

# Traffic Regulation Order Report:

## Proposed Waiting, Permit Holder/Limited Waiting, Loading Only & Disabled Badge Holder Restrictions: Various Roads, Lechlade-on-Thames, Gloucestershire.

Version 1 – November 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 .....	4
5. Traffic Data .....	5
6. Consultation on the proposed TROs.....	5
7. Objections/Support.....	5
8. Details of Objections and Case Officers Response .....	6
9. Modification.....	8
10. Equality Impact Assessment.....	10
11. Summary.....	10
12. View of the Case Officer.....	12
13. Recommendation by the Senior Case Officer .....	12
14. Decision by the Traffic Regulation Order Manager .....	13
Appendices.....	14

**Traffic Regulation Order Title:**

**GLOUCESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL ON STREET PARKING ORDER 2017 (VARIOUS ROADS) (TOWN OF LECHLADE-ON-THAMES) (COTSWOLD DISTRICT) (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 with the inclusion of the modified proposal elements as advertised in September/October 2025.

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

- 3.1. This scheme has been initiated following a request from Lechlade Town Council to amend the existing parking restrictions in Lechlade-on-Thames. In response, GCC conducted a review of the town's parking arrangements. As a result of this review, a series of proposed changes to the current restrictions have been developed. The proposals include:

- Introducing additional No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions.
- Formalising the existing advisory Disabled Badge Holder Only Bays in the Market Place.
- Realigning the layout of the existing Limited Waiting 2 Hours No Return 2 Hours Bays in the on-street car park in the Market Place.
- Creating additional shared use Permit Holder/Limited Waiting Bays on Burford Street.
- Formalising the description and wording of existing shared use Permit Holder/Limited Waiting restrictions on Burford Street & Oak Street.
- Replacing three parking bays and the keep clear marking outside of The Swan with a parallel to the kerb Loading Only Bay (as part of the modification outlined in Section 9).

- 3.2. The No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions are proposed to prevent parking where it causes obstruction to access or the road in general. These restrictions would also supplement Rule 243 of the highway code (no parking within 10 metres of or opposite a junction).

- 3.3. On Burford Street and Oak Street, the restrictions are proposed to formalise the shared use limited waiting and permit holder bays, as well as to maximise the on-street space available for parking. The existing restrictions are proposed to be revoked and reproposed with a new description in order to make the restriction clearer to all road users and will be aided by new

signage at the works stage of the TRO process (if successful). There will be no material change to the shared use limited waiting/permit holder bays restrictions and the impact it has on road users.

- 3.4. The proposed restrictions on St John's Street aim to prevent inconsiderate and inappropriate parking, including double parking and parking close to the junction with the A417. These measures are intended to improve road safety and overall amenity. Additionally, the restrictions will prevent parking that obstructs large vehicles (including emergency service vehicles) and cyclists, as well as parking that affects sight lines.
- 3.5. At the Market Place, the restrictions are proposed to formalise the existing disabled badge holder bays and to provide a designated route for disabled badge holders to access the existing dropped kerb, in order to cross the road to utilise the town facilities.

#### **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 consulted over a four-week period from 11<sup>th</sup> September 2024 to 9<sup>th</sup> October 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. After reviewing the responses and engaging in further discussions with Lechlade Town Council, it was agreed to reduce the extent of the proposed restrictions on St John's Street, to continue to provide some on-street parking provision.
- 6.2. Statutory consultation for the proposed restrictions in the scheme was undertaken between 13<sup>th</sup> January 2025 and 3<sup>rd</sup> February 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 17<sup>th</sup> April 2025 and 9<sup>th</sup> May 2025 with Notices placed on site and delivered to directly affected properties, advertised in the local newspaper (Wilts and Gloucestershire Standard), placed on the GCC website and hard copies were put on deposit at Shire Hall and Lechlade 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 24<sup>th</sup> September 2025 and 15<sup>th</sup> October 2025 with Notices placed on site, delivered to directly affected properties and emailed to the members of the public who made a representation on the above, as well as to the statutory consultees. The proposal was also advertised on the GCC website and hard copies were placed on deposit at Shire Hall and Lechlade Library. The Notice of Modification Documents and proposal plan can be found in Appendix D.
- 6.6. The representations made during the Notice of Modification can be found in Appendix E.

## 7. Objections/Support

- 7.1. The Statutory Consultees responded as follows:

Name	Comments
County Councillor	No comments received
Freight Haulage Association	No comments received
Road Haulage Association	No comments received

Police	Offered no objections to the proposal
Town Council	Offered no objections to 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	Did not formally respond to the consultation but has been involved and supportive throughout the TRO process.
District Council	Offered no objections to the proposal

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

14 responses were received. Of these responses, two were in support of the proposals, seven issued a non-committal response and five were objections to the proposal.

**8. Details of Objections and Case Officers Response during Public Consultation**

8.1. Several responses stated objections due to the perception that the proposals introduced a 2-hour limited waiting restriction on Burford Street & Oak Street. The objectors stated this would reduce the potential for longer stay parking, increase vehicle movements in and out of the bays and reduce road safety. The responses also stated it would also result in Sherborne Street having an increased demand for parking as vehicles would be displaced to look for other longer stay parking places.

8.2. In response to the above objections, the proposal seeks to formalise the description and wording of existing shared use Permit Holder/Limited Waiting restrictions on Burford Street & Oak Street. There will be no changes to the impact the existing restriction has on drivers under this formalisation of the restriction description, as the 2-hour limited waiting provision is already in operation. Therefore, these grounds for objection are not considered valid.

8.3. Objections were also received regarding there already being a lack of parking in Lechlade and that the proposals would make it even more difficult for residents, particularly those without permits, to find parking places.

8.4. In response, as previously outlined, the existing 2-hour limited waiting restriction on Burford Street and Oak Street remains unchanged under this proposal. Where changes are proposed, they primarily involve the introduction of small sections of No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions in areas that are not legitimate parking spaces and are proposed to prevent parking where it causes obstruction to access or the road in general.

GCC as the highway authority has a duty of care for all road users and are not responsible for advising motorists on where to park their vehicles. It is the responsibility of the vehicle owner to ensure their vehicle is parked legally, in accordance with the Highway Code, and not in violation of any waiting restrictions. Failure to do so may result in the issue of a Penalty Charge Notice.

8.5. Objections were also received regarding the proposed removal of the advisory Keep Clear markings outside of The Swan and New Wave Brassiere and their replacement with shared use permit holders/limited waiting parking bays. The objections stated that the introduction of these shared use bays would impact businesses, as they would not be able to receive deliveries near to their premises. Objectors also highlighted the potential for the cellar doors

to The Swan's Cellar being obstructed by parked vehicles overhanging the kerb in the existing echelon bays, which raised a serious safety issue.

- 8.6. In response to these objections, GCC advertised a modification to the original proposal to address these concerns. The details of this modification can be found in Section 9.
- 8.7. An objection was also received regarding the proposed No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions on St Johns Street. The objector stated that parking along this section of carriageway acts as a natural form of traffic calming and that the removal of parking here would have the potential to increase vehicle speeds through the area.
- 8.8. In response to the objection, the proposed restrictions on St Johns Street are unlikely to significantly increase vehicle speeds, given the restrictions replace an existing No Waiting 8am-6:30pm (Single Yellow Line) restriction that currently prevents parking during most of the day. The proposed restrictions aim to prevent parking, at any time, in this section of carriageway near to the junction between St John's Street and Burford Street. This is to address the obstruction and congestion issues parked vehicles here can cause at night. The restrictions would also supplement Rule 243 of the Highway Code.

Additionally, parked vehicles will remain on St John's Street beyond the proposal area which will continue to act as a natural form of traffic calming. Therefore, the combination of these parked vehicles and the junction should keep vehicle speeds low along this section of the carriageway.

- 8.9. A response was also raised regarding the minor extension to the No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) Restrictions outside of Budgens. The response stated support for the proposals but requested that this remain as an unrestricted area, so that it may be used for loading and unloading purposes.
- 8.10. In response, the proposed extension to the No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) Restrictions have been proposed to ensure that the goods delivery door to Budgens is kept clear of parked vehicles. At present, this area is a parking space which may be utilised by any vehicle. The introduction of No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) Restrictions will maintain clear access to this delivery door. No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) Restrictions have an exemption for loading and unloading. Therefore, loading and unloading will continue to be possible at this location following the implementation of the proposal.
- 8.11. A representation was also received which requested that the No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions proposed on the south side of St Johns Street be extended at least up to the dropped kerb for St John's Coach House to prevent a small section of carriageway being used as a parking space between the proposed end of the No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions and the start of the dropped kerb.
- 8.12. In response to this representation, GCC advertised a modification to the original proposal to address this concern. The details of this modification can be found in Section 9.
- 8.13. A representation was also received that stated support for the proposals, but raised a concern that relocating the parking bays in the marketplace to the east, as proposed, would reduce the width of the carriageway outside Maple House and the Old Vicarage, where overnight

parking is currently unrestricted. They questioned whether there would be sufficient clearance for vehicles to pass parked vehicles here.

- 8.14. In response to the concern raised, the parking bays within the Market Place car park will be selectively realigned to accommodate the proposed pedestrian walkway connecting the disabled bays to the dropped kerb. This adjustment will apply only to the bays in the immediate vicinity of the walkway and will not involve shifting the entire car park eastward. The realignment will aim to retain as many parking spaces as possible while ensuring that no additional eastward encroachment onto the carriageway occurs.
- 8.15. A response was also received stating that there should be a sign at the traffic lights and on St John's Street to indicate that there is free car parking at the Memorial Hall. The representee stated this facility is currently underused and would help visitors find the free parking.
- 8.16. In response, this is not something that is within the remit of this TRO scheme or the TRO Team. The car park is privately owned and not the responsibility of GCC and so GCC are unable to erect signage to direct visitors to this car park.
- 8.17. A response was also received questioning whether the restrictions (both existing and proposed) on Sherborne Street near to Lechlade Motor Company would prevent loading and unloading of vehicles.
- 8.18. In response, the restrictions on the northern side of Sherborne Street (directly outside of Lechlade Motor Company) are not changing under this proposal. No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions are proposed on the southern side of the carriageway to align with Rule 243 of the highway code. No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) Restrictions have an exemption for loading and unloading. Therefore, loading and unloading will continue to be possible at this location following the implementation of the proposal.

## **9. Modification**

- 9.1. 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 changes to the extent of the proposed Permit Holders Zone 1 Lechlade/Limited Waiting 2 Hours No Return 2 Hours Mon-Sat 8am-6pm restrictions along Burford Street, where two sections of the originally proposed parking bays were removed from the proposal and replaced with different restrictions.

The first is the section of carriageway outside of The Swan, which was proposed to be replaced by a parallel to the kerb Loading Only Bay. This was in response to comments received regarding loading and unloading practices along Burford Street and the potential for the cellar doors to The Swan's Cellar being obstructed by parked vehicles overhanging the kerb in the existing echelon bays. The parallel bay would provide a dedicated loading space on Burford Street for all businesses to utilise, as well as prevent vehicles parking in such a way that they overhang the kerb and prevent the cellar doors being opened (particularly during an emergency).

The second is the section of carriageway outside of New Wave Brasserie where the existing Keep Clear marking is. Under the modified proposal the keep clear would be replaced by No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions, to formalise the parking restrictions in

this area. It will also prevent obstructions for deliveries to businesses in this area, which will continue to be able to load and unload on these restrictions.

Additionally, the proposed No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions on the south side of St John's Street were extended. The extension was to address concerns raised about the potential for obstruction to the private driveway and is intended to ensure that access to and from the property always remains unobstructed. The extension will also contribute to improved visibility and safety for all road users in the area.

- 9.2. This modification consultation (Notice of Modification) was undertaken between 24<sup>th</sup> September 2025 and 15<sup>th</sup> October 2025 with Notices placed on site, delivered to directly affected properties and emailed to the members of the public who made a representation on the above, as well as to the statutory consultees. The proposal was also advertised on the GCC website and hard copies were placed on deposit at Shire Hall and Lechlade Library. The Notice of Modification Documents and proposal plan can be found in Appendix D. The responses received during the Notice of Modification can be found in Appendix E.
- 9.3. During this consultation seven responses were received. Two were from Statutory Consultees and five were from members of the public. Of these seven responses, five were non-committal responses, one was an objection, and one was a non-valid objection.
- 9.4. The objector stated that they often find it difficult to find parking places in Lechlade at present. Therefore, they strongly opposed to any measure which reduced the number of available parking spaces in Burford Street and/or Market Place.
- 9.5. In response to the objection, the proposed modification to the original TRO proposal will result in the small reduction in on-street parking places on Burford Street outside of The Swan. However, as a result of the feedback received during the Notice of Proposal stage of the TRO process, it has been established that vehicles parking in these parking places pose a serious safety issue to the cellar of The Swan, as vehicles overhang the doors and prevent them being opened (particularly during an emergency). The remainder of the proposals in the modification result in an enforceable situation in the locations where there are existing Keep Clear markings and as such no legitimate parking will be lost when compared with the existing situation in these areas. Additionally, the additional parking places created outside of Khushi Restaurant as advertised during the Notice of Proposal will remain, so there will be very minimal loss of parking places over the current situation. The proposal in the Market Place remains unchanged from the Notice of Proposal stage.
- 9.6. The non-valid objection raised an objection to an element of the proposal advertised originally during the Notice of Proposal stage. The objector did not state an objection at the Notice of Proposal stage, but requested that the Keep Clear marking outside of The Hollies on Oak Street be retained, in addition to the proposed No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions. The objector raised concerns that the removal of the Keep Clear marking would permit disabled badge holders to park over the entrance to The Hollies, as they have an exemption to park on No Waiting restrictions.
- 9.7. In response, the existing keep clear marking outside of The Hollies is only advisory and not enforceable. The introduction of No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions will not make it any more likely that Disabled Badge Holders will park over the entrance to The Hollies. However, to appease the concerns of the resident, GCC will retain the Keep Clear marking outside of The Hollies in addition to the proposed No Waiting at Any Time (Double

Yellow Line) restrictions as part of the detailed design stage of the TRO process. This mirrors the proposed situation outside of New Wave Brasserie and should help reinforce the message to drivers to not obstruct the access.

- 9.8. Two non-committal responses were received which stated that the modification proposed on St John's Street would not solve the parking problems and requested that the No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions extend at least as far as St. John's Coach House driveway and preferably as far as the western wall of No.1 St. John's Street. The representations state this would prevent parking on the south side of the street opposite cars parked on the north side.
- 9.9. In response to the request for additional No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions along St John's Street, implementing such restrictions would be overly restrictive. The carriageway is straight, and current informal parking practices that have been observed are evidently working. Should obstruction to the highway or the footway occur, this is a matter for the police to enforce and should be raised with them accordingly. When implementing parking restrictions, it is important to maintain a balance between where parking is permitted and where it is not, in order to not be deemed "over-restrictive". The proposal aligns with this balance.
- 9.10. Following the close of this consultation, officers discussed the representations with the Local Highways Manager, and they supported the modified proposal (without the removal of the keep clear marking outside of The Hollies), based upon the proposals impact on safety and the feedback received in the consultations.

## **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-economically 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).

## **11. Summary**

- 11.1. This scheme has been initiated following a request from Lechlade Town Council to amend the existing parking restrictions in Lechlade-on-Thames. In response, GCC conducted a review of the town's parking arrangements. As a result of this review, a series of proposed changes to the current restrictions have been developed. The proposals include:
  - Introducing additional No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions.
  - Formalising the existing advisory Disabled Badge Holder Only Bays in the Market Place.
  - Realigning the layout of the existing Limited Waiting 2 Hours No Return 2 Hours Bays in the on-street car park in the Market Place.
  - Creating additional shared use Permit Holder/Limited Waiting Bays on Burford Street.
  - Formalising the description and wording of existing shared use Permit Holder/Limited Waiting restrictions on Burford Street & Oak Street.
  - Replacing three parking bays and the keep clear marking outside of The Swan with a parallel to the kerb Loading Only Bay (as part of the modification outlined in Section 9).

- 11.2. The No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions are proposed to prevent parking where it causes obstruction to access or the road in general. These restrictions would also supplement Rule 243 of the highway code (no parking within 10 metres of or opposite a junction).
- 11.3. On Burford Street and Oak Street, the restrictions are proposed to formalise the shared use limited waiting and permit holder bays, as well as to maximise the on-street space available for parking. The existing restrictions are proposed to be revoked and repropose with a new description in order to make the restriction clearer to all road users and will be aided by new signage at the works stage of the TRO process (if successful). There will be no material change to the shared use limited waiting/permit holder bays restrictions and the impact it has on road users.
- 11.4. The proposed restrictions on St John's Street aim to prevent inconsiderate and inappropriate parking, including double parking and parking close to the junction with the A417. These measures are intended to improve road safety and overall amenity. Additionally, the restrictions will prevent parking that obstructs large vehicles (including emergency service vehicles) and cyclists, as well as parking that affects sight lines.
- 11.5. At the Market Place, the restrictions are proposed to formalise the existing disabled badge holder bays and to provide a designated route for disabled badge holders to access the existing dropped kerb, in order to cross the road to utilise the town facilities.
- 11.6. Representations were received during the Notice of Proposal (Public Consultation) process from residents with regards to the proposed restrictions.
- 11.7. After considering the representations to the Notice of Proposal (Public Consultation), GCC re-consulted on a modification to the originally proposed restrictions. The modification included changes to the extent of the proposed Permit Holders Zone 1 Lechlade/Limited Waiting 2 Hours No Return 2 Hours Mon-Sat 8am-6pm restrictions along Burford Street, where two sections of the originally proposed parking bays were removed from the proposal and replaced with different restrictions.
- 11.8. The first is the section of carriageway outside of The Swan, which was proposed to be replaced by a parallel to the kerb Loading Only Bay. This was in response to comments received regarding loading and unloading practices along Burford Street and the potential for the cellar doors to The Swan's Cellar being obstructed by parked vehicles overhanging the kerb in the existing echelon bays. The parallel bay would provide a dedicated loading space on Burford Street for all businesses to utilise, as well as prevent vehicles parking in such a way that they overhang the kerb and prevent the cellar doors being opened (particularly during an emergency).
- 11.9. The second is the section of carriageway outside of New Wave Brasserie where the existing Keep Clear marking is. Under the modified proposal the keep clear would be replaced by No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions, to formalise the parking restrictions in this area. It will also prevent obstructions for deliveries to businesses in this area, which will continue to be able to load and unload on these restrictions.
- 11.10. Additionally, the proposed No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions on the south side of St John's Street were extended. The extension was to address concerns raised about the potential for obstruction to the private driveway and is intended to ensure that

access to and from the property always remains unobstructed. The extension will also contribute to improved visibility and safety for all road users in the area.

11.11. Representations were received during the Modification Consultation process from residents with regards to the proposed restrictions.

11.12. 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.

11.13. In considering the assessment under Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the proposed Waiting, Permit Holder/Limited Waiting, Loading Only & Disabled Badge Holder restrictions meet 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. 6 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 6 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 advertised in April/May 2025 with the inclusion of the modified proposal elements as advertised in September/October 2025.

## **13. Recommendation by the Senior Case Officer**

13.1. I am satisfied that the TRO has been correctly advertised and consulted upon in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the procedures laid down in that Act.

13.2. The necessary statutory procedures as set out in the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England & Wales) Regulations 1996 have been followed, and guidance, including the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 have been considered.

13.3. Although some objections to the TRO have been received, I am satisfied that they have been duly considered and that a balance has been drawn between any objections, positive feedback and safety of all road users.

13.4. After considering all background information, representations and data supplied in this report, I recommend that all upheld formal objections are considered as minor in nature.

13.5. I recommend that the TRO should be put forward to be made as advertised in April/May 2025 with the inclusion of the modified proposal elements as advertised in September/October 2025, under delegated authority.

#### **14. Decision by the Traffic Regulation Order 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:

14.2.

- Make the order as advertised in April/May 2025 with the inclusion of the modified proposal elements as advertised in September/October 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: 10<sup>th</sup> November 2025

## **Appendices**

**Appendix A** – Public Consultation (Notice of Proposal) Proposal Plans

**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