

## 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 2)

**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 highways 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.

Additional correspondence has also been undertaken with Ward Councillors and the objectors in order to clarify the proposals and gain a clearer understanding of objections/comments received.

**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: *Adam Roberts*

Signature: *(of Chief Finance Officer)*

Date: *23/3/16*

**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.

Sections 8 & 9 of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 set out procedures for making objections and holding public inquiries. The recommendations outlined in the Detailed Record of Decision have fully considered the regulations and the Council considers are in line with the procedures.

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

Name: *Tanya Connor*

Signature: *(of Monitoring Officer)*

Date: *22/3/16*

**Risk assessment:**

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

Name: *JAMIE GRIFFITHS* Signature: *(of Officer completing assessment)*

Date: *24/3/16*

**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 MILU GREENE (Print name)

Cabinet Portfolio TRANSPORT

Signed:  Date of decision: 24/3/16

**Date of publication of record of decision:** (to be inserted by Democratic Services)  
24.03.16

**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:  
04.04.16

**(PARKING REGULATION & ON STREET PARKING PLACES) CONSOLIDATION ORDER 2015 (VARIATION) (NO.2) ORDER 2015  
DETAILED RECORD OF DECISION (PART 2)**

SCHEDULE					
No.	Road Name	Restriction	Location	Response	Recommendation
9.	Broadway Ln	Single yellow line & loading ban Mon-Fri 8am-5pm	Adjacent to Muscliffe Primary School and opposite Shillingstone Dr	<p>1 in support – school strongly support the proposal</p> <p>1 objection (from a person not resident in the area affected) – proposed restriction is unnecessary as it does not prevent setting down/picking up passengers &amp; causes an inconvenience to frontagers (2 residential properties)</p>	<p>Implement as advertised</p> <p>Reason: The objection does not substantially outweigh the road safety benefits the proposal will deliver. The objection has been fully considered and further correspondence with the objector has not led to any additional reason for objecting. The objector did offer to withdraw their objection if the restriction times were altered to just school drop off / pick up times. This was given careful consideration, but after examining the existing restrictions in the area (which are the same as those proposed) it is considered that the greatest benefit is to maintain consistency with existing restrictions.</p> <p>Looking at the reasons for the objection and the numerous communications outlining the council's reason for proposing the restriction, the council is satisfied that the objection is 'frivolous or irrelevant' under section 9 of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 therefore is no need to hold a public inquiry and implementation should proceed.</p>

49.	Oswald Close	School Keep Clear Mon-Fri 8am-5pm (SCK) & loading ban at any time	SCK around turning head at end of road & loading ban around junction with Oswald Rd	<p>1 in support – school strongly support the proposal</p> <p>3 objections (2 residents, 1 from a person not-resident in the area affected). Residents object to effect of restrictions on their visitors/themselves. The non-resident objects to the effectiveness of the proposal</p>	<p>Implement the loading ban at the junction of Oswald Close / Oswald Road for 15 metres in each direction only.</p> <p>To delete the School Keep Clear restriction and undertake further consultation.</p> <p>Reason: The objections do not substantially outweigh the road safety benefits the reduced proposal will deliver. The objection has been fully considered and further correspondence with the objectors has not led to any clarification or additional reasons for objecting. One objector did offer to withdraw their objection if the restriction times were altered to just school drop off / pick up times. This was given careful consideration, but after examining the existing restrictions in the area, and bearing in mind the road safety concerns raised by several council officers, school staff, and some residents, it is considered that the greatest benefit is to proceed with the proposed loading ban restriction at a reduced length.</p> <p>The council is satisfied that under section 9 of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996, it is within the regulations to proceed with implementing the loading ban for 15 metres around the junction as indicated above.</p>
52.	Petersfield Rd / Holdenhurst Ave	Double yellow lines on Holdenhurst Ave and amend the single yellow line times on Petersfield Road to 10-11am & 1-2pm	Holdenhurst Ave - adjacent to the school Petersfield Rd – between Holdenhurst Ave and Warnford Rd	<p>18 in support</p> <p>1 objection (from a resident?)– effect of restrictions on residents of Holdenhurst Ave.</p> <p>2 general comments – requests for more roads to have times altered to allow parents to park at school pick-up times</p>	<p>Implement as advertised</p> <p>Reason: The objection does not substantially outweigh the reasons for implementation given the level of support also received. Residents can still park in the bus stops in Holdenhurst Avenue outside of the operating times (85m of parking available for 23 hours of the day) – this will be communicated to the objector.</p>

# Equality Impact Needs Assessment

The Diversity Promise – *Better for all*



1. Title of Policy/Service/Project	Autumn 2015 Traffic Regulation Order Review (Part 2)
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?

Disabled drivers are prohibited from parking on loading bans which are present in some of these proposals.

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>	Roads become safer around schools during school times.	Disabled drivers are prevented from parking in areas where road safety concerns have been raised due to parked vehicles.
<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

<p>Disabled driver prohibited from parking on sections of roads where road safety concerns have been raised due to parked cars.</p>	<p>No action is proposed as parking of any form is undesirable in the locations in questions. The restrictions have been kept to a minimum length, and are only operational during school times in order to reduce the impact as much as possible.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
---	--	------------	------------	------------

# G2 Initial Risk Assessment



PROJECT NAME:

Traffic Regulation Order Autumn Review 2015 (Part 2)

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+