

OFFICER DECISION REPORT - TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER (TRO)

5a

OUTCOME OF TRO PROCESS – DECISION (following objections)

PREPARED BY: Traffic Management Team, Highways and Traffic Group

TITLE OF REPORT: A37 Bristol Road, Farrington Gurney
PROPOSAL: 'Maintenance Vehicles Only' Parking Bay
SCHEME REF No: 26-034B
REPORT AUTHOR: Sadie Cox-Alcuaz

1. DELEGATION

The delegation to be exercised in this report is contained within **Part 2 Section 2.35** of the Constitution under the **Delegations of Functions to Officers**, as follows:

Section A	The Chief Executive, Executive Director - Chief Operating Officer, Directors and Heads of Service have delegated power to take any decision falling within their area of responsibility...."
Section B	Without prejudice to the generality of this, Officers are authorised to: serve any notices and make, amend or revoke any orders falling within their area of responsibility.
Section D	An Officer to whom a power, duty or function is delegated may nominate or authorise another Officer to exercise that power, duty or function, provided that Officer reports to or is responsible to the delegator.

For the purposes of this report, the Director of Place Management and the Head of Highways Delivery hold the delegated power to make, amend or revoke any Orders.

2. LEGAL AUTHORITY

This proposal is made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, which under Section 1 provides, generally, for Orders to be made for the following reasons, and in the case of this report specifically for the reason(s) shown below:

(a)	for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising, or	X
(b)	for preventing damage to the road or to any building on or near the road, or	
(c)	for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians), or	X

(d)	for preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property,	
(e)	(without prejudice to the generality of paragraph (d) above) for preserving the character of the road in a case where it is specially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot, or	
(f)	for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs, or	
(g)	for any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a) to (c) of subsection (1) of section 87 of the Environment Act 1995 (air quality)	

3. **PROPOSAL**

The introduction of a 'maintenance vehicles only' parking bay on the A37 Bristol Road.

4. **REASON**

Please refer to the Statement of Reasons.

The Council has had in mind and discharged the duty (as set out in section 122(1) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984) to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) so far as practicable. It has also had regard to the factors which point in favour of imposing the maintenance vehicles only parking bay. It has balanced the various considerations and concluded that it is appropriate to promote the proposed parking bay. The Council has also considered and discharged its network management duty under section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004. It has concluded that the proposed maintenance vehicles only parking bay is consistent with that duty, having regard to its other policies and objectives.

5. **IMPACT ON EQUALITIES**

An Equality Impact Assessment has been undertaken in relation to the introduction of parking restrictions, which is available upon request. The Council has had due regard to the needs set out in section 149(1) of the Equality Act 2010. It considers that the proposed Order is consistent with the section 149 public sector equality duty, which it has discharged.

6. **IMPACT ON HUMAN RIGHTS**

The proposals are considered to have a minimal impact on human rights (such as the right to respect for private and family life and the right to peaceful enjoyment of property). However, the Council is entitled to affect these rights where it is in accordance with the law, necessary (in the interests of public safety or economic well-being, to prevent disorder and crime, to protect health, or to protect the rights and freedoms of others), in pursuit of a legitimate aim and proportionate to do so. The proposal(s) within this report are considered to be in accordance with the law, necessary, in pursuit of a legitimate aim and proportionate.

7. SOURCE OF FINANCE

This proposal is being funded through cost code: TCSVL004S

8. CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT

The proposal requires consultation with the Chief Constable, Emergency Services, Road Haulage Association, Freight Transport Association (Logistics UK), Parking Services, Waste Services, Ward Members and the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Transport Delivery.

The responses to the informal consultation can be found in TRO report number 3.

9. OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS RECEIVED (following the public advertisement of the proposal(s))

The objections and comments received are shown below, with an officer response to the objections underneath.

3 Objections & 1 Partial Objection

Objections received:

- All the proposals seem to attempt to slow traffic down to a speed that tends to generate far more noise and pollution than is generally the case now. From the diagrams provided, it is unclear to me whether or not the main A37 road through Farrington Gurney will effectively be narrowed as a result. The council seems to have an obsession with walking/cycling/bussing while most residents actually need to use their cars for pretty much everything they do. Spending large amounts of money (OUR money!) on satisfying this obsession is disgraceful. Also, where are the actual costs shown? Where is the cost/benefit analysis? I have looked in vain...maybe I have missed it??
- The maintenance parking spot is a waste of space and taxpayer money. Your plans don't take into account a large electrical station or the footpath changes required. The route of the footpath isn't shown in your plans. The village maintains the grass verge, which is attractive, and we'd appreciate this green space staying intact. Main Street and Pitway Lane can be used for service vehicles and are next to these structures, with parking available. The council currently uses these roads just for these purposes. The space generated will be used by the council, maybe half a dozen times a year, and will be used by people dropping off and picking up from the bus stop... I guarantee it! Use the money to pay for new playground equipment in Farnington; we'd appreciate this more.
- The Parish Council objects to the proposed service-vehicle parking space on the A37 southbound, immediately before the bus stop.

The bay is not needed.

Council and highways vehicles already use Main Street and Pitway Lane, both of which are next to the crossing and bus stop. The consultation does not explain why those existing spaces are inadequate, how often a dedicated A37 bay would be used, or why a new space on the A37 road is required when quieter side roads are already used for the same purpose.

Drawings do not deal with the pavement or the substation.

The published plan does not show how the pavement will be re-routed as it's very close to the electrical substation, or how pedestrians will be kept clear of the new bay. Until those details are published, the Council cannot show that the bay can be built safely or that the footway will remain usable.

Loss of well-maintained verge for little public benefit.

The bay would take a noticeable area of the existing lawn/verge. That is a real local amenity and cared for by us. Removing it for a space that, on the Council's own case, would be used only occasionally is a poor use of public money and of highway land.

The bay will be used as a drop-off, not for maintenance.

A marked bay next to a bus stop on the A37 will be used by cars dropping off or collecting passengers. That will create turning and stopping on the approach to a new toucan crossing, the opposite of what the rest of the scheme is trying to achieve. If the Council intends the bay to be "maintenance only," the order should say so, and the design should make casual parking impractical. As drawn, it will not. Vehicle idling is a concern if used as we envisage.

Value for money.

The raised side-road entries and crossing deliver a clear safety benefit. The parking bay does not. I ask the Council to reconsider the bay from the scheme, keep the verge, and use Main Street and Pitway Lane for occasional service parking as now.

Partial objection received:

- Maintenance bay isn't required, off street parking available at the end of main street and this would be saver all around.

Officer Response:

The proposed scheme includes footway widening, improved bus stops and a new signalised pedestrian crossing. The scheme is funded from the West of England Combined Authority's City Region Sustainable Transport fund and has followed the relevant business case and grant assurance process.

The proposed maintenance bay is provided to ensure suitable access to maintain the traffic signals and is a standard feature to ensure equipment can be kept safe

and operational. Alternative options, included the use of Main Street, were considered but are not considered to be appropriate – a dedicated facility is preferred. When not in use, the bay will form part of the footway. There is adequate space for pedestrians to pass a parked vehicle when it is in use.

10. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM WARD MEMBERS AND CABINET MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT DELIVERY (in response to the above)

Councillor Ann Morgan - I do not agree with the maintenance hub and agree with the statements made by residents.

Cabinet Member for Sustainable Transport Delivery (Councillor Lucy Hodge)

My comment is – I support the recommendation in the report.

11. RECOMMENDATION

That the proposal as advertised is implemented.



Paul Garrod
Head of Highways Delivery

Date: 21/09/2026

12. DECISION

As the Officer holding the above delegation, I have decided that the objections / comments be not acceded to and the proposal as advertised be implemented.

The Council's policy framework has been used as the basis to develop the scheme with full engagement with stakeholders across the area.

I further note that the issue of deciding whether to implement any scheme is a matter of broad judgement, taking into account the wider transport and climate aims of the Council rather than a purely mathematical analysis on the numbers of positive or negative responses.

The arguments both for and against the scheme were clearly identified and were considered fully as part of the decision-making process before I made the final decision as set out above.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Chris Major', is positioned above the printed name.

Chris Major
Director for Place Management

Date:22/09/2026