

SUBJECT:	VARIOUS TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS - AMENDMENT ORDER NO. 19 2026
MEETING:	INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER DECISION – COUNCILLOR CATRIN MABY
DATE:	12th AUGUST 2026
DIVISION/WARDS AFFECTED:	ST ARVANS, DEVAUDEN, LLANELLY HILL, CANTREF.

1. PURPOSE:

- 1.1 This report seeks Cabinet Member approval to proceed with the making and implementation of The Monmouthshire County Council Traffic Regulation, Speed Limits and Parking Regulations Consolidation Order 2019 (Amendment Order No. 19) 2026. The proposed Orders were duly advertised in accordance with the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.
- 1.2 The Authority is exercising its statutory powers under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA 1984) and the Traffic Management Act 2004 (TMA 2004), which together provide the necessary legal framework for local authorities to manage and regulate traffic on their road networks. The purpose for these orders is multi-faceted, aligning directly with the objectives set out in Section 1 of the RTRA 1984. These objectives include ensuring public safety by avoiding danger to persons or other traffic, maintaining the efficiency of the highway network by facilitating the passage of vehicles, and preserving local amenities.
- 1.3 The proposals detailed within this document are the culmination of a thorough review process and represent a direct, proactive response to sustained concerns and requests received from various stakeholders, including residents, community councils and elected ward members. The overarching goal is to enhance safety, improve accessibility, and ensure the overall highway environment operates efficiently for all users.
- 1.4 If significant unresolved objections arise from the consultation, a public inquiry can be held to reach a decision. However, in this instance, it is considered that a public inquiry is not required. It is recommended that all the proposals proceed with the Traffic Orders made as originally planned.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 Following the completion of the statutory consultation period and the subsequent detailed review of all representations received, the following recommendations are presented for consideration and determination by the Cabinet Member:
- 2.2 It is recommended that a Public Inquiry should not be held it is advised to proceed with approving and implementing the proposed orders listed below as originally proposed:
 - 2.2.1 Proposed 7.5t Structural Weight Restriction on the A4077 Gilwern Viaduct.
 - 2.2.2 Proposed Revocation of Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseason, Tintern.

2.2.3 Proposed Time Restricted Prohibition of Driving (Term Time Only, 08:30-09:00 & 15:00-15:40) - Except for permit holders & Blue Badge holders), Harold Road, Abergavenny.

2.3 The Authority received a significant number of objections and representations opposing the proposed revocation of Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road (2280). Whilst these concerns are recognised and have been carefully considered, the Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, despite the level of opposition received, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.

3. KEY ISSUES

3.1 This section details the critical traffic issues and community concerns that necessitate the proposed statutory interventions under Amendment Order No. 19. Each proposal has been technically reviewed and validated against prevailing conditions and legal requirements.

3.2 Statutory Context and Rationale

The development of these proposals within AO19 has been guided by the principles of proportionality, effectiveness and evidence-based decision making and carefully mitigate any negative consequences. The measures seek to address identified highway, road safety, infrastructure and governance requirements whilst minimising unnecessary impacts on residents, businesses and the wider travelling public. Collectively, the proposals support the safe and efficient operation of the highway network, promote sustainable and active travel where appropriate, protect key transport infrastructure and ensure that traffic regulation measures are implemented on a clear, transparent and enforceable basis.

3.3 2279 A4077 Gilwern Viaduct, Gilwern – 7.5t Structural Weight Restriction

This proposal formalises a 7.5t structural weight restriction on the A4077 Gilwern Viaduct to ensure consistency between the legal Order, on-street signing and the underlying structural assessments. Previously the bridge was signed as a 7.5t environmental weight restriction but following emergency repairs to the bridge it is deemed necessary to impose a 7.5t structural weight limit to reflect the bridges structural capacity.

This will provide clarity for road users and enforcement authorities and ensure that vehicular loading of the bridge is managed in a manner that safeguards its long-term integrity. The restriction is considered necessary in the interests of highway safety, the protection of the highway infrastructure and the continued availability of the viaduct as a safe and reliable part of the local road network.

3.4 **2280 Glynwood Road, Pontyseison – Revocation of Prohibition of Motor Vehicles**

The proposal seeks to revoke the existing Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern, following concerns raised regarding the consultation process associated with the original traffic order. The revocation is proposed to provide legal certainty, procedural clarity and transparency, ensuring that any traffic management measures affecting the road are supported by a robust and fully compliant statutory process.

Revoking the current restriction will remove uncertainty regarding the existing provisions and enable the Council to undertake a comprehensive review of the restriction and its objectives. This will allow all interested parties and stakeholders to be properly consulted and any future proposals to be considered based on up-to-date evidence and representations.

The proposal does not prejudice the merits of the original restriction or the potential need for future traffic management measures at this location. Subject to the outcome of the review and consultation process, revised measures are intended to be brought forward through a new Traffic Regulation Order.

The revocation is considered necessary in the interests of good governance, fairness and legal robustness, ensuring that any future restrictions are implemented on a clear and defensible basis, are capable of effective enforcement and continue to support the objectives of improving pedestrian safety and reducing environmental impacts where appropriate.

3.5 **2281 Harold Road, Abergavenny – Time Restricted Prohibition of Driving (Term Time Only, 08:30-09:00 & 15:00-15:40) - Except for permit holders and Blue Badge holders.**

The proposal seeks to make the School Street restrictions on Harold Road, Abergavenny permanent, which were previously introduced under an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order. The restriction has been operating consistently and effectively since the implementation of the experimental order and therefore it is considered appropriate to formalise the arrangement with a permanent time restricted prohibition of driving.

The permanent order will support a safer environment for pupils, parents, school staff and other road users by reducing vehicle movements outside the school during periods of high pedestrian activity. Operating only during school arrival and departure times and during term time, the restriction is designed to address the highest-risk periods while minimising impacts on residents, businesses and other road users. The scheme will also help reduce congestion, encourage walking, wheeling, and cycling, and improve local environmental conditions through lower traffic levels, noise, and vehicle emissions. The proposal is considered necessary to facilitate the safe and convenient use of the highway, promote sustainable travel and deliver long-term road safety benefits, while maintaining access for exempted users, including permit holders and Blue Badge holders.

4. EQUALITY AND FUTURE GENERATIONS EVALUATION (INCLUDES SOCIAL JUSTICE, SAFEGUARDING AND CORPORATE PARENTING):

- 4.1 The A4077 Gilwern Viaduct weight restriction supports the long-term protection of a key transport asset by ensuring vehicle use remains within the bridge's structural capacity, reducing the risk of damage, future maintenance costs and network disruption. The Glynwood Road proposal further contributes to a resilient transport network by ensuring future traffic management measures are developed through a robust, evidence-led and legally compliant process.
- 4.2 The Harold Road proposal creates a safer environment for children and other vulnerable road users by reducing traffic outside the school at key times, encouraging walking, wheeling and cycling and improving opportunities for active travel. Together with the wider highway management objectives of the Gilwern Viaduct and Glynwood Road proposals, the Orders support safer, more accessible communities and contribute to improved quality of life.
- 4.3 The Harold Road proposal particularly supports equality by improving safety and accessibility for pedestrians, children, wheelchair users and those with limited mobility, while maintaining appropriate access arrangements through exemptions for Blue Badge holders and permit holders.
- 4.4 By encouraging active travel and reducing unnecessary vehicle movements around the school environment, the Harold Road proposal helps reduce traffic-related emissions and noise pollution. The sustainable management of existing highway infrastructure through the Gilwern Viaduct restriction also promotes the efficient use of public resources and supports long-term environmental sustainability.
- 4.5 The Glynwood Road proposal demonstrates a commitment to transparent decision-making, stakeholder engagement and statutory compliance. Alongside the clear and enforceable measures proposed for Gilwern Viaduct and Harold Road, it ensures highway management interventions are proportionate, evidence-based and capable of delivering lasting benefits for communities now and in the future.

5. OPTIONS APPRAISAL

5.1 Table One below provides an options appraisal of the proposal:

Options	Benefits	Risks	Comments/Mitigation
No action	Less demand on officer time and resource/budget.	Failure to implement the proposals would result in the loss of road safety benefits, continued legal and operational inconsistencies in traffic regulation measures, uncertainty for road users, reduced protection of highway infrastructure, and ongoing enforcement and governance challenges.	The continuing risks to pedestrian safety outside the school, uncertainty surrounding the legal status of the Glynwood Road restriction, and inconsistencies between the legal Order and structural requirements at Gilwern Viaduct are considered unacceptable. The proposed measures provide proportionate and necessary interventions to improve safety, legal certainty, and the resilience of the highway network.
Adopt the proposals as advertised	- Improves highway safety and accessibility by providing appropriate traffic controls, supporting emergency and refuse service access, and delivering a permanent School Street on Harold Road to protect pupils and other vulnerable road users. - Ensures traffic regulation measures are clear, consistent, and enforceable by resolving legal and administrative anomalies, providing legal certainty, and enabling future traffic management	- Some residents may experience increased noise and more regular use of Glynwood Road, and the revocation may result in a temporary absence of enforcement pending completion of a future review and consultation process. - Some road users may experience minor inconvenience due to the restricted vehicle access periods associated with the Harold Road School Street. - Heavy goods vehicles may be required to use alternative routes because of the formalised structural weight restriction on Gilwern Viaduct.	This is the preferred option. The proposals represent a balanced and proportionate approach to addressing identified road safety, infrastructure, and governance issues. They support the effective management of the highway network, improve legal and operational clarity, protect important infrastructure assets, and contribute to the delivery of long-term safety and resilience benefits, whilst minimising adverse impacts on affected users wherever practicable.

	proposals to be progressed through robust statutory processes. • Supports the sustainable and effective management of the highway network through the protection of key infrastructure, including the formalisation of the 7.5t structural weight restriction on the A4077 Gilwern Viaduct, while promoting long-term highway safety and sustainable travel objectives.		
--	--	--	--

6. REASONS:

- 6.1 The proposals support the safe and efficient operation of the highway network by improving road safety, protecting highway infrastructure, and ensuring traffic regulations are implemented on a clear, lawful, and enforceable basis.
- 6.2 The proposals will deliver benefits for local communities by creating safer conditions for pedestrians, children, and other vulnerable road users, supporting active travel, and maintaining the resilience of key transport infrastructure.
- 6.3 The proposals represent a proportionate and evidence-based approach to highway management. They address identified road safety, infrastructure, and governance requirements whilst minimising impacts on residents, businesses, and the travelling public.
- 6.4 The proposals will improve the clarity, consistency and effectiveness of traffic regulation measures, support statutory compliance and enforcement, and contribute to the long-term sustainable management of the highway network.

7. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

7.1 The proposals will be funded by the Council's Road Safety and Traffic Management budget.

8. CONSULTEES:

- Cabinet Member for Climate Change and the Environment
- Cabinet
- Communities and Place DMT
- SLT including Monitoring Officer and S151 Finance Officer
- The Traffic Orders were publicised in accordance with the statutory process including notification of County Councillors for the affected wards and the relevant Town/Community Council.

9. BACKGROUND PAPERS:

Appendix 1: Schedule of consultation responses.

Appendix 2: Summary of consultation responses.

Appendix 3: Notice of Intention as published as part of the consultation.

Appendix 4: Statement of Reasons as published as part of the consultation.

Appendix 5: Drawing no's 2279, 2280, 2281.

Appendix 6: Wellbeing of Future Generations Equalities Impact Assessment.

10. AUTHORS:

Graham Kinsella, Traffic and Road Safety Manager

Gareth Freeman, Senior Traffic Engineer

Georgina Edwards, Traffic & Road Safety Technician (Traffic)

11. CONTACT DETAILS:

E-mail: grahamkinsella@monmouthshire.gov.uk

Email: garethfreeman@monmouthshire.gov.uk

E-mail: georginaedwards@monmouthshire.gov.uk

Appendix 1: Schedule of Consultation Responses

Reference / Proposal / Agree-Disagree	Comments	Officers Response
Online response 846 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseason, Tintern - AO19 No	• I am confused by the MCC position. Their reasoning states that they want to secure the safety of pedestrians and reduce the impact on the environment. I would contend that reopening this path would have the opposite effect. • They also seem to state that perhaps they didn't consult properly, they either did or they didn't. Regardless, if closing this path IS the correct action they should leave it closed. If they feel they must consult again, leave it closed until they have done that, but of course there may be no real reason to go back on the original decision, who knows. • There seems to be confusion of the intent of the MCC. If they reopen the path, they "may" consider shutting it again. What is the MCC position. Please be clear. What is the position of the local Community Councils, how have they been "consulted" about this change?. The MCC stance may be a surprise to some. • There are increasing numbers of locals and tourists using the woodlands for walking and peaceful enjoyment, which is obviously beneficial to all. NRW are encouraging this. Opening this lane will act against this positive use of the woods. Having places of peace and tranquility helps people mental well-being. Note, this is in an AONB. • These lanes were not designed for motor vehicles, a totally inappropriate activity for these ancient woodlands • Opening this lane again will quickly lead to a physical deterioration of this and surrounding paths as more offroaders use it. Use by pedestrians will become impossible (Penterry Lane is now impassable on foot) The "offroaders" do not stick to the designated paths. They already use footpaths in local woods (Fedw and Chepstow Park). This will just encourage more riders and more use. To get to this route other woodland paths will be used. "Offroaders" have to get to the top of this route somehow, or to the bottom of it! • There will be an increase in noise pollution and general disturbance in these woodlands. Please note, we have nesting Wood Warblers and Woodcock – both red listed as well as dormice and bats (both protected species) in these woodlands and NRW are hoping Nightjars may return to Fedw woods after their recent larch felling. We need to keep disturbance to a minimum to encourage wildlife. • This is an obvious attempt by the offroad lobby to keep as many of these paths open to them, by whatever means and it should be seen in that context, along with all the other actions they are taking up and down the valley. MCC should be looking at the whole not just individual actions. No doubt there are many of your communities up and down being similarly affected.	The purpose of the current proposal is to revoke the existing Traffic Regulation Order in order to address concerns regarding its legal and procedural robustness. The proposal is not intended to reassess the merits of the underlying restriction or the potential impacts of vehicular access on other users of the route. As set out in the Statement of Reasons, revocation is intended to remove uncertainty surrounding the existing Order and allow the Authority to undertake a full review of the restriction. Any future Traffic Regulation Order proposal would be considered separately and would be subject to the appropriate statutory consultation process. The community councils have been consulted upon as part of the TRO process. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.

Online response 847 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 No	This revocation in most affects an old Drovers Path. This path has for many years been a footpath only and is heavily used by walkers. Why are you taking this action which appears to make little sense. As a former chair of (redacted) and an established local resident I wish to object most strongly to this proposed action.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular or pedestrian use of the route, but to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 848 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 No	Safety of pedestrians and cyclists on the route will be compromised by allowing motorbikes at this location.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access or the relative suitability of the route for different users, but to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.

Online response 849 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseason, Tintern - AO19 No	The current situation whereby motor vehicles, including motorcycles, are prohibited is entirely appropriate for this narrow byway, little more than a path on which two people would be unable to walk side-by-side. It is not as though there is a need for vehicular traffic to use the route, for which there are alternatives. Furthermore, it is situated within the Wye Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, a popular area for walking and cycling. Revocation of the Order would most likely encourage inappropriate and damaging motorcycle use of the path. It would also be detrimental to local wildlife. I object in the strongest terms to the proposal to Revoke the Prohibition Order.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 850 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseason, Tintern - AO19 No	We suffer illegal motorbiking on our footpaths and private track to (redacted) which cause noise, distress, aggressive and antisocial behaviour from those bikers when told they are trespassing. It creates huge damage and economic disadvantage to us as we have to resurface our road more often. This is: - a public safety issue introducing an additional hazard for drivers on a blind bend. - a restriction on walkers, cyclists and riders who like routes which avoid vehicles. - introducing additional environmental and ecological damage - dirt bikers disrupt and damage nesting areas - increased noise levels in a designated national landscape and SSI - likely increase in flood damage due to ruts caused by groups of motorbikes - additional burden to council / taxpayers who have repair these roads. A footpath needs less care than one with vehicular access. I note that this is the third attempt to revoke this in recent times and am very concerned at the short notice period and lack of direct communication with local residents. I would like to refer you to the damage caused by vehicles at the top of Stoney Way which is on 3 official walking tourist trails and is unwalkable in wet weather - it is now deeply rutted increasing flash flooding risk and when wet the mud is up to the knees due to being churned up by dirt bikes. There are more walkers visiting and more economic benefit by fostering and protecting routes that they use. I would also like to note that Penterry Lane itself is	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access or the relative suitability of the route for different users, but to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.

	hazardous with pot holes that may cause cyclists and trail riders to fall when at speed.	
Online response 851 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 No	The road is not designed for vehicles - being an old Drover road and often very narrow. It is a very popular walking route for locals and visitors to this part of the Wye Valley. Allowing motor cycles on this route would essentially end all possibility for walking on the path. It would also have a major negative affect on the wildlife, flora and fauna in the area. To be honest I am shocked that this is even being considered, as well as the fact that during planning there was no advance public interaction with local residents who know the area well.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 852 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 No	As an established walking route, mentioned in at least 3 walking guides, I would like to argue that this remains a walking route. The pathway is neither of the size or of the robustness to support vehicle use. Unless MCC proposes to clear the route and shore it up? The area is a beautiful sanctuary for wildlife which will scared away by the noise and increased traffic.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access or the relative suitability of the route for different users, but to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and

		deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 853 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseason, Tintern - AO19 No	It's already impossible to walk on the stoney way which is of major historical significance due to the deep ruts caused by off road motor bikes not to mention the noise of large groups of them. The cost of repairs falls on taxpayers except you are overstretched and don't do the repairs. No more!	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 854 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseason, Tintern - AO19 No	I strongly object to the proposed revocation of the Traffic Regulation Order and request that the motion be overturned. The current restriction protects an important route used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders, many of whom choose these paths specifically to avoid motorised traffic. Introducing vehicle access would significantly reduce the safety and enjoyment of these users. There is already clear evidence of the damage caused by off-road motorbikes in the area, with sections of nearby routes becoming extremely difficult or impossible to use during wet weather. Allowing further vehicular access is likely to increase erosion, rutting and flood-related damage, while placing an additional burden on the council and taxpayers for future maintenance. The proposal also raises concerns regarding public safety on narrow routes and blind bends, increased noise pollution within a designated National Landscape,	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access or the relative suitability of the route for different users, but to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is

	and potential impacts on wildlife and nesting habitats within environmentally sensitive areas. It is notable that previous attempts to revoke this TRO were rejected in 2015 and 2019. The reasons for retaining the restriction remain valid today and, if anything, the evidence of environmental and access-related damage has become stronger. For these reasons, I respectfully request that the proposed revocation be rejected and that the existing prohibition on motor vehicles remains in place.	considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 855 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 No	I strongly object to the proposed revocation of the Traffic Regulation Order and request that the motion be overturned. The current restriction protects an important route used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders, many of whom choose these paths specifically to avoid motorised traffic. Introducing vehicle access would significantly reduce the safety and enjoyment of these users. There is already clear evidence of the damage caused by off-road motorbikes in the area, with sections of nearby routes becoming extremely difficult or impossible to use during wet weather. Allowing further vehicular access is likely to increase erosion, rutting and flood-related damage, while placing an additional burden on the council and taxpayers for future maintenance. The proposal also raises concerns regarding public safety on narrow routes and blind bends, increased noise pollution within a designated National Landscape, and potential impacts on wildlife and nesting habitats within environmentally sensitive areas. It is notable that previous attempts to revoke this TRO were rejected in 2015 and 2019. The reasons for retaining the restriction remain valid today and, if anything, the evidence of environmental and access-related damage has become stronger. For these reasons, I respectfully request that the proposed revocation be rejected and that the existing prohibition on motor vehicles remains in place.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 856 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 No	This will encourage more track bikes (unregistered) onto a very narrow track, that is barely suitable for walkers. These track bikes often come from the Wireworks carpark, where riders park their cars. These bikes are unregistered, but use public roads around the Angiddy part of the village (unlawfully). They are also incredibly noisy when in large groups and spoil the general nature of the AONB.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access or the relative suitability of the route for different users, but to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty.

		Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 857 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseason, Tintern - AO19 No	Revoking the prohibition will encourage more incidences of track bikes being used on footpaths and bridle ways that are frequently used by pedestrians in this area.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 858 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseason, Tintern - AO19 No	I strongly object to the proposed revocation of the Traffic Regulation Order and request that the motion be overturned. The current restriction protects an important route used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders, many of whom choose these paths specifically to avoid motorised traffic. Introducing vehicle access would significantly reduce the safety and enjoyment of these users. There is already clear evidence of the damage caused by off-road motorbikes in the area, with sections of nearby routes becoming extremely difficult or impossible to use during wet weather. Allowing further vehicular access is likely to increase erosion, rutting and flood-related damage, while placing an additional burden on the council and taxpayers for future maintenance. The proposal also raises concerns regarding public safety on narrow routes and blind bends, increased noise pollution within a designated National Landscape,	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access or the relative suitability of the route for different users, but to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is

	and potential impacts on wildlife and nesting habitats within environmentally sensitive areas. It is notable that previous attempts to revoke this TRO were rejected in 2015 and 2019. The reasons for retaining the restriction remain valid today and, if anything, the evidence of environmental and access-related damage has become stronger. For these reasons, I respectfully request that the proposed revocation be rejected and that the existing prohibition on motor vehicles remains in place.	considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 859 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 No	I strongly object to the proposed revocation of the Traffic Regulation Order and request that the motion be overturned. The current restriction protects an important route used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders, many of whom choose these paths specifically to avoid motorised traffic. Introducing vehicle access would significantly reduce the safety and enjoyment of these users. There is already clear evidence of the damage caused by off-road motorbikes in the area, with sections of nearby routes becoming extremely difficult or impossible to use during wet weather. Allowing further vehicular access is likely to increase erosion, rutting and flood-related damage, while placing an additional burden on the council and taxpayers for future maintenance. The proposal also raises concerns regarding public safety on narrow routes and blind bends, increased noise pollution within a designated National Landscape, and potential impacts on wildlife and nesting habitats within environmentally sensitive areas. It is notable that previous attempts to revoke this TRO were rejected in 2015 and 2019. The reasons for retaining the restriction remain valid today and, if anything, the evidence of environmental and access-related damage has become stronger. For these reasons, I respectfully request that the proposed revocation be rejected and that the existing prohibition on motor vehicles remains in place.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 860 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 No	Unsafe for walkers, which includes families and animals.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access or the relative suitability of the route for different users, but to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty.

		Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 861 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseason, Tintern - AO19 No	The pathway will become dangerous and damaged. The erosion and rutting caused on other 'offroad roadways' makes them impassable in wetter weather. It will also cost tax payers money to keep them maintained when budgets are already very stretched. There is a byway behind the old Beaufort hotel in tintern. I regularly walk this way and the often bring back litter and on one occasion I've brought a vehicle bumper of the trail, on another I've recovered a damaged tyre and other broken and discarded off road accessories that have just been dumped when they have served their purpose. The area does not need polluting, eroding, being made unsafe, and more noise from often very loud off road vehicles anymore than it already is.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 862 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseason, Tintern - AO19 No	I strongly object to the proposed revocation of the Traffic Regulation Order and request that the motion be overturned. The current restriction protects an important route used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders, many of whom choose these paths specifically to avoid motorised traffic. Introducing vehicle access would significantly reduce the safety and enjoyment of these users. There is already clear evidence of the damage caused by off-road motorbikes in the area, with sections of nearby routes becoming extremely difficult or impossible to use during wet weather. Allowing further vehicular access is likely to increase erosion, rutting and flood-related damage, while placing an additional burden on the council and taxpayers for future maintenance. The proposal also raises concerns regarding public safety on narrow routes and blind bends, increased noise pollution within a designated National Landscape,	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access or the relative suitability of the route for different users, but to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is

	and potential impacts on wildlife and nesting habitats within environmentally sensitive areas. It is notable that previous attempts to revoke this TRO were rejected in 2015 and 2019. The reasons for retaining the restriction remain valid today and, if anything, the evidence of environmental and access-related damage has become stronger. For these reasons, I respectfully request that the proposed revocation be rejected and that the existing prohibition on motor vehicles remains in place.	considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 863 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 No	Completely unsuitable for vehicles - this should only be used for walking or horse riding - we do not need further damage to the area	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 864 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 No	I strongly object to the proposed revocation of the Traffic Regulation Order and request that the motion be overturned. The current restriction protects an important route used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders, many of whom choose these paths specifically to avoid motorised traffic. Introducing vehicle access would significantly reduce the safety and enjoyment of these users. I personally have had experience of my own dog nearly being hit by a dirt bike a couple of years ago which was very distressing. The bikes were travelling at speed around a blind corner where both myself and my dog were taking a peaceful walk. This proves to me that allowing bikes on this track will eventually lead to an accident of this nature. There is already clear evidence of the damage caused by off-road motorbikes in the area, with sections of nearby routes becoming extremely difficult or	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access or the relative suitability of the route for different users, but to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty.

	impossible to use during wet weather. Allowing further vehicular access is likely to increase erosion, rutting and flood-related damage, while placing an additional burden on the council and taxpayers for future maintenance. The proposal also raises concerns regarding public safety on narrow routes and blind bends, increased noise pollution within a designated National Landscape, and potential impacts on wildlife and nesting habitats within environmentally sensitive areas. It is notable that previous attempts to revoke this TRO were rejected in 2015 and 2019. The reasons for retaining the restriction remain valid today and, if anything, the evidence of environmental and access-related damage has become stronger. For these reasons, I respectfully request that the proposed revocation be rejected and that the existing prohibition on motor vehicles remains in place.	Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 865 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 No	As a local dog owner these lanes are a haven away from motorists, so I strongly object to the proposed revocation of the Traffic Regulation Order and request that the motion be overturned. The current restriction protects an important route used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders, many of whom choose these paths specifically to avoid motorised traffic. Introducing vehicle access would significantly reduce the safety and enjoyment of these users. There is already clear evidence of the damage caused by off-road motorbikes in the area, with sections of nearby routes becoming extremely difficult or impossible to use during wet weather. Allowing further vehicular access is likely to increase erosion, rutting and flood-related damage, while placing an additional burden on the council and taxpayers for future maintenance. The proposal also raises concerns regarding public safety on narrow routes and blind bends, increased noise pollution within a designated National Landscape, and potential impacts on wildlife and nesting habitats within environmentally sensitive areas. It is notable that previous attempts to revoke this TRO were rejected in 2015 and 2019. The reasons for retaining the restriction remain valid today and, if anything, the evidence of environmental and access-related damage has become stronger. For these reasons, I respectfully request that the proposed revocation be rejected and that the existing prohibition on motor vehicles remains in place.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 866 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 No	I strongly object to the proposed revocation of the Traffic Regulation Order and request that the motion be overturned. The current restriction protects an important route used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders, many of whom choose these paths specifically to avoid motorised traffic. Introducing vehicle access would significantly reduce the safety and enjoyment of these users. There is already clear evidence of the damage caused by off-road motorbikes in the area, with sections of nearby routes becoming extremely difficult or impossible to use during wet weather. Allowing further vehicular access is likely to increase erosion, rutting	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access or the relative suitability of the route for different users, but to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective

	and flood-related damage, while placing an additional burden on the council and taxpayers for future maintenance. The proposal also raises concerns regarding public safety on narrow routes and blind bends, increased noise pollution within a designated National Landscape, and potential impacts on wildlife and nesting habitats within environmentally sensitive areas. It is notable that previous attempts to revoke this TRO were rejected in 2015 and 2019. The reasons for retaining the restriction remain valid today and, if anything, the evidence of environmental and access-related damage has become stronger. For these reasons, I respectfully request that the proposed revocation be rejected and that the existing prohibition on motor vehicles remains in place.	and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 867 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 Yes	Dirt Bikes are dangerous, loud and destructive and quite regular; racing around the paths of tintern. My children and I have almost being hit a few times particularly on this stretch of path. We stopped one once and he said Tintern's is on a dirt bike website recommending riding around so we need all the help we can get to stop this, so lifting this order and others would make it even more acceptable.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 868 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 No	I oppose this proposal in the strongest possible terms, and speak as someone who spends a lot of time walking in the woods ! Some years ago. following an altercation with off-roaders. I set up a meeting with your (redacted) to address the issue of motor vehicles using(abusing)this route and the route up from Tintern to Porthcasseg. The result was that the latter remained open to motor traffic (MCC even making it easier to traverse by adding tons of gravel in the difficult bits!!) but closed the above to motor traffic. A couple of years ago, one of the motorbike fraternity removed the prohibition sign at Fair oak. Not knowing whether MCC had removed it without consultation, I asked (Redacted) recently to confirm whether indeed	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access or the relative suitability of the route for different users, but to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention

	the route had been re-instated for motor traffic. She replied positively that it had not, and would arrange for the prohibition sign to be replaced. This was carried out as recently as 6-8? weeks ago. So what has changed? We know that the motorcycle fraternity is backed by a powerful lobbying group. Presumably it is that group, which purports to be responsible, but on the ground has no influence over their members. This is shown by the disregard for the existing status of the route by numerous motorcyclists ,particular at weekends. They ride into Ravensnest wood (and others) careeing around all available paths not just along the route above. I cannot believe that MCC would willingly want to reinstate this route to a B.O.A.T. The problems associated with this wanton activity are: -Noise. 2 stroke engines are very loud and disturb the peace and tranquility of the whole Anghiddy valley, truly part of a "National Landscape". Whilst not affected in my home, a number of friends, having properties close to the lanes leading to the route, detest the noise. -Destruction of the paths themselves. At one point, the route is rendered all but impassible to pedestrians and horse riders. These are old drovers roads after all, and are structurally completely unsuited to motor traffic. -Effect on flora and fauna. There is a large deer population which cannot be very comfortable with motorcycles racing through their patch. -Danger to walkers and riders. I have been ridden at on more than one occassion when trying to tell motorcyclists that they are riding illegally. It is impossible to identify many of them as they deliberately ride without number plates. -My understanding is that NRW does not allow riding anywhere in their woods. This route does not just pass through Ravensnest, but gives access as above to all the other paths in the wood. -Riders are not in the main local.I have encountered riders from as far away as Shropshire, Carmarthenshire, and many from the Bristol area. This is because it is generally considered that Monmouthshire is a "soft touch" when it comes to enforcement. The sad fact is, that if the route is not reinstated to a B.O.A.T then many motorcyclists will continue to ignore the legality of riding the route because there seems to be little if any enforcement. But at least it may keep some away, and render me knowingly on the right side of the law when confronting riders in the future. It would behove members of MCC Planning Department to experience walking through these fine woods with motorcyclists racing through, to inform them of the importance of their decision.	of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 869 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseason, Tintern - AO19	This is a tiny muddy track used by walkers (like me and my wife), often with dogs, in a beautiful and secluded part of the PEACEFUL Welsh countryside. We already have occasional issues with trail bikers illegally using forestry tracks, causing worry to walkers, dogs and sometimes livestock. In these steep-sided valleys, the noise of trail bikes already carries far enough, disrupting the peace and quiet of the countryside, almost always at weekends.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns

No	We object in the strongest possible terms to the possible revocation of the prohibition of motor vehicles ruling. This would be an environmental and predominantly safety catastrophe for the many walkers who use the peaceful tracks in this whole area. We urge you to reconsider your decision. If motor vehicles are allowed to use this tiny muddy track, it could lead to serious injury to people and/or pets. Collectively, this community would consider taking legal action to prevent it.	regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 870 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 No	I do not support the proposed revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern. In my view, the restriction should remain in place. 1. The TRO has been in place for approximately six years, initially on a temporary basis and subsequently made permanent. 2. The TRO has already been subject to consultation on two previous occasions, including consultation with the Trail Riders Association. 3. The TRO was introduced to protect the narrow, rural character of the lane and to ensure public safety. As an exceptionally narrow country lane, it is physically unsuitable for motorised vehicles. 4. The period for challenging the TRO by way of appeal or High Court action has long since passed. It is therefore questionable that a challenge relating to the consultation process has now been accepted. In light of the above, it appears neither lawful nor logical to revoke the TRO, only then to consult on its reinstatement. Revoking the TRO would result in the route once again being damaged by motorbikes, despite the recovery it has seen over the past six years. It would also be likely to increase motorbike use on other routes in the locality, at a time when MCC is working with Wye Valley National Landscapes and Track and Trails to identify further ways of protecting vulnerable routes from motorbike damage and implementing additional TROs. It is also important to note that MCC Countryside has incorrectly and unlawfully changed the status of Coal Lane from a restricted byway to a UCR, thereby allowing motorbikes to damage a route less than a mile from the one in question. Revoking the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road would result in further harm to both routes. MCC Highways should urgently correct its error in relation to Coal Lane, as requested by Devauden Community Council, Cllr Buckler and local residents, and ensure that this TRO remains in place to prevent damage to Glynwood Road. Taken together, these	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access or the relative suitability of the route for different users, but to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.

	issues raise serious concerns regarding the conduct and approach of MCC.	
Online response 871 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseason, Tintern - AO19 No	It's such a tiny path, regularly used by pedestrians (including children). Driving land-rovers along here will wreck the plants and ancient stone work and endanger others. Even if you heard them coming you wouldn't be able to get out the way because there is no space. It's a small and uneven path even if you're travelling by foot. I find it bizarre that this is being considered.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 872 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseason, Tintern - AO19 Yes	The Tracks and trails Group supports the existing TRO but DOES NOT support the REVOCATION of this TRO. A detailed letter has been sent to (redacted) at MCC from the chair of the Tracks and Trails group with the full support of the LAF ,which was consulted on both occasions when the TRO was put in place. The LAF supported the implementation of the TRO . The group has serious concerns about the revocation - all the conditions that necessitated the implementation of the TRO that was made originally in 2019 and reviewed and confirmed in 2023 are still relevant and so we cannot see any logical reason to revoke the TRO. We understand that the reasons that a TRO was required were as follows: 1 to avoid danger 2 to prevent damage 3 to facilitate passage of pedestrians 4 its" unsuitability for vehicular traffic having regard to existing character or adjoining property 5 preserving character where suitable for persons on foot or horseback 6 preserving amenities of AONB and conserving or enhancing natural beauty for recreation and nature study. These are matters of continuing concern, yet it is proposed to revoke this order. The Statement of Reasons (SOR) supplied by MCC in	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access or the relative suitability of the route for different users, but to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.

	support of this revocation do not state or imply that the original grounds have changed or are no longer made out, rather they refer to “concerns were raised and the consultation process was challenged by an independent organisation”. We would like answers to the following questions: 1.What were the errors in the process/consultation and how are they to be corrected? 2. Under what grounds is the TRO being sought? 3. Why was LAF not notified or consulted on the proposed revocation? 4. Has MCC considered using section 22 of the RTRA 1984? 5. Who is the independent body referred to? 6. If a further TRO is to replace the original couldn't the original remain in place until the new one comes into force? Please note our strong opposition to the proposed action in respect of this TRO	The specific answers to the questions are below: 1) The authority is unable to provide this information. 2) The existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. 3) The Tracks & Trails group who are a sub committee of the LAF and contain representatives from affected organisations were notified during the statutory consultation process. 4) The authority will refer to the appropriate sections of the RTRA when considering a replacement TRO. 5) The authority is unable to provide this information. 6) No, the existing order must be revoked before a new TRO can be made.
Online response 873 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 Yes	As a permanent and long term resident, farmer, dog walker and horse rider in the locality of the lane (Redacted), I strongly object to the proposal of legalising motorised vehicles to use this track. Firstly, the early use of this ancient track was for pedestrians and carts. It is steep and narrow and, in places deep sided, with ancient walls in parts. The track and its walls and banks are a haven for bird, animal and plant life and are part of the historical heritage of this area. I have, in the past enjoyed riding up this path but in later years, it has become less passible due to the erosion of the track causing deep ditches, dangerous for all but a very sure footed pony. I believe, this is, in part due to the illegal use by motor bikes which erode the surface which was never intended for such use. The motor bikes not only cause damage but they are dangerous to other users due to their speed and noise. The erosion is causing, at times, serious ecological damage as soil is washed away with resultant flooding. I met a pair of bikers at the top near Fair oak some years ago and was in fear of my own and my horse's safety. It seems that part of the pleasure of the vehicles using these tracks is the mess and the noise they make, regardless of other users and wildlife that live and pass through the woods. In the past, we have used this track to drive cattle back to our own farm from Fair oak. In conclusion, this track is not suitable for motorised vehicles which cause ecological damage and erosion. The riders and drivers of these motorised vehicles cannot appreciate and therefore respect the rich ecology of the woods as they speed noisily through unable to hear, smell and see little of the beauty around them. They cause harm to unsuspecting wildlife and are a danger to public safety.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.

Online response 874 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 No	(Redacted) are requesting that MCC do not remove the existing TRO. MCC have indicated that they believe the order needs to be revoked because "concerns were raised and the consultation process was challenged by an independent organisation" The TRO restricting vehicle use to protect the track was initially introduced on a temporary basis in 2019 and made permanent in 2023. Despite this, there are continued issues, with motorcyclists still using the track illegally, with an adjacent farmer experiencing verbal abuse as a result. If MCC proceed with revoking the TRO to allow for reconsultation, it is likely to increase motorbike activity on the route. This may also have a knock-on effect on nearby routes, including Coal Lane (approximately one mile away), where we are still awaiting action from MCC to address it incorrect designation. (Redacted) do not feel revocation is necessary, particularly given that the order has been in place for several years so any window of challenge has already passed. If the intention is simply to reconsult on reinstating it, this approach seems illogical. A more proportionate course of action would be to retain the TRO while any consultation is reviewed or repeated, assuming that such a process is genuinely required.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access or the relative suitability of the route for different users, but to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing. The existing order must be revoked before a new TRO can be made.
Online response 875 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 No	I am writing as a local resident and a member of the Monmouthshire Local Access Forum (LAF) to object to this proposal. I am familiar with the history of Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's) relating to this track made in 2019 and in 2023. On 10th July 2019 (Agenda item 7) LAF members were consulted on the proposal to prohibit motor vehicles on route 53-4 Glynwood Road. LAF membership includes representatives of user groups, landowners and others with other relevant expertise. The member representing motor vehicle user groups at that time was (Redacted). The LAF collectively supported the TRO to prohibit motor vehicles and the Order was confirmed in December 2019. In 2023 MCC carried out a further consultation following representations received by the Trail Riders Fellowship in relation to the 2019 TRO, after that Order had been confirmed. The options the LAF was asked to consider were 1. To revoke the existing TRO 2. Retain the 2019 Order 3. Make a further TRO to allow the road to be used by vehicles to facilitate events such as the Wyegate Long Distance Trial. (This would have been allowed under the TRO Regulations with the permission of MCC without the need for a new TRO.) As the consultation period was due to close before the next LAF meeting members were asked to respond directly to (Redacted). The LAF member representing the Green Lane Association (GLASS) was (Redacted) who responded suggesting GLASS members might be	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and

	able to undertake repairs to the route. The LAF collectively supported Option 2, to retain the existing Order. As a member of the Tracks and Trails LAF subgroup I was made aware of a further consultation dated 27th May 2026 proposing revocation of the previous orders. I strongly object to this proposed revocation for the following reasons 1. The TRO has been in place for more than 6 years and has been effective in preventing motorised use and further damage. 2. The TRO was reconsidered in 2023 and there was no legal challenge from motorised user groups. 3. The grounds relied on to make the 2019 and 2023 TRO's remain valid in 2026. These include public safety, prevention of damage to the road surface, safe passage for pedestrians, the route's unsuitability for vehicular traffic, preserving the character of the area, preserving the AONB (NL) for recreation and nature study and noise disruption to local residents. 4. No details have been provided regarding the alleged errors in the process or consultation. 5. No legal advice has been provided 6. The "Independent Organisation" referred to has not been named. 7. Revoking the vehicle prohibition will allow motorised traffic onto a steep narrow track with limited visibility and no passing places in some sections creating a danger and conflict between vehicles and vulnerable pedestrians. 8. Failure to consult with the LAF to consider the risk of accidents to pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. 9. Prevent confrontation and intimidating behaviour by illegal motorised use on the surrounding woodland tracks. The Statement of Reasons suggests that MCC may reconsider the Revocation and bring forward a new TRO at a future date. In order to maintain the safety of the walkers and local residents who have used this track over the last 6 years without the risk of unexpectedly encountering large groups of motorcycles and 4WD vehicles, the current TRO should remain in force until any further consultation has been completed and a new TRO is in place, (only if this is deemed necessary.) This route provides access to the surrounding woodland, which is otherwise protected by barriers at other entry points. If the TRO is revoked, it would permit access to and likely unlawful use of many popular forest tracks as well as The Tread and Trot Trail and St Tewdrics Trail. Permitting further degradation of this route by motorcycles and 4WD vehicles, after 6 years of environmental recovery and stabilisation of the surface, would be madness!	deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
--	---	---

Online response 876 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 Somewhat	I support the council's decision to remove the current prohibition. It is important that any restrictions on public highways are fair, legally sound, and based on proper consultation with all road users including equestrians who ride and drive. Please keep my details on file. I wish to be formally consulted when the new review begins so I can share my views on how the road should be managed in the future.	Support for the proposed revocation and comments regarding the importance of ensuring that restrictions on public highways are legally robust, fair and supported by appropriate consultation have been noted. The request to be consulted on any future proposal relating to this route has also been noted. Any future Traffic Regulation Order proposal would be subject to the appropriate statutory consultation process. This doesn't include direct notification of the consultation with individual members of the public.
Online response 877 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 No	The bridle track is not wide enough at the top for motorcycles so that walkers and horseriders would be vulnerable. The track would be very susceptible to damage in wet weather - swiftly becoming a quagmire and impassable for pedestrians.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 878 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 No	This closure was discussed at length during the previous consultation process. The path is narrow and unsuitable for motorised vehicles. The revocation would result in increased danger to walkers, horse riders and pedal cyclists. Any review of the TRO should be carried out without opening the path to motorised vehicles.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access or the relative suitability of the route for different users, but to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing

		Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing. The existing order must be revoked before a new TRO can be made.
Online response 879 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 Yes	I respond on behalf of the Trail Riders Fellowship to confirm our support for the revocation of the prohibition of motor vehicles. We maintain that the prohibition was made unlawfully and refer to our previous correspondence on this matter. We see no justification to deny the publics' access to their public road. The prohibition has inflicted net detriment to the public interest by preventing the net benefits of responsible motorcycling from being realised from use of Glynwood Road. In particular the benefits arising from public motorcycle use by members of the Trail Riders Fellowship and the Auto Cycle Union.	Your comments have been noted.
Online response 880 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 No	As a local resident and occasional user of the "road" - which for all practical purposes is currently a path - I believe the revocation of the prohibition of motor vehicles would create a danger to persons walking on the path, would create considerable damage to the natural surface of the path, and would spoil what is a valuable environmental amenity to walkers currently using the path. The path is generally narrow and unsurfaced, with considerable encroachment by vegetation and overhanging branches at points. It has the appearance of a footpath and is wholly unsuitable for motor vehicles of any kind; such vehicles being likely to be a danger to people on foot given the absence of passing points, likely to be made worse by a deteriorating surface. It is entirely unclear why the Council would wish to remove a clear environmental amenity for no obvious benefit to road vehicle users.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the

		promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 881 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 No	A very small and tight path with overhanging branches, uneven surface and twists and turns does not lend itself to motor vehicles. The wildlife including vegetation and animals using the path and banks as a corridor would be greatly impacted adversely.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 882 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 No	I have ridden horses along this track for many years. I very nearly had a nasty horse accident when my horse was spooked by oncoming motor bikes - this is while the ban for motor vehicles was in place. Opening up to vehicles will risk public safety. It will also be detrimental to public mental health - this is an area used for walking for mindfulness, the noise and fumes of motor vehicles ruin the peace. Motor bikes will also damage the surface of the track, making it unstable and often impassable for walkers.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible

		legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Online response 883 7.5t Structural Weight Restriction on the A4077 Gilwern Viaduct - AO19 No	The monitoring off HGV MOVEMENTS is impossible until the a camera system is put in place. to manage and enforce this weight limit.	The purpose of the proposed Traffic Regulation Order is to introduce a 7.5t structural weight restriction on the A4077 Gilwern Viaduct. Whilst the viaduct has historically been subject to a 7.5t environmental weight restriction, subsequent structural assessments undertaken following emergency repair works identified that the controlling factor at this location is the structural capacity of the bridge rather than environmental considerations. The proposed Order is therefore intended to align the legal basis of the restriction with the risk it is designed to manage. The permanent 7.5t structural weight restriction will provide consistency between the legal Order, on-street signing and the underlying structural assessments, ensuring the long-term protection of the structure and the continued safe use of the viaduct as part of the local highway network. It is the intention to carry out enforcement in due course.

Online response 884 Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern - AO19 Yes	We are writing to express our profound disappointment and concern regarding the decision to permit vehicles to use the lane that was previously downgraded to prevent vehicular access. This issue has been ongoing for more than 20 years and has caused significant difficulties for us as residents. Throughout this period, vehicle use of the lane has resulted in damage to our property, as well as substantial erosion and deterioration of the lane itself. Despite repeated concerns being raised, we feel that the impact of reinstating vehicular access on local residents has not been adequately considered The regular passage of off road vehicles leaves large amounts of mud, stones, and debris at the entrance to our property. We are frequently left with the responsibility of clearing this material ourselves, which has, on occasion, amounted to several wheelbarrow loads of rocks and mud. We were previously informed that vehicle owners should be responsible for any mud and debris deposited on the highway. However, the only practical way to pursue this would be to record vehicle registration numbers and report offenders. This places us in a vulnerable and intimidating position, having to confront groups of people in bike helmets . In any event, this is often impossible, as registration plates are frequently removed, obscured by debris/mud and the vehicles often travel past at speed. Furthermore, the condition of the lane has become increasingly hazardous. Vehicle traffic has repeatedly left the surface uneven, deeply rutted, muddy, and eroded. As a result, the lane can no longer be used safely by pedestrians, horse riders, or other non-motorised users. What should be a route available to walkers and riders, effectively become inaccessible because of the damage caused by off-road motorcycles and 4x4 vehicles. We are also particularly concerned because, prior to the downgrade, groups of up to 16 or more Land Rovers regularly used the lane in convoy. This activity caused damage to our fencing and contributed to the undermining of the adjoining wall and banks on either side of the lane. During such events, pedestrians and horse riders have nowhere safe to move aside, creating a serious risk to public safety. It is only a matter of time before someone is injured. We are extremely unhappy with this decision and deeply disappointed that the concerns of those most directly affected appear to have been overlooked. After dealing with this problem for over two decades, we feel unsupported and frustrated by the lack of effective action to protect residents, safeguard public safety, and preserve the condition of the lane. We respectfully request that the council urgently reviews this decision and fully considers the long-term consequences of allowing vehicular access once again. The ongoing damage to the lane, the risks to public safety, the impact on our property, and the burden placed upon residents and other users of the route should all be given serious weight. We would appreciate a written response outlining the reasons for this decision and detailing what measures the council intends to take to prevent further damage, improve safety, and support the residents who continue to be adversely affected.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing. It is the intention of the authority to consult on a replacement TRO in due course.
--	---	--

Email response 1 Proposed Prohibition of 7.5t Structural Weight Restriction - A4077 Gilwern Viaduct, Gilwern - AO19 Disagree	I would like to object to the proposed traffic order on the grounds off safety Having not viewed the report but understanding the works to be carried out I believe the bridge should be made a 3.5 ton limit emergency order Could some one inform me when will the ANPR be installed	Remedial works to increase the weight limit from 3t to 7.5t are ongoing, the 3t temporary restriction will stay in place until the works are completed.
Letter response 1 Proposed Revocation of Existing Prohibition of Motor Vehicles - Glynwood Road, Pontseison - AO19 Disagree	I oppose this proposal in the strongest possible terms, and speak as someone who spends a lot of time walking in the woods ! Some years ago. following an altercation with off-roaders. I set up a meeting with your (Redacted) to address the issue of motor vehicles using(abusing)this route and the route up from Tintern to Porthcasgeg. The result was that the latter remained open to motor traffic (MCC even making it easier to traverse by adding tons of gravel in the difficult bits!!) but closed the above to motor traffic. A couple of years ago, one of the motorbike fraternity removed the prohibition sign at Fair oak. Not knowing whether MCC had removed it without consultation, I asked (Redacted) recently to confirm whether indeed the route had been re-instated for motor traffic. She replied positively that it had not, and would arrange for the prohibition sign to be replaced. This was carried out as recently as 6-8? weeks ago. So what has changed? We know that the motorcycle fraternity is backed by a powerful lobbying group. Presumably it is that group, which purports to be responsible, but on the ground has no influence over their members. This is shown by the disregard for the existing status of the route by numerous motorcyclists ,particular at weekends. They ride into Ravensnest wood (and others) careeing around all available paths not just along the route above. I cannot believe that MCC would willingly want to reinstate this route to a B.O.A.T. The problems associated with this wanton activity are: -Noise. 2 stroke engines are very loud and disturb the peace and tranquility of the whole Anghiddy valley, truly part of a "National Landscape". Whilst not affected in my home, a number of friends, having properties close to the lanes leading to the route, detest the noise. -Destruction of the paths themselves. At one point, the route is rendered all but impassible to pedestrians and horse riders. These are old drovers roads after all, and are completely unsuited to motor traffic. -Effect on flora and fauna. There is a large deer population which cannot be very comfortable with motorcycles racing through their patch. -My understanding is that NRW does not allow riding anywhere in their woods. This route does not just pass through Ravensnest, but gives access as above to all the other paths in the wood. -Riders are not in the main local. I have encountered riders from as far away as Shropshire, Carmarthenshire, and many from the Bristol area. This is because it is generally considered that Monmouthshire is a "soft touch" when it comes to enforcement. The sad fact is, that if the route is not reinstated to a	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access or the relative suitability of the route for different users, but to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.

	B.O.A.T then many motorcyclists will continue to ignore the legality of riding the route because there seems to be little if any enforcement. But at least it may keep some away, and render me knowingly on the right side of the law when confronting riders in the future. It would behove members of MCC Planning Department to experience walking through these fine woods with motorcyclists racing through, to inform them of the importance of their decision.	
Letter response 2 Proposed Revocation of Existing Prohibition of Motor Vehicles - Glynwood Road, Pontseison - AO19 Disagree	I am writing to object in the strongest terms to the proposal to revoke the prohibition of motor vehicles on Glenwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern. In my view, this proposal is wholly inappropriate and raises serious concerns about public safety, highway condition, environmental impact and the apparent lack of proper assessment of the site itself. The idea of permitting motor vehicles to use this route suggests that those responsible for the proposal may not have properly inspected the track or considered its actual condition on the ground. Glenwood Road, in this location, is barely passable on foot in places. It is not suitable for ordinary motor vehicles, and certainly not for increased recreational or regular motorised use. Allowing motor vehicles onto such a route would create obvious risks to walkers, cyclists, horse riders and other lawful users of the countryside. It would also risk worsening the physical condition of the track, which is plainly not built or maintained to accommodate motor traffic. There are also significant concerns about the wider road network leading to this route. The single track lane from Tintern to St Arvans via Penterry, from which this footpath/track is accessed by Fairoak Farm, is already in extremely poor condition. It is heavily affected by potholes and is hazardous even for cyclists, let alone motor bicycles or other motor vehicles. Encouraging or permitting motor vehicle access in this area would place additional pressure on an already unsafe and poorly maintained rural road. I would also ask whether Natural Resources Wales has been formally consulted about this proposal, particularly in relation to the likely damage to footpaths, tracks, habitats and the wider countryside in this sensitive area. The potential environmental consequences of allowing motor vehicles onto such routes should be fully assessed before any decision is made. Please find attached three pictures of sections of the track which when damp are knee deep in mud and are totally unsuitable for motor vehicles In summary, I object to the proposed revocation because: The route is not physically suitable for motor vehicles. (see attached images) The proposal would create serious safety risks for pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders and other countryside users. The access road from Tintern to Penterry is already in a dangerous and deteriorated condition. Motor vehicle use would likely worsen the condition of the track and surrounding footpaths. It is unclear whether proper consultation has taken place with Natural Resources Wales and other relevant	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.

	bodies. The proposal appears to have been made without adequate regard to the actual state of the route on the ground, or the fact that the track exits onto a blind corner, which is already dangerous with traffic in two directions, let alone three. I therefore urge Monmouthshire County Council to withdraw this proposal and retain the existing prohibition of motor vehicles on Glenwood Road.	
Letter response 3 Proposed Revocation of Existing Prohibition of Motor Vehicles - Glynwood Road, Pontseison - AO19 Disagree	I am submitting this letter as a formal objection to the proposal to revoke the prohibition of motor vehicles on Glynwood Road. I recognise that the Council must balance different interests when considering access arrangements. However, the particular characteristics of Glynwood Road strongly support retaining the existing restriction. First, there is the safety of people using the lane. Walkers, horse riders, cyclists and children may all be present, while the lane is exceptionally narrow and steep-sided in certain locations. These physical constraints mean that vulnerable users may be unable to move to a safe position when confronted by an approaching vehicle. The previous use of the route by recreational off-road vehicles, including Land Rover Defenders, demonstrates the type of activity that could resume if the prohibition were removed. Vehicles of this size are not compatible with the restricted width, limited passing opportunities and mixed use of the lane. Second, the surface is not suitable for renewed motor traffic. Glynwood Road is unmetalled and already contains deep ruts. Additional vehicle movements would be likely to make the condition worse, potentially increasing erosion, mud, loose material and the need for future repair or maintenance. Third, there is a significant local infrastructure concern. Where the lane runs beside Cross Farm, it carries the cast-iron water pipe serving the cottages at Pontyseison. The pipe is approximately 70 years old and is described as fragile. Any proposal that could increase pressure on the lane or worsen its condition should therefore be approached with particular caution. Finally, experience before the restriction was imposed shows that vehicle access created problems beyond the lane itself. Rocks, stones and mud were frequently dislodged, particularly by motorcycles, and deposited where the track meets the highway. Residents were then required to clear this material. Reintroducing vehicles risks recreating this burden and could leave loose debris on the road. Taken together, these matters raise concerns about public safety, infrastructure resilience, environmental deterioration, disturbance to residents and the continuing maintenance of the route. I respectfully request that Monmouthshire County Council retain the prohibition of motor vehicles. I would also encourage the Council to conduct a detailed inspection of the lane, including the section containing the water pipe and the junction where vehicles rejoin the highway, before reaching a final decision.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.

Letter response 4 Proposed Revocation of Existing Prohibition of Motor Vehicles - Glynwood Road, Pontseison - AO19 Disagree	I am writing to say how let down I feel by the proposed revoking of the prohibition of motor vehicles on Glynwood Road, Tintern. My first question is have you walked the route? It is an ancient and historic drove track in the heart of the Lower Wye Valley AONB. In places it is no more than 3 metres wide, stunning, beautiful, quiet, a haven for wildlife and something worth fighting to preserve from motorcycles etc My job is to persuade people to come and live in Monmouthshire as opposed to Herefordshire and Gloucestershire. The Wye Valley is one of our crown jewels. Please stand up for our county.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Letter response 5 Proposed Revocation of Existing Prohibition of Motor Vehicles - Glynwood Road, Pontseison - AO19) Disagree	I am writing to object to this Notice to revoke the prohibition of Motor vehicles on this tiny green lane. It is ridiculous, dangerous and totally wrong to allow vehicles on what is an ancient "holloway". It is also in an AONB and as such is a haven for people to experience nature and tranquillity. In this age of mental health crisis the value of undisturbed, quiet ways to walk is becoming more essential and the Council should be supporting them not destroying them.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and

		deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Letter response 6 Proposed Revocation of Existing Prohibition of Motor Vehicles - Glynwood Road, Pontseison - AO19 Disagree	I am writing to formally object to the proposal to revoke the existing prohibition of motor vehicles on Glynwood Road. My principal concern is public safety. Glynwood Road is extremely narrow and is steep-sided in places, leaving very little room for people to move aside when a vehicle approaches. The lane is regularly used by walkers, horse riders, cyclists and children. These users would be particularly vulnerable if motor vehicles, including off-road vehicles and motorcycles, were once again permitted to use it. Before the current restriction was introduced, vehicles such as Land Rover Defenders used the lane for recreational off-road driving. The size and nature of these vehicles, combined with the limited width and visibility available on the lane, created an unsuitable environment for people using it on foot, horseback or bicycle. The lane is also unmetalled and deeply rutted along much of its length. Renewed vehicle use would be likely to accelerate its deterioration and make it more difficult and potentially less safe for other users. There is an additional infrastructure concern where the lane passes alongside Cross Farm. A fragile cast-iron water pipe, approximately 70 years old, runs beneath or alongside this section and supplies the cottages at Pontyseison. Increased traffic and further damage to the lane could place this important water supply at greater risk. Prior to the prohibition, vehicles, particularly motorcycles, regularly displaced stones, rocks and mud when leaving the lane and rejoining the highway. Residents were then left to clear the resulting debris. For these reasons, I respectfully ask the Council to retain the current prohibition and to carry out a full inspection and safety assessment of the lane before considering any change.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing.
Email response 2 Proposed Revocation of Existing Prohibition of Motor Vehicles - Glynwood Road, Pontseison - AO19 Disagree	A number of our residents have contacted (Redacted) to oppose in the strongest possible terms the proposal by MCC to revoke the prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern. We initially thought this was an error, but on inspection the sign clearly shows it to be genuine. We are aghast that anyone in MCC could even consider this proposal. Glynwood Road is an old drovers' path, in places about 2' wide, but we presume you must know this. The lanes and paths above Chepstow are some of the most popular walks and cycle paths in Wales, let alone Monmouthshire, and here you are proposing to endanger the lives of locals and visitors by allowing and encouraging motor vehicle access. The wildlife and fauna are also remarkable, and we certainly expect MCC to be protecting these and not the opposite. (Redacted) strongly objects to this proposal, about which we note that we have been neither informed nor consulted, in itself a cause for concern.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access, the availability of alternative routes, or the potential impacts of different user groups on the route and surrounding environment. The proposal is intended to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty.

		Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing. The statutory consultation process was followed which included erecting notices on site, in the local newspapers and on the MCC website.
Letter response 7 Proposed Revocation of Existing Prohibition of Motor Vehicles - Glynwood Road, Pontseison - AO19 Disagree	I am writing to ask Monmouthshire County Council not to revoke the existing prohibition of motor vehicles on Glynwood Road. The lane is used by members of the local community for walking, cycling and horse riding, and it is also a place where children may play. These users currently benefit from the protection provided by the restriction. Removing it would introduce vehicles into a space where people cannot always move safely out of the way. Glynwood Road is not a conventional highway. It is narrow, steep-sided in parts, unmetalled and heavily rutted. There are sections where a walker, rider or cyclist faced with an approaching vehicle would have very limited opportunity to reach a safe position. This is especially concerning where large off-road vehicles are involved. Before the present arrangements were introduced, the lane was used recreationally by off-road vehicles, including Land Rover Defenders. Such use is difficult to reconcile with the peaceful and shared character of the route. Reopening the lane could also bring back the noise and disturbance associated with recreational vehicle activity, affecting both residents and people using the surrounding countryside. The community has previously experienced practical consequences from vehicle access. Motorcycles and other vehicles dislodged mud, stones and rocks when leaving the track and joining the main road. Local people were then left to clear away this material. Apart from being inconvenient, loose debris on a highway can create an avoidable hazard for passing traffic and other road users. The physical state of the lane is another important consideration. Further vehicle movements would be likely to deepen the existing ruts and cause additional damage. The section beside Cross Farm is particularly sensitive because it contains a fragile cast-iron water pipe, approximately 70 years old, which supplies the cottages at Pontyseison. Protecting this essential local infrastructure should be given significant weight. The current prohibition provides a sensible safeguard for local residents, vulnerable users and the condition of the lane itself. I respectfully request that it remain in force and that the Council undertake a thorough site inspection before progressing any proposal to remove it.	The purpose of the current proposal is not to determine the merits of vehicular access or the relative suitability of the route for different users, but to address concerns regarding the legal and procedural robustness of the existing Traffic Regulation Order. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would therefore expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable TRO that can fully consider stakeholder concerns and deliver the intended restrictions on a robust legal footing. The existing order must be revoked before a new TRO can be made.

Letter/email response 8 Proposed Revocation of Existing Prohibition of Motor Vehicles - Glynwood Road, Pontseison - AO19 Agree	I SUPPORT THE REVOCATION OF THE TRO. I am also concerned at the threats in the paperwork to just re-do the PoD TRO, so here are my suggestions for actions now. Thank you for the opportunity. (I did try using the Mon CC–provided Microsoft form, but it locked up partway through. Luckily I could extract my to-then work. Also, the wording of the form does not suit a revocation. Also, the form is not clear - ideally should be stated before use - if work will be saved, if the form will timeout and information entered will be lost, any size limit, and if a pdf of the whole completed form will be available for the customer to save locally. Bad all around. Not really suited for this serious application. The definite closing date with a time is a great result – keep it up!) It is concerning that Mon CC continues to be steered by a tiny minority in the area, and by (Redacted) County Councillors. The issue of the private water pipe supplying houses in the hamlet of Pont-y-saeson under the last c. 15 metres of the road needs to be addressed. Will MPV use actually damage the pipe? If so, then it needs to be improved – not difficult. To be clear, i have taken advice from the local Welsh Water Inspector, who visited the site with me - this is the only water pipe under the road. There used to be a pipe under most of the road, but that was replaced many years ago by a pipe under the forest. I suggest that Mon CC needs to look at wider issues and legal duties, rather than concentrating on the few lines from TRO law. Such could be used to close any road - anywhere - anytime. In this instance, there is lack of evidence - that is why the current TRO needed to be done by stealth ... and why it is being revoked, thankfully for natural justice. Instead, concentrate on: The fundamental duty of a Highway Authority is set out in s.130(1) of the Highways Act s.130(1) "... to assert and protect the rights of the public to the use and enjoyment of any highway for which they are the highway authority ...". The Circular below would apply to this road, as it is USED MAINLY FOR RECREATION, i.e. as a PRoW. Also, signage in the recent past was "PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY". Incidentally, most people assume that "PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY" means Footpath or at most Bridlepath – both 'paths' and everyone knows that: "You can't drive a vehicle on a path". The day-to-day reference / guide for PRoW departments - "Rights of Way Circular (1/09) - Guidance for Local Authorities - Version 2", Defra or the Welsh equivalent. Section 3.4 advises that liaison groups are set up to represent "... all interests ...": in addition to LAFs = 'Local Access Forums' (a statutory requirement). That has never been done. Plus, in that document: 6.29 Information on traffic regulation orders relating to byways open to all traffic is published in the revised edition of Making the Best of Byways 2005 and the circular „Regulating the use of motor vehicles on public rights of way and off road." The booklet and online version of 'Making the Best of Byways' is Government guidance via Defra (and the Welsh equivalent), and is clear that it definitely covers	Support for the proposed revocation of the existing Traffic Regulation Order is noted. Glynwood Road is a public highway without an official classification, the representation that "unsealed public road Monmouthshire County Council signs should be installed" is noted but does not give rise to any action the Council is required to take. There is no statutory duty on a highway authority to erect signs indicating that a road is unsealed or unsurfaced. The Tracks & Trails group who are a sub committee of the LAF and contain representatives from affected organisations were notified during the statutory consultation process. The purpose of the current proposal is solely to revoke the existing Order in order to address concerns regarding its legal and procedural robustness. The proposal is not intended to reassess the merits of the original restriction. Any future Traffic Regulation Order proposal would be considered separately and would be subject to the appropriate statutory consultation process. The Council has received prior legal advice that the existing Order is procedurally defective and is not sufficiently robust to be reliably enforced. Retention of the current Order would expose the Council to legal challenge and uncertainty. Accordingly, revocation is considered necessary to establish a clear and defensible legal position and to enable the promotion of a new, legally compliant and enforceable Traffic Regulation Order, should that be considered appropriate in the future, following proper consideration of stakeholder concerns and statutory requirements.
---	---	--

	[unsealed] 'List of Streets' roads as well as BOATs. (GOV.UK was short of space and found it hard to index – so it is available on the LARA website - https://laragb.org/). It also suggests a liaison group with MPV users. Then in "Rights of Way Improvement Plans Statutory Guidance to Local Highway Authorities in England" would be an equivalent for Wales There are sections: Motorised users 2.2.14 The rights of way improvement plan process may identify demand for recreational motoring in the countryside. In so far as motor vehicles are lawfully able to use local public rights of way, local highway authorities will need to consider how to respond to this and whether there are ways to manage demand. There is some coverage in Mon CC's ROW&CAIP of unsealed County Roads, so they clearly wish to include them in the 'countryside access' aspect of their Improvement Plan. And later in that Statutory Government Guidance: Minimising conflicts between different classes of users 2.2.21 There is potential for conflict on ways carrying higher rights between different classes and types of users. Wherever possible proposals for improving rights of way should not unduly benefit one class of user at the expense of another. Improvements that are intended to benefit cyclists, harness-horse drivers, horse riders or walkers should not unduly restrict lawful motorised use of public vehicular rights of way. Proactive management to deal with the issues of proper recording of rights, maintenance and shared use, can bring benefits to all users. The management principles set out in Making the Best of Byways¹² may be used to avoid conflict over the use of byways that are regularly used by vehicles, and a revised edition is to be issued shortly to assist local authorities in their work. I emphasise: "... proposals for improving rights of way should not unduly benefit one class of user at the expense of another ..." The idea here is that if a HA responded to every complaint with action, and was concerned that every other user is a danger to foot traffic, then soon there would be nothing left but access for walkers. Even they might only be allowed along paths one at a time – in case they had an accident when meeting another walker! Then there would be so many Footpaths, that many would fall into disuse. And land-holders and nearby house-holders would still have a field day in deterring use anyway. THERE IS A TINY NETWORK open to MPV users, and they are active in conserving those CARRIAGEWAYS - mainly by use (as Mon CC do not allow volunteer input on roads). Maybe Mon CC should seek to maximise the number of non-MPV routes that are open, so that other users are not funnelled into the open-and-useable Carriageways. But MPV users are quite happy to share with care – they also have very-long-standing Codes of Conduct. STRANGE ASSERTIONS ABOUT DANGER The local land-holder and house-holder campaigners with vested interests talk (protracted example in the recent LAF meeting) about the danger of death for a walker meeting a vehicle in a typical single-track road or	
--	--	--

	lane. Away from the lairy stories, such lanes are just over the width of a typical car, so if the car pulled well over to one side, then the walker could sidle past quite safely. There would be plenty of room for a solo motorcycle to pass walkers, and typically the rider would slow right down or stop anyway. If a car met foot traffic, and say a group with a pushchair too, in a very narrow road with no verges, then it is quite feasible for either the walkers or the car to retrace to a passing place. Unlikely that there would be issues with solo motorcycles. What the anti-access campaigners do vociferously imply is that meeting a motorcycle is going to be day-ruining mentally traumatic, or dangerous or even fatal. They conveniently omit to realise or say that the motorcycle rider(s) will not wish to injure themselves or others, or incapacitate their vehicles. The vehicles will all be roadworthy, and have fit-for-purpose brakes. The riders will be alert and fit to drive – that is a condition of using roads. Most vehicles can also be heard from a reasonable distance away, so other users can prepare. Of course, the lack of proper signing leads to a vicious spiral of prejudice and misinformation: X all the motorcycles are not road-legal, X all the riders are not road-legal, X hence they all ride in an anti-social manner, because all other aspects are lawless, X they are always noisy, and deliberately make more noise than anyone needs to do, X they are racing - incapable of slowing or stopping if they meet anyone, and it goes on. Instead, have a good think about a walker meeting, perhaps on a narrow and steep route: ☐ one or more ridden horses (or even the ride one, lead another scenario), ☐ a horse-drawn vehicle, ☐ a rider or riders with mountain bicycle(s), ☐ a farm worker driving a modern tractor with a huge implement on the back, ☐ a delivery van driver concentrating more on his satnav, ☐ panicked wild boar or deer, ☐ a hunt in full cry, or ☐ a walker with one or more dogs – some even loose and out-of-control. In fact, there are so many attacks on ridden horses by walkers' dogs that this has become a major concern for horse-riders. I suggest that aversion to vehicle users is more down to: 1 – a belief that use is illegal on what people believe are paths, and 2 – constant campaigning by the likes of the NFU and the CLA (they rely on making money from subscriptions and legal fee referrals, and need to present their solution to the members' 'problems'). Further, having a carriageway on your land-holding is far more onerous than having the odd path. Land-holders have to be careful with the surface. A major dislike is that they can't be 'ploughed out' ... which effectively means it is not worthwhile grubbing the hedges out either. But it is not as clear-cut as that, MPV users occasionally meet land-holders or house-holders who say like: "This is not access for vehicles. We are not against public access - we don't mind walkers and	
--	---	--

	horse-riders coming through here". Yet just down the road we stop for a horse-rider and mention the confrontation, and she says like: "Yes, they try and stop horse-riders and walkers too". Some of it is knowingly deliberate try-on to raise their property value, but sometimes it is the conveyancing solicitors who have not done their jobs properly. However, when there is an old road going beside your potential house purchase, then that should raise some interest? But ... remember the relentless propaganda: "Every un-tarmacked linear route in the countryside is a path"! And that can easily be diverted or blocked off. 'Tracks & Trails' project It is also morally wrong and a waste of the money already spent on that project (£10,000s spent on Consultants, hundreds of hours of Officers' time so far, £11,000 recently approved for "AI-assisted" survey equipment) that TROs should be re-considered on this road while the 'Tracks & Trails' project is still running and as-yet unresolved. Although there have been re-shuffles within Monmouthshire County Council's Officers and Councillors, we have to wonder if their long-established "over my dead body" policy will ever be changed. They refuse to sign-post the only two BOATs in the county – after 35 years one still only has 'Footpath' signs; and the other, regularly enjoyed by people with MPVs, still has a 'Bridleway' sign at one end and a "WHITEBROOK" sign at the other. Such behaviour is one of the main reasons for the Tracks & Trails project, but it is yet unclear if the project can solve deeply-ingrained attitudes. (Also, the project has ignored the remit to improve general all-user access around the area ... especially using all the paths and tracks in Forestry Commission Wales / NRW –managed land. An example is Footpaths that come to unsealed County Roads, but no signage to state that tourists can actually / confidently go along that public access route ... and get out the other end – and not end up at one of the many cul-de-sacs in the forestry.) FENCING & ENFORCEMENT NEEDED please If the house resident next to the north end is concerned about danger to children playing on the road, then her garden needs to be fenced off from the road – presently completely open. While you are at it – a little enforcement is needed to redress the balance. Relocate the bygone agricultural ornament (like a chaff cutter?) from by the end of the road outside this house and beside the sign. It is an obstruction to the highway. Removal of ROGUE WAYMARKS please There are numerous misleading waymark discs (these are illegal in three laws), notably where the road crosses the NRW forestry track and where a Footpath (towards the southern end) meets the road. These all need to be rectified, and the Lower Wye Ramblers officially warned by Mon CC PRow that discs must not just be put on "routes that I can walk on". Proper training needed. Instead, discs for 'unsealed Public Road, Monmouthshire County Council' should be made and fitted. DESPERATE NEED for Signage Glyn Wood Road still desperately needs SIGNAGE. I suggest that the existing metal posts at both ends are	
--	--	--

	retained, and 'unsealed Public Road, Monmouthshire County Council' signs are installed. Please contact me if you think that more is needed – I submitted a design with the T&T consultation response that covered all eventualities! This is the very minimum that should be done to go towards Mon CC's fundamental duties. Locals and tourists simply can't understand that there is such a thing as an un-tarmacked public road - to them everything is a path. As Mon CC's propaganda goes. There is nothing on Mon CC's website to explain anything. I see today an announcement of a campaign from motorcyclists' organisations: But there is a big fly in the ointment. The campaign states: "Ride Right. Use only legal public roads, follow signage,". But Mon CC still insists on not signing unsealed roads. So the MPV user groups put a lot of effort into providing maps for their members, instilling Codes of Conduct, etc – but the Highway Authority (although taking the money from the users) refuses to provide signage, and honour their side of the deal. We might take the view that Mon CC does it as a deliberate ploy: put around information that everything un-tarmacked is a path, don't sign unsealed roads (even those used mainly or even wholly for recreation), sign some of them at a lower status (actually illegal – to place a misleading sign, but never mind all that), don't provide explanation on their website, then wait for the locals to be upset by "motorbikes riding [illegally] on paths". Then the wishes of the old land-holding County Councillors can be satisfied, and the roads eventually closed. A significant number of Officers still work to the 'old ways'. I spoke once with the Head of Communications at Mon CC – he was not in the slightest interested in having a brief discussion about 'green roads or lanes'. He knew what he wanted to know, but most importantly – he knew what would keep him in a job. Although complexion of the MP has changed, and the Council's political majority is now very different, it will take a long time for attitudes to change and for Mon CC to reach the 21st Century. Even the Police are in on it. They make no effort to find out which unsealed roads are legal for public vehicles, and just work on 'make it up'. I know, because I have spoken several times and met with the main Officer from Chepstow covering the lower Wye Valley. Officers higher up are not interested. So, when local residents phone the Police, they are left with the impression that all motorcycle use is illegal. This leads to more clamouring for bans and closures. "We can't have people racing scrambler motorbikes illegally on country paths!!" Similarly, Community Councillors are ill-equipped. The lack of signage leads them to believe what they see, and I have never seen proper information provided. Since this and similar unsealed Public Roads are used mainly for recreation ... and have been treated for many years by Mon CC as PRow, then they should be signed. This is a fundamental requirement for PRow, and helps give inclusive access for all minority groups as well as for foot traffic. Natural England on GOV.UK (equivalent for Wales)	
--	---	--

	state that: “Correct use of signs: • prevents trespass • protects your land • improves user experience • informs users of path status • prevents misuse” My comment on each: • prevents trespass – might not “prevent”, but goes most of the way to stop inadvertent straying. • protects your land – can help. • improves user experience – yes, certainly gives confidence, and users know that others (other users, land-holders, nearby house-holders, etc) will know that they are there legitimately. • informs users of path status – or carriageway status! Lazy use here. Two out of the four classes of PRoW are carriageways, NOT paths. And unsealed Public Roads are carriageways. Yes, it does. • prevents misuse – it goes a long way towards preventing misuse. It is quite conceivable that correct signage would also be a great help to reduce any illegal (vehicles and/or drivers/riders not fully road-legal) and/or ‘anti-social’ use. There are also official documents covering this subject – see LARA website. Many, let’s say, ‘marginal’ users will be deterred by ‘official’ signage. In fact, any offence may be more severely punished if on a highway, rather than on privately-held land. So, the refusal to sign is actually encouraging (the tiny amount of) illegal use. Is this deliberate Mon CC policy? ANOTHER MUDDLED ORDER – DELIBERATE? The Local Access Forum meeting on 10 June 2026 spent (aka wasted) a lot of time discussing a response to the ‘consultation’ – there were factions there who live in the Wye Valley and are rabid about banning MPVs from anywhere near to their houses. This was despite ‘paralegal’ Richard Ray being in attendance for the whole meeting to advise. This Order is combined with two completely unrelated Orders, and a date (5pm on 17 June 2026) given for close of ‘consultation’. Reality is that this Order has to be Revoked regardless. It is concerning that anti-access (or just people wound up by Mon CC’s misinformation) activists might gang up to oppose the Revocation, and then Mon CC interpret this as support for a future PoD TRO. Stealth was a problem (possibly done deliberately) with the initial advertising of this TRO – it was hidden in the middle of a massive list of around 30 schemes (found long after the event) – all very minor changes such as moving the edge of a 30mph speed limit by 10 metres. Thanks again.	
--	---	--

Appendix 2: Summary of Consultation Responses

Order/ Location	Agree	Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Unspecified
Revocation of the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern.	6	40	1	
Proposed Prohibition of 7.5t Structural Weight Restriction - A4077 Gilwern Viaduct, Gilwern.		2		
Proposed Time Restricted Prohibition of Driving (Term time only, 08:30-09:00 & 15:00-15:40) – Except for permit holders and Blue Badge holders - Harold Road, Abergavenny.				0

Appendix 3: Notice of Intention

ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATION ACT 1984 NOTICE OF INTENTION TO MAKE A PERMANENT ORDER

MONMOUTHSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL MONMOUTHSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL TRAFFIC REGULATION, SPEED LIMITS AND PARKING REGULATIONS CONSOLIDATION ORDER 2019 (AMENDMENT ORDER NO 19) 2026

PROPOSED PROVISION AND AMENDMENTS TO TRAFFIC ORDERS WITHIN VARIOUS COMMUNITIES IN MONMOUTHSHIRE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Monmouthshire County Council of County Hall, The Rhadry, Usk, NP15 1GA ("the Council") propose to make a Road Traffic Regulation Order as follows:

EFFECT OF THE ORDER:

- To introduce a 7.5t Structural Weight Restriction on the A4077 Gilwern Viaduct.
- To revoke the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyiseion, Tintern.
- To introduce a Time Restricted Prohibition of Driving (Term Time Only, 08:30-09:00 & 15:00-15:40) - Except for permit holders & Blue Badge holders), Harold Road, Abergavenny.

Within the locations identified on the plans, which are available to view at County Hall, Usk or online via <http://www.monmouthshire.gov.uk/public-consultation-traffic>

Further details of the proposed Order, comprising a copy of the draft order, plans and a statement of reasons for proposing to make the Order may be examined via pre-arranged appointment at County Hall, Usk NP15 1GA (appointments can be arranged by e-mailing traffic@monmouthshire.gov.uk) or by phoning 01633 644644 or online via <http://www.monmouthshire.gov.uk/public-consultation-traffic> which can be accessed by scanning the QR code below.

Any representations in respect of this proposal should be made not later than 5pm on **17th June 2026** by either:

- Sending a written letter, stating the grounds on which the representation is being made, addressed to: Traffic Section, Monmouthshire County Council, County Hall, Usk NP15 1GA;
- Or by scanning the QR code below and selecting "How to comment on a proposed TRO", where the public Consultation response form can be accessed.

Date: 27th May 2026
Carl Touhig
Head of Neighbourhood Services
Monmouthshire County Council



Appendix 4: Statement of Reasons

MONMOUTHSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL MONMOUTHSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL TRAFFIC REGULATION, SPEED LIMITS AND PARKING REGULATIONS CONSOLIDATION ORDER 2019 (AMENDMENT ORDER NO 19) 2026

PROPOSED PROVISION AND AMENDMENTS TO TRAFFIC ORDERS WITHIN VARIOUS COMMUNITIES IN MONMOUTHSHIRE

EFFECT OF THE ORDER:

- To introduce a 7.5t Structural Weight Restriction on the A4077 Gilwern Viaduct, Gilwern.
- To introduce a Time Restricted Prohibition of Driving (Term Time Only, 08:30-09:00 & 15:00-15:40) - Except for permit holders & Blue Badge holders on Harold Road, Abergavenny.
- To revoke a Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern.

STATEMENT OF REASONS

The proposals outlined in this Amendment Order are presented by Monmouthshire County Council in its capacity as the highway authority. The Authority is exercising its statutory powers under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA 1984) and the Traffic Management Act 2004 (TMA 2004), which collectively provide the legal framework for local authorities to manage and regulate traffic on their road networks.

The purpose for which these orders are proposed is multi-faceted, aligning directly with the objectives set out in Section 1 and 2 of the RTRA 1984 and following consideration of the matters set out in Section 122. These include but are not limited to:

- For avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road.
- For facilitating the passage on the road of any class of traffic, including pedestrians.
- 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.
- For preserving the amenities of the area through which the road runs.

Each of the proposals detailed in this statement is the culmination of a thorough review process and is a direct response to concerns and requests received from local residents, community councils, and elected ward members. They reflect a commitment to a proactive and responsive approach to highway management, addressing local issues to enhance safety, accessibility, and the overall highway environment for all users. The measures proposed are designed to be both effective and proportionate to the identified problems, ensuring that any negative impacts are minimised and appropriately mitigated.


Drawing Number	Associated Road Name(s)	Details
2279	A4077 Gilwern Viaduct, Gilwern.	Proposed 7.5t Structural Weight Restriction. The purpose of this Traffic Regulation Order is to introduce a 7.5 tonne structural weight restriction on the A4077 Gilwern Viaduct. The Order is intended to ensure that the type and nature of the weight restriction applying at this location accurately reflects the characteristics and vulnerabilities of the structure and provides an appropriate and proportionate level of protection. The viaduct has historically been signed as a 7.5 tonne environmental weight restriction. However, following the need for emergency repair works and a corresponding structural assessment of the viaduct, it became evident that the controlling factor for vehicle loading at this

		location is the structural capacity of the bridge rather than environmental considerations. This highlighted the need to align the legal basis of the restriction with the risk it is intended to manage. During the period when emergency works were undertaken, a temporary 3 tonne structural weight restriction was implemented to ensure the immediate safety of the structure and the travelling public. Following completion of these works and further review of the bridge's condition, it has been determined that a permanent 7.5 tonne limit will be appropriate, provided this is correctly established as a structural weight restriction. The introduction of this Order will therefore formalise a 7.5 tonne structural weight restriction on the A4077 <u>Gilwern Viaduct</u>, ensuring consistency between the legal Order, on-street signing and the underlying structural assessments. This will provide clarity for road users and enforcement authorities and ensure that vehicular loading of the bridge is managed in a manner that safeguards its long-term integrity. The restriction is considered necessary in the interests of highway safety, the protection of the highway infrastructure and the continued availability of the viaduct as a safe and reliable part of the local road network.
2280	<u>Glynwood Road, Pontyseison Tintern,</u>	Proposed Revocation of the Existing Prohibition of Driving. The purpose of this Traffic Regulation Order is to revoke the existing Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on <u>Glynwood Road, Pontyseison, Tintern</u>. The prohibition was previously introduced as part of an earlier Traffic Regulation Order following a statutory consultation process. <u>Subsequent to the making of that Order</u>, concerns were raised and the consultation process was challenged by an independent organisation. <u>In light of this challenge</u>, and without prejudice to the merits or objectives of the original restriction, the authority considers it appropriate to revoke the current prohibition <u>in order to ensure legal clarity, procedural robustness and transparency.</u> The revocation of the Order will remove any uncertainty surrounding the validity of the existing restriction and will allow the authority to undertake a full review of the restriction. This approach ensures that any future traffic regulation proposals affecting <u>Glynwood Road</u> are progressed through a consultation process that is comprehensive, legally sound and fully compliant with statutory requirements. It is the intention of the authority that following this revocation and subsequent review, the restriction may be reconsidered and, if appropriate, brought forward again through a new Traffic Regulation Order with renewed


		consultation at a future date. This will enable all interested parties and stakeholders to be properly consulted and will support informed decision-making in the public interest. The revocation is therefore considered necessary in the interests of good governance, legal certainty and fairness, and to ensure that any future traffic management measures on Glynwood Road are implemented on a clear and defensible legal basis in order for future provisions to be enforceable and realising the intention of the measure namely to secure the safety of pedestrians and reduce the impact on the environment.
2281	Harold Road, Abergavenny.	Time Restricted Prohibition of Driving (Term Time Only, 08:30-09:00 & 15:00-15:40) - Except for permit holders and Blue Badge holders. The purpose of this Traffic Regulation Order is to introduce a time-restricted prohibition of driving on Harold Road, Abergavenny, operating during school term times only between 08:30 and 09:00 hours and 15:00 and 15:40 hours, with exemptions for permit holders and Blue Badge holders. This Order is intended to replace and make permanent the arrangements that were previously implemented under an Experimental School Street Order. The experimental scheme demonstrated that restricting vehicular access during peak school arrival and departure times improved safety and conditions outside the school. Making the provisions permanent will ensure a consistent and enforceable arrangement that continues to protect pupils, parents, school staff and other road users. The introduction of this Order is necessary to improve pedestrian safety by reducing vehicle movements during periods of high pedestrian activity, particularly at times when children are travelling to and from school and are most vulnerable. It will also help to reduce congestion and minimise potential conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians directly outside the school frontage. In addition, the Order will contribute to creating a safer, calmer and more pleasant environment by reducing noise and vehicle emissions during critical times of the school day. By improving safety and the quality of the streetscape, the Order supports and encourages active travel, including walking, wheeling and cycling, for school journeys. Overall, the Order is considered necessary to facilitate the safe and convenient use of the highway, support sustainable travel objectives and deliver long-term road safety benefits for the local community, while retaining appropriate access for exempted users.

Appendix 5: Drawings


2279 A4077 Gilwern Viaduct, Gilwern - Proposed Prohibition of 7.5t Structural Weight Restriction.



2280 Glynwood Road, Pontyseison - Proposed Revocation of Existing Prohibition of Motor Vehicles.



2281 Harold Road, Abergavenny - Proposed Time Restricted Prohibition of Driving (Term time only, 08:30-09:00 & 15:00-15:40) – Except for permit holders and Blue Badge holders.



Equality and Future Generations Evaluation

Name of the Officer completing the evaluation Georgina Edwards Phone no: 01633 644012 E-mail: georginaedwards@monmouthshire.gov.uk	Please give a brief description of the aims of the proposal To consider the proposed introduction, amendment and revocation of various traffic regulation orders at locations throughout Monmouthshire, including a structural weight restriction on the A4077 Gilwern Viaduct, the revocation of the existing Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Glynwood Road, Pontyseason, Tintern, and the implementation of a permanent School Street restriction on Harold Road, Abergavenny.
Name of Service area Neighbourhood Services	Date Completed 10 th July 2026

1. **Are your proposals going to affect any people or groups of people with protected characteristics?** Please explain the impact, the evidence you have used and any action you are taking below.

Protected Characteristics	Describe any positive impacts your proposal has on the protected characteristic	Describe any negative impacts your proposal has on the protected characteristic	What has been/will be done to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
Age	The Harold Road School Street proposal will improve safety for children travelling to and from school and provide a safer environment for older road users through reduced vehicle movements during peak school periods.	None identified.	Restrictions have been designed following technical assessment and consultation to maximise safety benefits whilst maintaining appropriate access arrangements.

Protected Characteristics	Describe any positive impacts your proposal has on the protected characteristic	Describe any negative impacts your proposal has on the protected characteristic	What has been/will be done to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
Disability	Improved safety and accessibility for vulnerable road users, including people with mobility impairments. Exemptions for Blue Badge holders are retained within the Harold Road proposal.	None identified.	Blue Badge holder exemptions are included and highway accessibility considerations have informed the scheme design.
Gender reassignment	None identified.	None identified.	N/A
Marriage or civil partnership	None identified.	None identified.	N/A
Pregnancy or maternity	Reduced vehicle movements around Harold Road will provide a safer environment for parents and carers travelling with young children and prams.	None identified.	N/A
Race	None identified.	None identified.	N/A
Religion or Belief	None identified.	None identified.	N/A
Sex	None identified.	None identified.	N/A
Sexual Orientation	None identified.	None identified.	N/A

The Socio-economic Duty and Social Justice

The Socio-economic Duty requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to reduce inequalities of outcome which result from socio-economic disadvantage when taking key decisions This duty aligns with our commitment as an authority to Social Justice.

	Describe any positive impacts your proposal has in respect of people suffering socio economic disadvantage	Describe any negative impacts your proposal has in respect of people suffering socio economic disadvantage.	What has been/will be done to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
--	---	--	--

Socio-economic Duty and Social Justice	he Harold Road School Street proposal improves safety for families who walk, wheel or cycle to school and reduces reliance on private vehicles. The proposals also support a safe, accessible and resilient highway network that benefits all users.	The revocation of the prohibition of motor vehicles on Glynwood Road may result in increased vehicle movements until any future traffic management measures are progressed. The Gilwern Viaduct restriction may require some goods vehicles to use alternative routes.	The Council intends to undertake a further review of Glynwood Road through a new legally compliant process. Exemptions remain in place within the Harold Road School Street for Blue Badge holders and permit holders. The Gilwern Viaduct restriction is required to protect a key transport asset and maintain long-term network resilience.
---	---	---	---

Policy making and the Welsh language.

How does your proposal impact on the following aspects of the Council's Welsh Language Standards?	Describe the positive impacts of this proposal	Describe the negative impacts of this proposal	What has been/will be done to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
Policy Making Effects on the use of the Welsh language, Promoting Welsh language Treating the Welsh language, no less favourably	All statutory notices, consultation documents and traffic signs will be provided in accordance with the Council's Welsh Language Standards.	None identified.	N/A
Operational Recruitment & Training of workforce	None identified.	None identified.	N/A
Service delivery Use of Welsh language in service delivery Promoting use of the language	The proposals will be implemented and communicated bilingually in accordance with the Council's Welsh Language Standards.	None identified.	N/A

4. Does your proposal deliver any of the well-being goals below? Please explain the impact (positive and negative) you expect, together with suggestions of how to mitigate negative impacts or better contribute to the goal. There's no need to put something in every box if it is not relevant!

Well, Being Goal	Does the proposal contribute to this goal? Describe the positive and negative impacts.	What actions have been/will be taken to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
A prosperous Wales Efficient use of resources, skilled, educated people, generates wealth, provides jobs	Yes. The proposals support the efficient operation and management of the highway network and protect strategic infrastructure assets.	Continue monitoring effectiveness and operational impacts.
A resilient Wales Maintain and enhance biodiversity and ecosystems that support resilience and can adapt to change (e.g., climate change)	Yes. The structural weight restriction on Gilwern Viaduct helps protect and preserve a key transport asset and supports long-term network resilience.	Continue routine inspection and maintenance of highway infrastructure.
A Healthier Wales People's physical and mental wellbeing is maximised, and health impacts are understood	Yes. The Harold Road School Street encourages walking, wheeling and cycling while improving road safety and reducing vehicle emissions around the school environment	Continue monitoring scheme performance.
A Wales of cohesive communities Communities are attractive, viable, safe, and well connected	Yes. The proposals support safer and more accessible communities through appropriate traffic management and infrastructure protection.	Maintain engagement with communities and stakeholders
A globally responsible Wales Taking account of impact on global well-being when considering local social, economic, and environmental wellbeing	Yes. Encouraging active travel through the School Street proposal supports reductions in vehicle emissions and promotes more sustainable travel choices.	Continue supporting sustainable transport initiatives where appropriate.
A Wales of vibrant culture and thriving Welsh language. Culture, heritage, and Welsh language are promoted and protected. People are encouraged to do sport, art, and recreation	Yes. All communications, consultations and signage will be provided in line with Welsh Language Standards.	Continue provision of bilingual services and information.

Well, Being Goal	Does the proposal contribute to this goal? Describe the positive and negative impacts.	What actions have been/will be taken to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
A more equal Wales People can fulfil their potential no matter what their background or circumstances	Yes. The proposals improve safety and accessibility for vulnerable road users and retain exemptions for Blue Badge holders where appropriate.	Ensure accessibility considerations continue to be incorporated into future traffic management proposals.

3. How has your proposal embedded and prioritised the sustainable governance principles in its development?

Sustainable Development Principle	Does your proposal demonstrate you have met this principle? If yes, describe how. If not explain why.	Are there any additional actions to be taken to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
 Long Term Balancing short term need with long term and planning for the future	Yes. The proposals address immediate highway safety, infrastructure and governance issues whilst supporting long-term safety, accessibility and network resilience objectives.	Monitor the effectiveness of implemented measures and review where necessary.
 Collaboration Working together with other partners to deliver objectives	Yes. The proposals have been developed through engagement with elected members, community councils, statutory consultees and other stakeholders	Continue engagement throughout implementation and future reviews.
 Involvement Involving those with an interest and seeking their views	Yes. Statutory consultation has been undertaken and all representations have been considered as part of the decision-making process.	Continue communicating outcomes and future proposals to stakeholders.

Sustainable Development Principle	Does your proposal demonstrate you have met this principle? If yes, describe how. If not explain why.	Are there any additional actions to be taken to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
 Putting resources into preventing problems occurring or getting worse	Yes. The proposals proactively address road safety concerns, protect infrastructure and ensure traffic management measures remain legally robust and enforceable.	Continue monitoring and responding to emerging highway issues.
 Considering impact on all wellbeing goals together and on other bodies	Yes. The proposals support safer communities, infrastructure resilience, accessibility, active travel and statutory compliance.	Ensure future highway schemes continue to integrate these considerations.

4. Council has agreed the need to consider the impact its decisions have on the following important responsibilities: Social Justice, Corporate Parenting and Safeguarding. Are your proposals going to affect any of these responsibilities?

	Describe any positive impacts your proposal has	Describe any negative impacts your proposal has	What will you do/ have you done to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
Social Justice	Supports a safer and more accessible highway environment for all users.	None identified.	N/A
Safeguarding	The Harold Road School Street proposal improves safety for children and other vulnerable road users.	None identified.	N/A
Corporate Parenting	Supports safer travel environments for all children, including children looked after by the Council.	None identified.	N/A

5. What evidence and data has informed the development of your proposal?

- Structural assessments and engineering advice relating to the A4077 Gilwern Viaduct.
- Legal advice regarding the existing Traffic Regulation Order on Glynwood Road, Pontyseison.
- Monitoring and review of the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order on Harold Road, Abergavenny.
- Officer site inspections and technical assessments.
- Highway safety, accessibility and network management considerations.
- Statutory consultation responses from residents, elected members, community councils and statutory consultees.
- Relevant legislation including the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and Traffic Management Act 2004.

6. SUMMARY: As a result of completing this form, what are the main positive and negative impacts of your proposal, how have they informed/changed the development of the proposal so far and what will you be doing in future?

Positive impacts:

The proposals support the safe and efficient operation of the highway network through improved road safety, protection of highway infrastructure and clear, lawful and enforceable traffic regulation measures. The Harold Road School Street improves safety for pupils and other vulnerable road users and encourages active travel. The Gilwern Viaduct restriction protects a key transport asset and supports network resilience. The Glynwood Road proposal provides legal certainty and supports the development of future traffic management measures through a robust statutory process.

Negative impacts:

The revocation of the existing prohibition of motor vehicles on Glynwood Road may result in increased traffic movements until any replacement measures are introduced. Some road users may experience inconvenience because of the Harold Road School Street restrictions or alternative routing requirements associated with the Gilwern Viaduct weight restriction.

Mitigation:

The proposals have been developed following technical assessment and statutory consultation. Exemptions remain for Blue Badge holders and permit holders at Harold Road. The Council intends to undertake a future review of traffic management arrangements at Glynwood Road. The Gilwern Viaduct restriction reflects structural requirements and protects the long-term operation of the asset.

7. ACTIONS: As a result of completing this form are there any further actions you will be undertaking? Please detail them below, if applicable.

What are you going to do	When are you going to do it?	Who is responsible
Implement the approved Traffic Regulation Orders and associated measures.	Following Cabinet Member approval and completion of the statutory Order making process.	Traffic Team (Graham Kinsella, Phaedra Cleary, Gareth Freeman, Georgina Edwards)
Monitor the operation of the Harold Road School Street.	Following implementation.	
Progress review of future traffic management arrangements for Glynwood Road.	Following revocation of the existing Order.	

8. VERSION CONTROL: The Equality and Future Generations Evaluation should be used at the earliest stage, such as informally within your service, and then further developed throughout the decision-making process. It is important to keep a record of this process to demonstrate how you have considered and built-in equality and future generations considerations wherever possible.

Version No.	Decision making stage	Date considered	Brief description of any amendments made following consideration
1	ICMD	12 th August 2026	
2			
3			

