

## CABINET MEMBER DECISION RECORD

This form should be used to record Executive decisions taken by Cabinet Members

Decision Ref. No:

**Responsible Officer:**

Clare Griffiths, Traffic Technician – Traffic Management

**Subject:**

Disabled Bay Proposals – November 2018 (P8 2018)

**Decision taken:**

To implement the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) details of which are in the attached Detailed Record of Decision

**Reasons for the decision:**

To progress the implementation of the previously advertised restrictions to facilitate residential parking for blue badge holders and removal of such parking where no longer required by blue badge holders.

**Call-in and Urgency:**

This decision is subject to the council's call in procedure.

**Background:**

Residents who hold a blue disabled badge for parking may apply for a residential disabled bay outside their home subject to certain conditions. All of the disabled bays relevant to this decision record meet the required conditions and have completed the statutory process required. Full consideration has been given to the type of restriction, if any, that is proposed to replace a bay; this includes considering improving the parking facilities available to the local community, improving road safety and ensuring essential services can take place.

**Options - and reasons for rejection:**

Options are to either implement the TRO as advertised, amend it to make the changes less restrictive or not to implement the TRO at all and keep the restrictions as they currently are. Individual decisions and the reason for them are detailed in the attached Detailed Record of Decision.

**Consultations undertaken:**

The public consultation opened on Friday 30 November 2018 and closed on Friday 21 December 2018. Notices were placed in the Bournemouth Daily Echo and on the council's website.

Notifications were sent to all councillors and all statutory consultees including emergency services, disability groups, local public transport providers, national transport associations and various council departments.

The consultation details were advertised in the Bournemouth Daily Echo, on the council's website, on TraffWeb (the council's online TRO website), and on street notices in the relevant locations.

This fulfils the statutory consultation process required by The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.

**Finance/Resource Implications:**

The costs associated with both the consultation and implementation of the traffic order will be covered by income from the disabled bay application fees and the Traffic Regulation Order Budget. The whole scheme cost is estimated to be £4670.

Name: ADAM RICHENS

Signature: (of Chief Finance Officer)

Date:

27/1/19

**Legal implications:**

It is felt that the objections received to the making of the TROs have been properly considered and that there are therefore no grounds for challenge to the making of the TRO in this case.

Name: TANHA COULTER

Signature: (of Monitoring Officer)

Date:

24/01/19

**Risk assessment:**

An initial risk assessment has been completed and the proposals have been classed as low risk.

Name:

Clare Griffiths

Signature: (of Officer completing assessment)

Date:

23/01/19

**Impact Assessments:**

An Equality and Diversity Impact has been undertaken and is enclosed in the background papers.

**Information for/not for publication:**

This decision is to be published.

**Background papers:**

Detailed Record of Decision

Initial Risk assessment

EINA Screening Record


Any conflict of interest declared by a Cabinet Member who is consulted by the Member taking the decision	Name of Cabinet Member	Nature of interest	Details of any dispensation granted by the Monitoring Officer
<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes*			

\* Delete as appropriate

**Decision taken by:**

Councillor MILOS GREENE ..... (Print name)

Cabinet Portfolio TRANSPORT, CLEANING + WASTE .....

Signed: 

Date of decision: 1/2/19

Date of publication of record of decision:

Date decision effective:

DETAILED RECORD OF DECISION

DISABLED BAY PROPOSALS - November 2018 (P8 2018)

Legend: DPP – Disabled Parking Place, DPP (Permit) - Disabled Parking Place reserved for sole use of the resident permit holder, DPP (Conversion to Permit) – existing Disabled Parking Place changed to Disabled Parking Place reserved for sole use of the resident permit holder, DPP Removal – revocation of Disabled Parking Place, SPP – Street Parking Place, NWAAT – No Waiting at Any Time, SYL – Single Yellow Line, LW – Limited Waiting

	Road Name(s)	Restriction	Location	Ward	Response	Decision
1.	Branksome Wood Road	DPP Removal & replacement with NWAAT	Outside No. 26A	Talbot & Branksome Woods	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
2.	Cadnam Way	DPP (Permit)	Outside No. 8	Throop & Muscliff	1 objection: - limited on-street parking at the front of this row of properties - off-road parking to the side of the properties is available to the applicant - suggests bay will not be used for the purpose for which it is intended	Implement as advertised Reason: - whilst we acknowledge the limited availability of on-street parking in the area, the disabled bay allows for a blue badge holder to access their vehicle as close as possible to their property - the conditions for a residential disabled bay have been met - if we determine that the bay is being misused in the future, the bay will be removed
3.	Christchurch Rd	DPP (Permit)	Outside No. 971	Boscombe East	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
4.	Columbia Rd	DPP Removal	Outside No. 167	East Cliff & Springbourne	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
5.	Downey Cl	DPP	Opposite No. 36, adjacent garages access road	Wallisdown & Winton West	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
6.	Evelyn Rd	DPP (Permit)	Outside No. 24	Moordown	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
7.	Gardens View	DPP (Conversion to Permit)	Outside No. 10	East Cliff & Springbourne	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
8.	Gladstone Rd	DPP (Permit) and revocation of SYL	Outside No. 80	Boscombe East	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
9.	Hambledon Gdns	DPP (Permit)	Outside No. 4	Littledown & Iford	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
10.	Hankinson Rd	DPP Removal	Outside No. 105	Winton East	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
11.	Hawkwood Rd	Conversion of part of LW Bay and NWAAT to DPP (Permit)	Outside No. 36	Boscombe West	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received

12.	Herberton Rd	DPP Removal	Outside No. 43	West Southbourne	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
13.	Irving Rd	DPP (Permit)	Outside No. 50A	West Southbourne	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
14.	Jewell Rd	DPP Removal	Outside War Memorial Homes	Strouden Park	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
15.	Lincoln Ave	DPP (Conversion to Permit)	Outside No. 29	East Cliff & Springbourne	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
16.	Lingdale Rd	DPP Extension	Outside No. 8	West Southbourne	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
17.	Morley Rd	DPP Removal	Outside No. 29	Boscombe East	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
18.	Queen Mary Ave	DPP (Permit)	Outside No. 19	Moordown	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
19.	Rebbeck Rd	DPP Removal	Outside No. 29	Boscombe East	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
20.	Rebbeck Rd	DPP (Permit)	Outside No. 43	Boscombe East	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
21.	Riggs Gdns	DPP	Outside No. 3	Wallisdown & Winton West	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
22.	Turbary Park Ave	DPP Extension	Outside No. 84	Kinson Avenue	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
23.	Tyrrell Gdns	DPP (Permit)	Outside No. 18	Strouden Park	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
24.	Wilson Rd	DPP	Outside No. 37	East Cliff & Springbourne	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
25.	Windham Rd	DPP (Permit)	Outside No. 40	East Cliff & Springbourne	1 objection: - bay will devalue property - limited on-street parking available - applicant has since passed away and bay no longer required	Not to be implemented Reason: we have confirmation that the bay is no longer required
26.	Woodside Rd	Removal of SYL	Opposite No. 8	Boscombe East	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received

# Equality Impact Needs Assessment

The Diversity Promise – *Better for all*



1. Title of Policy/Service/Project	Disabled Bay Proposals – November 2018 (P8 2018)
2. Service Unit	Environment
3. Lead Responsible Officer and Job Title	Clare Griffiths, Traffic Technician, Traffic Management
4. Members of the Assessment Team:	Clare Griffiths Chris Parkes
5. Date assessment started:	07 January 2018
6. Date assessment completed:	07 January 2018

## About the Policy/Service/Project:

7. What type of policy/service/project is this? (delete as appropriate)	New/Proposed Traffic Regulation Order
8. What are the aims/objectives of the policy/service/project? (please include here all expected outcomes)	To implement Traffic Regulation Orders at a number of sites across Bournemouth as requested by members of the public. Residents who hold a blue disabled badge for parking may apply for a residential disabled bay outside their home subject to certain conditions. All of the disabled bays relevant to this decision record meet the required conditions and have completed the statutory process required.

9. Are there any associated services, policies or procedures?	Yes
If 'Yes', please list below: Parking Enforcement, Road Safety, Development Control, and all legal requirements applicable to implementing Traffic Regulation Orders.	
10. List the main people, or groups of people, that this policy/service/project is designed to benefit and any other stakeholders involved?	
	Disabled Blue Badge Holders
11. Will this policy/service/impact on any other organisation, statutory, voluntary or community and their clients/service users?	
	No.

## Consultation, Monitoring and Research

Where there is still insufficient information to properly assess the policy, appropriate and proportionate measures will be needed to fill the data gaps. Examples include one-off studies or surveys, or holding informal consultation exercises to supplement the available statistical and qualitative data.

If there is insufficient time before the implementation of the policy to inform the EINA, specific action points will be need to be clearly set out in the action plan. Steps must include monitoring arrangements which measure the actual impact and a date for a policy review.

### Consultation:

12. What involvement/consultation has been done in relation to this (or a similar) policy/service/project and what are the results?
A public consultation was undertaken from 30 November 2018 to 21 December 2018. As well as advertising the consultation on-street via public notices, information was also published in the Bournemouth Daily Echo and on the council's website.

Notifications were sent to all councillors and all statutory consultees including emergency services, disability groups, local public transport providers, national transport associations and various council departments.

The results of the consultation can be found in the attached Detailed Record of Decision.

13. If you have not carried out any consultation, or if you need to carry out further consultation, who will you be consulting with and by what methods?

N/A

#### **Monitoring and Research:**

14. What data, research and other evidence or information is available which is relevant to this EINA?

Residential disabled bays are advertised and consulted on a number of times a year resulting in approximately 30-40 bays being installed annually. This service has proven to be very popular with disabled residents and as such this project is the latest batch of residential disabled bays to be installed.

15. Is there any service user/employee monitoring data available and relevant to this policy/service/project? What does it show in relation to equality groups?

N/A

16. If there is a lack of information, what further information do you need to carry out the assessment and how are you going to gather this?

N/A



## Assessing the Impact

	Actual or potential positive benefit	Actual or potential negative outcome
17. Age	No impact	No impact
18. Disability	Provides disabled parking adjacent to residents' properties who are registered disabled and meet the requirements	Non-disabled residents do not have parking spaces adjacent to their properties
19. Gender	No impact	No impact
20. Gender reassignment	No impact	No impact
21. Pregnancy and Maternity	No impact	No impact
22. Marriage and Civil Partnership	No impact	No impact
23. Race	No impact	No impact
24. Religion or Belief	No impact	No impact

	Actual or potential positive benefit	Actual or potential negative outcome
25. Sexual Orientation	No impact	No impact
26. Any other factor/ groups e.g. socio- economic status/carers etc	No impact	No impact
27. Human Rights	No impact	No impact

**Stop - Any policy which shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination must be stopped, removed or changed.**

28. If impacts have been identified include them in the action plan what will be done to reduce these impacts, this could include a range of options from making adjustments to the policy to stopping and removing the policy altogether. If no change is to be made, explain your decision:

## Action Plan

Include:

- What has/will be done to reduce the negative impacts on groups as identified above.
- Detail of positive impacts and outcomes
- The arrangements for monitoring the actual impact of the policy/service/project

29. Issue identified	Action required to reduce impact	Timescale	Responsible officer	Which Business Plan does this action link to e.g. Service Equality Action Plan/Team Plan
Non-disabled residents do not receive parking spaces adjacent to their properties	No action is proposed as able bodied residents can use an alternative parking space when a space adjacent to their home is unavailable.	N/A	N/A	N/A



# Initial Risk Assessment



PROJECT NAME:

Disabled Bay Proposals - November 2018 (P8 2018)

PROJECT NUMBER: *To be obtained from PMO*

PROJECT RISK LEVEL:

LOW \*

Table 1 - Suggested criteria on which to score the type of project (please tick appropriate category)

CRITERIA				Score
1) Duration of Project	0-6 months <input checked="" type="radio"/>	7-12 months <input type="radio"/>	Above 1 year <input type="radio"/>	2
2) Effort	1-4 people (FTE) <input checked="" type="radio"/>	5-10 people (FTE) <input type="radio"/>	11+ people (FTE) <input type="radio"/>	1
3) Business Impact	Service Unit/Service <input type="radio"/>	More than 1 SU <input type="radio"/>	Council/External <input checked="" type="radio"/>	10
4) Priority	Desirable <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Highly Desirable <input type="radio"/>	Essential <input type="radio"/>	1
5) Costs &/or Savings	Up to £250k <input checked="" type="radio"/>	£251k-£500k <input type="radio"/>	Over £501k or if project is to be funded through prudential borrowing <input type="radio"/>	2
6) Risk Impact	Low Impact - Minor service disruption/inconvenience, minor injury, small financial loss, isolated service user complaint. <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Medium Impact - Service disruption, More serious injury or financial loss, adverse media coverage, numerous service user complaints <input type="radio"/>	High Impact - Significant or total service disruption, major disabling injury or fatality, high or catastrophic financial loss, adverse national media coverage, ministerial intervention in service running. <input type="radio"/>	1
<b>Risk Score</b>				<b>17</b>

A numerical rating is applied to each cell (see Table 1) For example a 'Priority' of 'Highly Desirable' is worth 3 points and a 'Cost' of '£501-£1m' is worth 5 points. Totalling the points scored for each 'criteria' gives a project score. This score is then mapped against a project-risk status in Table 1 below:

Project Risk Rating	Points Total
Low	Between 10-18
Medium	Between 19-35
High	36+