

## CABINET MEMBER DECISION RECORD

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

Decision Ref. No:

Responsible Officer:

Jamie Griffiths, Team Leader - Traffic Management

**Subject:**

Traffic Regulation Order - Autumn 2015 Review (Part 1)

**Decision taken:**

To approve the recommendations listed in the detailed record of decision attached

**Reasons for the decision:**

To progress the implementation of the advertised restrictions to improve safety and/or improve the flow of vehicle movements, and to improve the parking facilities available to the local community.

**Call-in and Urgency:**

This decision is subject to the councils call in procedure.

**Background:**

The restrictions listed in the Detailed Record of Decision have been requested by members of the public, councillors and council officers from the highways and cleansing & waste teams and have been the subject of a public consultation process.

**Options - and reasons for rejection:**

Options are to either implement the Traffic Regulation Order (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.

**Consultations undertaken:**

The public consultation opened on Friday 6 November 2015 and closed on Friday 27 November 2015. 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.

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 these traffic orders will be met by the existing Traffic Management budget.

Name: IAN MILNER Signature: (of Chief Finance Officer)

Date: 4/1/16

**Legal implications:**

A challenge could be made to the measures if proper consideration of the representations to the orders was not undertaken. However, all representations received have been fully considered.

Following this decision the TRO will be executed allowing enforcement to commence.

Name: TANYA COURT Signature: (of Monitoring Officer)

Date: 4/1/16

**Risk assessment:**

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

Name: J. GRIFFITHS Signature: (of Officer completing assessment)

Date: 4/1/16

**Impact Assessments:**

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

**Information for/not for publication:**

This decision is to be published.

**Background papers:**

- Initial Risk assessment
- EINA
- Detailed Record of Decision

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
Yes/No*			

\* Delete as appropriate

**Decision taken by:**

Councillor ... MILK GREENE (Print name)

Cabinet Portfolio TRANSPORT, SUSTAINABILITY AND CARBON MANAGEMENT

Signed



Date of decision: 14/12/15

**Date of publication of record of decision:** (to be inserted by Democratic Services)

**Date decision effective** – that is 5 working days after the date of publication of the record of decision unless the decision is called-in for consideration by the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel:



SCHEDULE					
No.	Road Name	Restriction	Location	Response	Recommendation
1.	Albert Rd	Disabled bay with waiting limited to 3hrs 8am-6pm	Adjacent to the Sacred Heart RC Church	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
2.	Alum Chine Rd	Loading Bay (general use)	Adjacent to the library	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
3.	Avebury Ave	Revoke double yellow lines	Avebury Avenue to boundary of No.4	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
4.	Avon Cl	Revoke double yellow lines	Adjacent to No.5/5a	1 objection – perception that the unrestricted parking would block a private access	Implement as advertised Reason: No private access will be blocked by this proposal (which will create some additional parking for residents).
5.	Avon Rd	Revoke double yellow lines	From Avon Gardens to the boundary of Nos.46/48 on both sides	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
6.	Bemister Rd	Disabled Bay	Adjacent to No.62	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
7.	Boundary Rd (service rd)	Double yellow lines	Adjacent to No. 29-37 (associated with traffic signal/crossing upgrade)	1 in support	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
8.	Branksome Wood Rd	Double yellow lines	10m across a new crossing point opposite The Cedars	2 in support 5 comments All comments request all parking is removed from this section of Branksome Wood Road	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received – proposals cannot be extended as part of this consultation. Further consideration will be given to extending the double yellows.
10.	Capstone Rd	Disabled Bay	Adjacent to No.97	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
11.	Castle Lane West	Double yellow lines	Around the junction with Castle Gate Close.	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
12.	Castle Lane West	Disabled Bay	Adjacent to No. 398	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
13.	Castlemain Ave	Revoke double yellow lines	adjacent to No. 62	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
14.	Charminster Rd	Double yellow lines	Adjacent to Nos. 401-405	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received

15.	Cherry Tree Nursery / Wessex Water access Rd	Double yellow lines	4m either side of the nursery access	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
16.	Christchurch Rd	Revoke Disabled bay Double yellow lines	adjacent to No. 1100-1114	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
17.	Clarence Park Rd	Loading Bay	adjacent to No. 19	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
18.	Commercial Rd / Poole Hill	Double yellow lines / waiting limited to 30 mins 10am-7pm	Around the disused toilets	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
19.	County Gates Ln	Double yellow lines	At junction with Prince of Wales Road	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
20.	Curzon Rd & Boscombe Grove Rd	Double yellow lines	On corner of Curzon Rd / Boscombe Grove Rd	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
21.	Dean Park Rd	2 x disabled bays with waiting limited to 3hours 8am-6pm	Adjacent to the rear of Trinity Gate	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
22.	Delhi Rd	Disabled Bay	Adjacent to No.8	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
23.	East Way	Double yellow lines	Western side on the approach to Castle Lane West	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
24.	Ensburry Ave	Disabled Bay	Adjacent to No. 17	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
25.	Ensburry Ave / Slades Farm Rd	Double yellow lines	Around the junction	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
26.	Evershot Rd	Disabled Bay	Adjacent to No.16	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
27.	Fitzharris Ave	Disabled Bay with waiting limited to 3hours 8am-6pm / Double yellow lines	One disabled bay either side of the park access with double yellow lines between covering the access	1 objection to unnecessary double yellows lines across the park access	Implement as advertised Reason: The objection does not substantially outweigh the reasons for implementation – double yellow lines have a much higher level of compliance than other measures available to the council
28.	Fitzharris Ave / Linwood Rd	Double yellow lines	Around the junction	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
29.	Garfield Ave / Holdenhurst Rd	Revoke No waiting 8am-7pm	Adjacent to Premier Sports Solutions Car Sales	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
30.	Garfield Ave	Disabled Bay	Adjacent to No. 16	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
31.	Gervis Pl	No Stopping except Taxis 10pm - 5am and No Loading 5am - 10pm.	Outside 7 Bone burger restaurant.	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received

32.	Gresham Rd	Disabled Bay	Adjacent to No. 2	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
33.	Harewood Ave	School Keep Clear	Adjacent to the Newlands Road entrance	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
34.	Holloway Ave	School Keep Clear (SKC) and Double yellow lines	SKC and yellow lines both sides of the new school entrance between Ringwood Rd and Anchor Rd	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
35.	Ibbertson Rd	Double yellow lines	Adjacent to No. 9	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
36.	Ibbertson Way	Disabled Bay	Adjacent to No. 2	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
37.	Ipswich Road	Mon-Fri 10-11am & 2-3pm	Change the existing 10-11am & 2-3pm to apply Mon-Fri only	1 in support	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
38.	Jewell Road	Disabled Bay	Adjacent to No. 120	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
39.	Kimberley Rd	Disabled Bay removal	Adjacent to No. 120	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
40.	Kingswell Rd / Hendford Rd	Double yellow lines	Around the junction	1 comment – concerns about speed of traffic and general road safety in the area, proposal not specifically mentioned.	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
41.	Kingswell Rd / Ibbett Rd	Double yellow lines	Around the junction	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
42.	Latimer Road	Loading Bay	Adjacent to No. 1	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
43.	Lincoln Ave	Double yellow lines	Replace existing the single yellow line at its junction with Holdenhurst Rd	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
44.	Madison Ave	Disabled Bay	Adjacent to No.4	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
45.	Mallard Rd	Disabled Bay	Adjacent to No. 27	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
46.	Northcote Rd	revoke limited waiting bay	Adjacent to No.19	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
47.	Norton Road / Victoria Park Rd	Double yellow lines	Around the junction	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
48.	Ophir Rd / Beechey Rd	Double yellow lines	Around the junction	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
50.	Paddington Grove	Disabled Bay	Adjacent to No. 54	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received

51.	Pembroke Road / Westbourne Park Rd	Double yellow lines	Around the junction	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
53.	Portchester Place cul de sac	Revoke limited waiting bays	Whole cul de sac.	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
54.	Queen Mary Avenue / Mayfield Road	Double yellow lines	Around the junction	1 objection to the loss of parking for residents	Implement as advertised Reason: The objection does not substantially outweigh the reasons for implementation (road safety concerns around a tightly parked cross roads)
55.	Queensland Rd	Revoke double yellow lines and add some double yellow lines	Replace parking bays adjacent to No.4 (access) with double yellow lines & revoke double yellow lines adjacent to No. 2 (2 spaces)	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
56.	Ravine Rd	Revoke agreed residential disabled bay	adjacent to No. 17	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
57.	Redhill Drive	Double yellow lines	between Nos. 199-209	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
58.	Riggs Gardens	Revoke Disabled Bay	Adjacent to No.12	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
59.	Riggs Gardens	Disabled Bay	Adjacent to No.11	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
60.	Robert Louis Stephenson Ave	New motorcycle bay	Adjacent to No 10 & 12	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
61.	Rosebery Rd	Disabled Bay	Adjacent to No.24	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
62.	Sea Rd	No Loading	Sea Rd Eastern side between Westby Rd and Florence Rd	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
63.	Seabourne Rd	Loading bay	Adjacent to Nos.71-81	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
64.	Seabourne Rd / Southbourne Grove / Southville Rd / Wentworth Ave	Double yellow lines (DYL) Bus Stops Waiting limited to 1hr 9am-6pm	DYL on Southville Rd adjacent to No. 124 Seabourne Rd & on Seabourne Rd between Woodside Rd and Beresford Rd & on Beresford Rd from Seabourne Rd to No. 4. Bus Stops adjacent to Nos. 186-192 Seabourne Rd & 3-15 Southbourne Grove Limited waiting on Wentworth Ave adjacent to No. 2 Fishermans Walk and on Beresford Rd adjacent to No 2. Southbourne Grove	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received



65.	Somerset Rd	Revoke Single Yellow Line	Adjacent to the side of No.20 Walton Rd	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
66.	Spring Rd / Victoria Rd	Double yellow lines	Around the junction	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
67.	St Clements Rd	Remove the restriction on Bank Holidays	southern side between Walpole Road and Palmerston Road	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
68.	St John's Rd	Double yellow lines	Adjacent to Nos. 21-27	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
69.	Terrace Rd	No Stopping at any time except taxis	Existing taxi rank adjacent to Hamptons	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
70.	The Triangle	No loading at any time	Adjacent to the DPP bays o/s Library entrance	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
71.	Vanguard Rd	Disabled Bay	Adjacent to No.21	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
72.	Walton Rd / Slades Farm Rd	Double yellow lines	around the junction	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
73.	West Overcliff Dr	Double yellow lines	Adjacent to the access to Faversham Court	9 in support	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
74.	Wharfdale Rd	Revoke Disabled Bay	Adjacent to No.13	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
75.	Wick Ln	Double yellow lines	From Nos. 84/86 to Branders Ln	1 in support 1 general comment – road not wide enough to accommodate parking	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
76.	Wickham Rd	Disabled Bay	Adjacent to No.27	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
77.	Wilson Rd	Revoke Disabled Bay	Adjacent to No. 37	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
78.	Wimborne Rd	Double yellow lines	Adjacent to No. 780-788	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
79.	Wimborne Rd Service Rd (Queen Mary Ave to King George Ave)	Double yellow lines	Western side behind properties on Wimborne Road	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
80.	Windham Rd	Disabled Bay	Adjacent to No. 211	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
81.	Wolverton Rd	Disabled Bay	Adjacent to No. 126	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received
82.	Wycliffe Rd	Double yellow lines	Southern side from the existing loading ban at the junction with Wimborne Rd to No.1	No representation received	Implement as advertised Reason: No objections received

83.	Zamek CI	Disabled Bay	Adjacent to No. 1	No representation received	Delete proposal Reason: Resident withdrew application
-----	----------	--------------	-------------------	----------------------------	--

# G2 Initial Risk Assessment



PROJECT NAME:

Traffic Regulation Order Autumn Review 2015 (Part 1)

PROJECT NUMBER: *To be obtained from PMO*

N/A

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:

Table 1 - Risk Status	
Project Risk Rating	Points Total
Low	Between 10-18
Medium	Between 19-35
High	36+

# Equality Impact Needs Assessment

The Diversity Promise – *Better for all*



1. Title of Policy/Service/Project	Autumn 2015 Traffic Regulation Order Review
2. Service Unit	Planning, Transport and Regulation
3. Lead Responsible Officer and Job Title	Jamie Griffiths – Team Leader, Traffic Management
4. Members of the Assessment Team:	Jamie Griffiths Chris Parkes
5. Date assessment started:	2 November 2015
6. Date assessment completed:	14 December 2015

## About the Policy/Service/Project:

7. What type of policy/service/project is this? (delete as appropriate)	New/proposed
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 sites across Bournemouth as requested by members of the public, councillors and council officers, in order to improve safety and to improve parking facilities for the local community.
9. Are there any associated services, policies or procedures?	Yes
If 'Yes', please list below: Parking Enforcement, Road Safety, Development Control, and all legal regulations 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?

Members of the public, waste collection services, public transport providers.

11. Will this policy/service/impact on any other organisation, statutory, voluntary or community and their clients/service users?

Public transport providers, disabled blue badge holders

## **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 7 November to 27 November 2015. 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 Detail Record of Decision. In summary no objections were received on equalities grounds or in relation to proposals affecting disabled drivers.

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

	<b>Actual or potential positive benefit</b>	<b>Actual or potential negative outcome</b>
<b>18. Disability</b>	Provides disabled parking adjacent to residents properties who are registered disabled and meet the requirements	Non disabled residents do not receive parking spaces adjacent to their properties
<b>19. Gender</b>	No impact	No impact
<b>20. Gender reassignment</b>	No impact	No impact
<b>21. Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	No impact	No impact
<b>22. Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	No impact	No impact
<b>23. Race</b>	No impact	No impact
<b>24. Religion or Belief</b>	No impact	No impact
<b>25. Sexual Orientation</b>	No impact	No impact
<b>26. Any other factor/ groups e.g. socio-</b>	No impact	No impact

	Actual or potential positive benefit	Actual or potential negative outcome
economic status/carers etc		
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 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 the space adjacent to their home is unavailable.	N/A	N/A	N/A
---	---	-----	-----	-----