proposal in its current format. It was, therefore, agreed that the decision on the Abbots Road area proposal would be deferred to allow further research and assessment to be undertaken, prior to a final decision being made.

In response to comments that the funds for this TRO scheme should be used to repair pot holes, the remit of the scheme is for parking restrictions and has been funded by the County Councillor. Therefore, pot hole repairs are not related to the budget for this project and are outside the remit of this scheme.

In response to the comments regarding the introduction of a 20mph speed limit, this falls outside the remit of this TRO scheme, which is for parking restrictions and would be introduced under different legislation. Should the objector wish to pursue this further, they should speak with their County Councillor in the first instance to make such a request.

Roman Road & Valerian Close

- 8.5. The response received in support of the No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions requested that the restrictions be extended to cover the junctions between Roman Road & Fosse Close & Tribune Place to mitigate against a migration of parking to other areas. Another response also asked if restrictions would be introduced at the junction between Roman Road & Vulcan Way.
- 8.6. In response to the requests, the waiting restrictions proposed come at the request of the County Councillor (based upon requests made to them by residents) and are being funded through their highways local funding. During the multiple site assessments, officers did not observe inappropriate parking at the Fosse Close, Tribune Place and Vulcan Way junctions and, therefore, deemed that waiting restrictions were not required at these locations. GCC will monitor the displacement of parking into the surrounding roads and will review the parking restrictions in the area, if deemed necessary.

Upton Lane

- 8.7. The first objector stated that while they acknowledged that unsafe parking at junctions on Upton Lane should be dealt with, they felt this could be managed through targeted enforcement such as fixed penalty notices, rather than the waiting restrictions proposed along Upton Lane. The objector is concerned that extending parking restrictions along the full length of Upton Lane, from Abbeymead Avenue to the M5 bridge, will simply displace parking into already congested side roads, worsening pavement and roadside parking problems. Another objector stated that the proposals may encourage increased vehicle speeds due to an unobstructed carriageway, and that clearer speed limit signage, rather than waiting restrictions, would be a more appropriate and safer alternative. The objector suggested No Waiting 08.15am to 9am and 3.00pm-4pm (Single Yellow Line) restrictions as an alternative to prevent parking only during peak times.
- 8.8. In response to the objections, without the introduction of waiting restrictions GCC are unable to enforce parking, as civil enforcement requires parking controls backed by a valid TRO and signed/lined on street in accordance with DfT TSRGD 2016 regulations. The proposed restrictions will provide clarity for motorists on where parking is permitted and where it is not, as well as enabling enforcement by civil enforcement officers.

In response to comments surrounding the extent of the proposal and the risk of the migration of parking, the proposal has been developed based upon feedback derived during the

informal consultation and the extents of the proposal were expanded to reflect the feedback received. It is acknowledged that some displacement of parking is inevitable, but as the restrictions are targeted in their nature, there is likely to be a very small migration of parking. Where this does occur, vehicles will likely be displaced evenly, rather than into one location. Additionally, as alluded to above unrestricted sections of carriageway have been left in the proposal area in areas where it is safer for parking to occur and will continue to remain unrestricted to be utilised. GCC will monitor the displacement of parking into the surrounding roads and will review the parking restrictions in the area, if deemed necessary.

In response to the comments surrounding an increase in vehicle speeds under this proposal, it is unlikely that vehicle speeds will significantly increase, as there are sections of carriageway within the proposal area which will remain unrestricted. Therefore, vehicles will remain parked in these locations and as such, should continue to act as a form of natural traffic calming, keeping vehicle speeds reduced.

In response to the comments regarding improvements to speed limit signage, the existing speed limit on Upton Lane is already correctly signed in accordance with the TSRGD 2016. As the road is subject to a 30 mph speed limit by virtue of a system of street lighting, it is defined as a restricted road and, therefore, the use of repeater signs is not permitted. Consequently, GCC are satisfied that the speed limit is appropriately signed.

In response to the comments surrounding the introduction of time restricted waiting restrictions, these would not be a suitable solution given parking would continue to be permitted outside of the restricted times. Therefore, it would not tackle the parking issue that these restrictions aim to address - inconsiderate & inappropriate parking, double parking and parking that causes obstruction.

- 8.9. Another response was received that stated they would not raise an objection, but suggested vehicles have not historically parked close to the affected junctions and consider the proposals to be unjustified and not preventative of an existing problem. The representee suggested that there is little evidence to warrant the proposed restrictions and that the introduction and ongoing maintenance of road markings would represent an unnecessary burden on public funds. The representee further notes that existing Highway Code provisions already prohibit obstructive parking, but expresses the view that police enforcement is infrequent, which is seen as undermining the effectiveness of current regulations. While acknowledging that a TRO is required for enforcement by GCC, the representee considers it unlikely that enforcement officers would attend the location, given the perception that parking contraventions do not occur at the proposed restriction sites.
- 8.10. In response to the representation, the waiting restrictions proposed come at the request of the County Councillor (based upon requests made to them by residents) and are being funded through their highways local funding. Vehicles have been observed parking near the affected junctions during multiple site visits undertaken as part of the TRO process, supported by feedback received during the informal consultation. While the representee suggests that parking has not historically occurred at these locations, the absence of reported issues does not rule out the introduction of preventative measures where road safety concerns exist. The

proposals are based on professional highway safety assessment and established junction protection standards and are intended to address both existing and potential future parking issues. Ongoing maintenance costs are planned as part of GCCs existing maintenance budget and programme. Whilst the Highway Code does state that vehicles should not park in these locations, without the introduction of waiting restrictions backed by a TRO, GCC are currently unable to enforce inappropriate parking practices that occur at these locations.

In response to comments regarding parking enforcement, the proposed restrictions would be enforced by Civil Enforcement Officers as part of GCC's existing parking enforcement arrangements. Enforcement patrols are planned and delivered in accordance with the GCC Parking Enforcement Strategy, with activity targeted on a risk-based and demand led approach to ensure efficient and proportionate use of resources. The introduction of the restrictions would not in itself require continuous enforcement, but compliance is expected to become largely self-enforcing over time, supported by periodic patrols.

Longborough Drive

- 8.11. A representation was received stating that the proposed restrictions should be extended to cover the section of carriageway between Abbeymead Avenue and Staunton Close. The representee stated that parking here restricts sight lines and creates a danger to road users, particularly when vehicles park too close to the Abbeymead Avenue junction, given the width of the road. Another representation also requested that restrictions be implemented opposite the junction with Staunton Close. The representee stated that vehicles parking there causes obstruction which forces vehicles onto the wrong side of the carriageway in order to navigate around the parked vehicles.
- 8.12. In response to the representations, the extent of the restrictions proposed on Longborough Drive has been carefully reviewed, taking into account Highway Code guidance, the existing road geometry, on-street parking demand and operational highway safety considerations, as well as feedback gathered from residents during the informal consultation process. The proposed restrictions have been designed to enable enforcement of Rule 243 of the Highway Code, whilst appropriately balancing the need to retain on-street parking in locations where it can be accommodated safely. The restrictions proposed should alleviate the concerns raised regarding parking close to the junction with Abbeymead Avenue, where the carriageway narrows, and Staunton Close, thereby improving visibility and allowing vehicles to safely enter and exit these junctions without obstruction.

The section of unrestricted carriageway between Abbeymead Avenue and Staunton Close has been deliberately retained to provide on-street parking for residents and visitors, while also acting as a form of passive traffic calming by encouraging lower vehicle speeds along Longborough Drive. In addition, the geometry and width of the carriageway opposite the junction with Staunton Close create a lay-by effect, and a vehicle parked in this location sits outside the normal swept path of moving traffic and therefore is considered to not obstruct vehicle movements or compromise highway safety. These observations are consistent with site assessments and align with feedback received during the informal consultation. GCC will monitor parking following the introduction of the proposals and will conduct further reviews of the parking restrictions in the area, if deemed necessary.

Stewarts Mill Lane

- 8.13. The first objection stated that the proposal should not allow parking to be permitted opposite a junction as it could obstruct visibility and create hazards for both drivers and pedestrians. The objector requested that restrictions be introduced opposite junctions to alleviate their concerns.
- 8.14. In response to the objection, the extent of the restrictions proposed has been carefully reviewed, taking into account Highway Code guidance, the existing road geometry, on-street parking demand and operational highway safety considerations, as well as feedback gathered from residents during the informal consultation process. Several sections of carriageway opposite junctions have been restricted under this proposal where parking is deemed unsafe and has only been left unrestricted if deemed safe to do so. The proposed restrictions have been designed to enable enforcement of Rule 243 of the Highway Code, whilst appropriately balancing the need to retain on-street parking in locations where it can be accommodated safely. Therefore, GCC believe that the proposed restrictions are appropriate and suitable for implementation.
- 8.15. Three objections were received that stated that many households rely on on-street parking due to limited off-street provision, with numerous properties having more vehicles than available space off-street. They raise concerns that the loss of parking under the proposals would make it difficult for residents to park second vehicles and would significantly affect visitors, tradespeople, and delivery vehicles, leading to increased competition for the remaining unrestricted spaces. The objections suggested that displaced vehicles would instead park on adjacent streets, increasing pressure on remaining unrestricted spaces.

The objectors consider that there is no evidence of a persistent safety or congestion issue on this road, noting an absence of recorded accidents or ongoing access problems under the existing arrangements. Therefore, they feel the proposals are a disproportionate response to any occasional obstruction.

The objectors consider the proposal to be unfair to homeowners who purchased their properties expecting on-street parking to remain available. They also argue that the cost of implementing the restrictions would be better spent addressing highway maintenance issues, such as repairing potholes.

One objector raised concerns regarding the potential negative impact on residents' quality of life, particularly for elderly and less mobile residents who rely on parking in close proximity to their homes. The objectors indicate that alternative, less restrictive measures such as marked parking bays, resident permit parking, or signage have not been adequately considered and could address any specific issues without removing parking provision entirely. The objector also stated that there has been inadequate consultation and that there has been no wider engagement with residents, with the exception of the formal notice being delivered through their door.

- 8.16. In response to the objections, the restrictions are proposed in order to prevent inconsiderate & inappropriate parking, as well as double parking, at locations where it causes obstructions

for vehicles utilising this section of carriageway. These restrictions have been proposed in response to concerns raised to the County Councillor regarding road safety issues at this location, caused by inconsiderate & inappropriate parking. GCC has intentionally kept sections of these carriageways unrestricted, where deemed safe to do so, to continue to maintain some parking provision here for residents to utilise. The scheme is limited in its nature in order to not be over-restrictive and only restrict parking where it is deemed unsafe to park. No legitimate safe parking places are lost under this proposal and the absence of parked vehicles in these locations will have a road safety benefit. GCC as the highway authority has a duty of care for all road users and has to manage its road network in order to improve road safety. The proposal aligns with these duties.

In response to comments surrounding the availability of parking for visitors, carers and tradespeople near to their properties, the scheme is targeted in its nature to only restrict parking where it is not safe to do, and as a result there will remain areas of carriageway unrestricted to continue to provide parking on-street. Additionally, loading and unloading are still permissible on Double Yellow Line restrictions. Therefore, these actions would still be permitted under this proposal, and these restrictions would not impact the deliveries or tradespersons undertaking these tasks.

In response to the comments surrounding where displaced residents should park their vehicles, it is not the responsibility of GCC to advise residents where to park their cars. The vehicle must be parked legally and in accordance with the Highway Code and not contravene any waiting restrictions or the vehicle may be liable to receive a Penalty Charge Notice.

In response to comments surrounding the migration of parking, some displacement of parking is inevitable, but as the restrictions do not remove any legitimate parking places, there is likely to be a very small migration of parking. Where this does occur, vehicles will likely be displaced evenly, rather than into one location. Additionally, as alluded to above unrestricted sections of carriageway have been left in the proposal area and, therefore, unrestricted parking will remain nearby. GCC will monitor the displacement of parking into the surrounding roads and will review the parking restrictions in the area, if deemed necessary.

In response to comments surrounding the evidence base and the need for these restrictions, vehicles have been observed to be parking here by the case officer over many site assessments throughout the TRO process. This is also supported by the positive feedback received during the informal consultation and this consultation process. The proposals will prevent parking in these unsuitable locations and a statement that vehicles do not park there is not a satisfactory reason to abandon a proposal, when there is a road safety concern surrounding inappropriate parking. Additionally, these locations come at the request of the County Councillor (based upon requests made to them by residents) and are being funded through their highways local funding.

GCC acknowledge the concerns raised regarding introducing waiting restrictions where properties were purchased with an expectation of on-street parking. However, it should be noted that there is no entitlement to park on the public highway, and the primary function of the highway is to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of traffic. Where parking is considered to be unsafe, obstructive, or detrimental to visibility, particularly near junctions,

this cannot be dismissed on the basis of convenience or historic parking practices. GCC as the highway authority has a duty of care for all road users and must prioritise road safety and accessibility over parking demand, and potential impacts on expectations of parking availability cannot outweigh the need to address locations where parking presents a safety risk.

In response to comments that the funds for this TRO scheme should be used to repair pot holes instead, the remit of the scheme is for parking restrictions and has been funded by the County Councillor. Therefore, pothole repairs are not related to the budget for this project and are outside the remit of this scheme

In response to the comments regarding the perceived negative impact on residents' quality of life, particularly for elderly and less mobile, if these residents are a blue badge holder they would be able to apply for an advisory disabled bay marking. Whilst this would not be able to be placed in the areas which the restrictions are proposed, it could be placed in an unrestricted section of carriageway adjacent to the restrictions and near to their property. Information and the application form can be found here: [Disabled Marked Bay and H Marking - Highways \(pplprojects.co.uk\)](https://www.pplprojects.co.uk/Disabled-Marked-Bay-and-H-Marking-Highways). Disabled Badge Holders are permitted to park on Double Yellow Lines for up to 3 hours provided that it is safe to do so. Loading and unloading are still permissible on Double Yellow Line restrictions. Therefore, elderly or less mobile residents would continue to be able to undertake these tasks under this proposal. Additionally, as alluded to above, unrestricted parking will remain nearby on-street outside of the areas restricted by the proposals, continuing to provide on-street parking in the vicinity.

In response to comments surrounding residents parking or alternative parking solutions such as marked bays, these would not be a suitable solution as it would not tackle the parking issue that these restrictions aim to address - inconsiderate & inappropriate parking, double parking and parking that causes obstruction.

In response to the comments surrounding consultation, GCC has followed the prescribed TRO consultation procedure in accordance with the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. GCC also had significant informal engagement with residents directly affected by the proposals in December 2024/January 2025, allowing for the opportunity to inform the proposals prior to the statutory TRO process commencing. GCC considered the feedback received during this informal engagement and used this to inform the development of the final proposals. Therefore, GCC has gone above the statutory requirements regarding consultation and considers that the level of engagement undertaken has been both comprehensive and proportionate, enabling a fully informed assessment of the proposals.

- 8.17. Two responses were also received which expressed support for the proposals due to persistent and hazardous parking. However, they also raised related concerns that the proposals may be insufficient or create new problems. One respondent highlighted the risk of drivers diverting to the parking areas outside numbers 52–58, if on-street parking is restricted, suggesting signage to deter this. The other respondent argued that the restrictions should be extended further around the Combrook Close junction to improve visibility when exiting, noting that the vehicles parking there do not belong to residents.

- 8.18. In response to the comments regarding the risk of drivers diverting to the parking areas outside numbers 52–58, these areas are not adopted public highway. As such, GCC does not have the powers to introduce parking restrictions, signage, or enforcement measures here. Additionally, as alluded to above unrestricted sections of carriageway have been left in the proposal area and will continue to remain unrestricted. Therefore, it is unlikely that parking will migrate into these areas. However, should issues relating to their arise, then these would need to be addressed by the landowner.

In response to the comments surrounding an extension around the Combrook Close junction, the extent of the restrictions proposed has been carefully reviewed, taking into account Highway Code guidance, the existing road geometry, on-street parking demand and operational highway safety considerations, as well as feedback gathered from residents during the informal consultation process. Therefore, GCC consider the junction protection measures included in the proposal to be sufficient to prevent inappropriate parking. GCC has intentionally kept sections of these carriageways unrestricted, where deemed safe to do so, to continue to maintain some parking provision here for any road user to utilise. The scheme is limited in its nature in order to not be over-restrictive and only restrict parking where it is deemed unsafe to park. When implementing parking restrictions, it is important to maintain a balance between where parking is permitted and where it is not permitted, so as not to be 'over-restrictive'. The proposal aligns with this guidance.

General

- 8.19. One response was received regarding all the proposed restrictions stating that they are not persuaded the measures would necessarily improve road safety or amenity. They state that vehicles already parking close to junctions may continue to do so, regardless of the No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions. The respondent stated they supported the principle of protecting and improving sight lines, particularly to assist deaf people, with a suggestion that a site visit could help identify more effective improvements. The respondent also proposed the introduction of 20 mph speed limits at all the locations included within this waiting restriction package, arguing this would better enhance safety and amenity at key junctions.
- 8.20. In response to the representation, No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Lines) are well documented to improve the navigability of roads as well as to improve road safety and amenity generally for vehicles (including cyclists) and pedestrians. The introduction of these measures will allow for the enforcement of parking close to junctions and make these practices illegal, which should improve visibility, discourage unsafe parking behaviour, and enhance overall road safety and amenity for all road users. The introduction of these measures will also improve sight lines, which were considered during the multiple site visits undertaken as part of this TRO scheme assessment.

In response to the comments regarding the introduction of 20mph speed limits, these requests fall outside the remit of this TRO scheme, which is for parking restrictions and would be introduced under different legislation. Should the representee wish to pursue this further, they should speak with their County Councillor in the first instance to make such a request.

It is also worth noting that a 20 mph speed limit, on its own, would not be a suitable solution to the issues identified and would be unlikely to significantly improve road safety or amenity at junctions. Such a measure would not address the problem of obstructive parking that the proposed waiting restrictions are intended to resolve, and vehicle speeds at junctions are already generally low due to the need for drivers to slow and manoeuvre. GCC as the highway authority has a duty of care for all road users and must manage its road network in order to improve road safety. The proposals included within this package align with these duties. Consequently, GCC believe that the proposed restrictions are appropriate and suitable for implementation.

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 Statement in Appendix F).

10. Summary

- 10.1. In order to improve road safety and amenity for both vehicles and pedestrians on the roads in question, it is proposed to introduce waiting and stopping restrictions on parts of various roads in the Wards of Abbeydale, Abbeymead & Barnwood in the City of Gloucester. These come at the request of the County Councillor and are being funded through their highways local funding.
- 10.2. The proposed restrictions aim to prevent inappropriate and inconsiderate parking, double parking, parking close to junctions and parking where it causes obstructions to vehicles, including emergency service vehicles. The proposals also aim to prevent stopping on Mead Road in the vicinity of Abbeymead Primary School, in order to provide safer, unobstructed access to the school entrance and crossing points throughout the duration of the school day.
- 10.3. Additionally, the proposals will prevent parking close to junctions, bends, narrow sections of carriageway, and where it affects sight lines for vehicles and pedestrians, supplementing Rule 243 of the Highway Code (no parking within 10 metres of or opposite a junction). These measures also aim to improve road safety and amenity in the affected areas.
- 10.4. Representations were received during the Notice of Proposal (Public Consultation) process from residents with regards to the proposed restrictions.
- 10.5. Following the conclusion of the consultation, officers met with the Local County Councillor and the Local Highway Manager at Shire Hall to consider the feedback received. Based on the consultation responses received, together with local engagement, the Local County Councillor indicated that they no longer supported the proposal for the Abbots Road area as drafted. It was, therefore, agreed that the decision on the proposal for the Abbots Road area

would be deferred to allow further research and assessment to be undertaken, prior to a final decision being made. All other proposed restrictions were agreed to proceed.

- 10.6. 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.
- 10.7. In considering the assessment under Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the proposed Waiting & Stopping 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.

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. As a result of the consultation feedback for the proposal at the Abbots Road area, the County Councillor has withdrawn their support for this proposal and, therefore, the decision on this proposal will be deferred to give officers time to carry out further assessments.
- 11.3. Seven objections have been raised from members of the public during the Notice of Proposal (Public Consultation) process across the remainder of the proposal areas, which is a small proportion of those consulted throughout these areas. Therefore, it can be considered that these proposals are deemed to be acceptable to the vast majority.
- 11.4. The final proposals (as shown in Appendix B) have been designed, taking into account the representations received, the desires of the County Councillor and also balancing this with the Council's duties under Sections 1 and 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and with the fact that only seven Objections were received.
- 11.5. 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 February 2026, with the exception of Abbots Road area, where the decision will be deferred, at the request of the Local County Councillor, so that further research can be undertaken before a final decision is made.

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. At the request of the County Councillor, the decision on the Abbots Road Area proposal will be deferred to allow further assessments to be undertaken.
- 12.3. Although some objections to the remainder of the proposals within this TRO package 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 in February 2026, with the exception of Abbots Road area, where the decision will be deferred, at the request of the Local County Councillor, so that further research can be undertaken before a final decision is made.

13. Decision by the Traffic and Active Travel 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 February 2026, with the exception of Abbots Road area, where the decision will be deferred, at the request of the Local County Councillor, so that further research can be undertaken before a final decision is made.
- 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:



Nathaniel Davis – Traffic and Active Travel Manager

Date: 28/08/2026

Appendices

Appendix A – Advertised TRO Proposal Plans

Appendix B – Final TRO Proposal Plans

Appendix C – Draft TRO Legal Documents

Appendix D – Informal Residents Consultation Letters

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

Appendix F – Statement of Due Regard