



CABINET MEMBER DECISION RECORD

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

Decision Ref. No:

Responsible Officer:

Chris Parkes, Team Leader – Traffic Management

Subject:

Bourne Ave, Braidley Rd & Avenue Rd Highway Improvement Scheme Traffic Regulation Order.

Decision taken:

To implement the Traffic Regulations Order (TRO) detailed in the attached record of decision

Reasons for the decision:

To progress the implementation of the advertised restrictions to facilitate the advancement of the Highway Improvement Scheme.

Call-in and Urgency:

This decision is subject to the councils call in procedure.

Background:

The aim of the scheme, as part of the Council's commitment to regenerate key areas across the town centre, is to improve the area around the Central Gardens/The Square by creating a safer and more attractive pedestrian orientated environment.

This includes:

1. Reducing the speed limit to 20mph, making the area more pedestrian and cycle friendly.
2. Improving key pedestrian and cycle routes to the town, providing a better link between the lower gardens and the central gardens through raised crossing points and a raised zebra crossing outside Tesco Metro.
3. Increasing disabled parking bays.
4. Increasing pay and display parking for shoppers, workers and visitors.
5. Increasing provision for cycle parking, and complete the cycle route through the town.
6. Removing unnecessary street furniture.
7. Improving the quality of the road surface in a significant part of the town centre by re-surfacing the road

Options - and reasons for rejection:

Options are, to 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. Details of the decisions and the reasons for them are shown in the attached record of decision.

Consultations undertaken:

Two public consultations were undertaken. The second introduced amendments to address concerns raised by the first consultation.

The first consultation opened on 25th November 2016 and closed on 16th December 2016. The second consultation opened on 24th March 2017 and closed on 14th April 2017

For both consultations notices were placed in the Bournemouth Daily Echo, on the council's website and 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).

Representations received are detailed in the attached record of decision.

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 has been included in the overall Bournemouth Square & Central Gardens pedestrian crossing and traffic calming scheme costs.

Name: ADAM RICHENS
Date: 21/6/17

Signature: (of Chief Finance Officer)

Legal implications:

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

Name: TANYA COULTER
Date: 21/6/17

Signature: (of Monitoring Officer)

Risk assessment:

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

Name: 
Date: 27/6/17

Signature: (of Officer completing assessment)

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:

Appendix 1 - 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
No/Yes*			

* Delete as appropriate

Decision taken by:

Councillor Mrs. GORSENE..... (Print name)

Cabinet Portfolio TRANSPORT, CLEANING + WASTE

Signed: 

Date of decision: 29/6/17

Date of publication of record of decision: 30/06/2017

Date decision effective: 10/07/2017



**(PARKING REGULATION & ON-STREET PARKING PLACES) CONSOLIDATION ORDER 2015 (VARIATION NO.4) ORDER 2016
(PARKING REGULATION & ON-STREET PARKING PLACES) CONSOLIDATION ORDER 2015 (VARIATION NO.3) ORDER 2017
20 MPH SPEED LIMIT ZONE (VARIATION NO.2) ORDER 2016
NOTICE OF INTENTION TO INSTALL TRAFFIC CALMING FEATURES (NO.2) 2016**

Legend: AAT – At Any Time, DPP – Disabled Parking Place, NWAAT - No Waiting At Any Time, RPZ – Restricted Parking Zone, SPP – Street Parking Place, PPP – Payment Parking Place

Summary						
Highway Improvement Scheme Bourne Avenue, Bradley Road, Avenue Road		Central	<p>The public consultation generated the following responses; 14 in support 10 general comments 3 objections 1 bus operator response</p> <p>These responses are detailed below next to the relevant road and restriction.</p>			
Response details						
N o.	Road Name(s)	Restriction	Location	Ward	Response	Decision/Response
1.	Bourne Avenue, Avenue Road	Bus stand	Bourne Ave near the War Memorial and Avenue Rd near the multi-storey car park.	Central	1 bus operator response	The bus operator is concerned about the loss of all day parking for buses in the Town Centre. However, at meetings the same bus operator has conceded that it is unrealistic to expect the Council to make such provision. In fact, it is highly unusual for any authority to allow buses to park all day in their town centre. The conversion of the bus parking to P&D and/or disabled bays as proposed will yield revenue and support the businesses in the area whilst making more provision for the public. An option to remove all parking was considered however this would have the impact of effectively widening roads resulting in higher vehicle speeds. Removing the parking and widening footways was also considered however that action is well beyond the financial scope of the current proposals and available budgets.
2.	Avenue Road	Taxi Rank	Spaces relocated either side of a new crossing adjacent to Boots	Central	1 general comment: Please keep the bus stop at the rear of M&S	The bus provision at the rear of M&S is being retained.
3.		DPP with waiting limited to 3 hours 8am-6pm	Remove 5 spaces adjacent to the gardens, and locate 10 spaces adjacent to the			

			rear of Nos. 5-9 Commercial Road. 2 new spaces will be located adjacent to the Library		
4.		Bus Stand	4 stands opposite The Avenue Shopping Centre / M&S		
5.		PPP Tariff 4*	3 spaces adjacent to Pure Gym 6 spaces adjacent to the gardens		
6.		NWAAT with loading ban AAT	Adjacent to the gardens next to the existing pedestrian crossing, and covering the new crossing points		
7.		20mph zone	From Bourne Avenue to adjacent to Pure Gym		
8.		Traffic Calming Features	Installation of 75mm high flat top road humps adjacent to The Avenue Shopping Centre entrance and opposite No. 16 Commercial Road (Clarks)		
9.	Avenue Lane	20mph zone	Entire length	No specific comments – see general scheme comments below	
10.	Bourne Avenue	DPP with waiting limited to 3 hours 8am-6pm	Remove 2 spaces adjacent to Hampshire Court (new crossing to be installed)	1 general comment: Request for cycle routes on both sides of Bourne Ave from the tennis courts to the town centre	Cyclists can use both sides of Avenue Rd. As this will be traffic calmed to 20mph the road environment will be inherently far more supportive of cyclists. There is also 'shared' cycle/pedestrian provision on the footway on one side. It seems unnecessary to make provision on footways on both sides as the footway provision made also aligns with the actual cycle route whereas the footway on the other side has no wider formal cycle link. This footway is also likely to be used by individuals using the disabled bays that flank it.
11.		PPP Tariff 4*	17 spaces adjacent to the gardens		
12.		NWAAT with loading ban AAT	Covering all new crossing points, and adjacent to the loading bay next to the Obscura Café and the bus stop opposite Tesco		
13.		20mph zone	From adjacent to Brompton Court to Avenue Road		

14.		Traffic Calming Features	Installation of 75mm high flat top road humps adjacent to Tesco, Hampshire Court and at its junction with Braidley Road (both arms of the roundabout)		
15.	Braidley Road	SPP	Realign 8 spaces opposite No. 21	1 comment regarding a section of Braidley Road not included in this consultation / scheme – speed of vehicles on the whole road.	There is merit in extending the 20mph zone further up Braidley Rd however there are no casualties to support this request and it is beyond the scope of the current scheme. The focus on speed reduction and pedestrian accessibility has higher priority in the key town centre areas where the number of pedestrians is highest.
16.		Remove P&D	Remove 2 spaces adjacent to the Town Hall (new crossing to be installed)		
17.		NWAAT with loading ban AAT	Covering all new crossing points		
18.		Motorcycle bay	In the circle, adjacent to the Town Hall		
19.		20mph zone	From No. 14 to Bourne Avenue		
20.		Traffic Calming Features	Installation of 75mm high flat top road humps at its junctions with Bourne Avenue, St Stephen's Way and adjacent to the turning/parking circle next to the Town Hall		
21.	Commercial Road	DPP with waiting limited to 3 hours 8am-6pm	Remove 2 spaces at the lower end of the precinct	No specific comments – see general scheme comments below	
22.	General scheme comments			General scheme comments	
	<p>14 in support (Inc. 2 councilors)</p> <p>7 general comments covering the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. querying use of 20mph restrictions ii. requesting signalled crossing adjacent to Tesco, iii. 20mph speed limit only required on Bourne Ave and Avenue Rd iv. Wrong to provide parking for out of services buses in the town centre v. speed humps not good on bus routes vi. would be nice to improve route around the war memorial vii. supports decluttering and 20mph limit viii. cycle signage should be set flush into the ground as elsewhere in the town 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. 20mph zones support a lower speed to create a more pedestrian and cycle friendly public space. ii. It would be difficult to orientate signal heads to achieve adequate approach sightlines. Signals crossings are approximately twice the cost of a zebra crossing and signals also have more ongoing maintenance cost. A zebra crossing will perform well in a low speed environment and will also give priority to pedestrian movements. iii. It is more practical and consistent to treat a whole area as a 20mph zone rather than treat small elements of a road differently. This also accords with design guidance and this 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ix. no need for road centre lines x. tighter radii on Braidley Rd / St Stephens Way junction to aid pedestrian movements xi. cycle crossing facilities as well as pedestrian would be desirable xii. relocate cycle stands in The Square to avoid blocking the pedestrian and cycle route <p>4 objections covering the following points: <i>(includes the only objection to P3 2017)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. questions the need for the scheme and effectiveness of 20mph limits b. shared footway/cycle way's dangerous particularly across The Square <p>1 response from a bus operator covering the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. No objection to traffic calming in principle however would like to highlight the discomfort to passengers they cause B. Traffic calming on the approach to bus stops / parking cause a particular issue for passengers C. Concern about the location of the pedestrian crossing adjacent to Tesco with regard to visibility for pedestrians and motorists 	<p>zone is likely to link with another zone in St Stephen's Rd as part of a development in that location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. Agreed, see note at item 1. v. Agreed however there are not many bus services using this route and there is agreed guidance on how to design humps so that passenger discomfort is minimized and this design guidance will be applied here. vi. Agreed but out of scope of this highway scheme. vii. Agreed. The scheme will be decluttering street furniture wherever possible. viii. Agreed. The signs showing cycling is permitted will be flush in the ground as other similar signage in the Town Centre area is. ix. Agreed, centre lines will only be used on the bend by the proposed new zebra where it is considered they are needed. x. Agreed. These will be made as tight as practical whilst accommodating swept path of vehicles. xi. Cycle crossing facilities are usually specified where there are formal cycle facilities on both sides of a crossing. This is not the case here however the imposition of traffic calming and a 20mph limit will make the whole zone inherently more pedestrian and cycle friendly. xii. Agreed. The cycle stands will be located so that they don't block the pedestrian and cycle routes. <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 20mph schemes are effective where physical speed reduction is included. This area is used by large numbers of pedestrians and it is considered appropriate to seek to lower vehicle speeds. b. No evidence of casualty collisions. The decision to allow cyclists in the Square is outside of the scope of this scheme. <p>Bus operator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. See note v. above. B. See note v. above. C. Visibility has been checked and complies with design standards. D. The Local Authority does not have a duty to provide bus parking in its town centre or elsewhere. It does provide stops
--	---

	<p>D. Loss of bus parking is acceptable provided they are replaced elsewhere in the town centre – this is not indicated anywhere</p> <p>E. Concern over enforcement of proposed 20mph speed limit</p>	<p>and bus subsidies to support public transport use across the Borough.</p> <p>E. The 20mph will be physically enforced by the raised crossing points and humps. These will also aid pedestrian access.</p>																		
	<p>*Tariff 4 Mon-Sat 9am-8pm & Sun 10am-8pm Max stay 2 hours no return within 3 hours</p> <table data-bbox="163 416 656 600"> <tr> <td>Up to 20 mins</td> <td>-</td> <td>£0.60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Up to 40 mins</td> <td>-</td> <td>£1.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Up to 1 hour</td> <td>-</td> <td>£1.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Up to 1 hour 20 mins</td> <td>-</td> <td>£2.40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Up to 1 hour 40 mins</td> <td>-</td> <td>£3.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Up to 2 hours</td> <td>-</td> <td>£3.60</td> </tr> </table>	Up to 20 mins	-	£0.60	Up to 40 mins	-	£1.20	Up to 1 hour	-	£1.80	Up to 1 hour 20 mins	-	£2.40	Up to 1 hour 40 mins	-	£3.00	Up to 2 hours	-	£3.60	
Up to 20 mins	-	£0.60																		
Up to 40 mins	-	£1.20																		
Up to 1 hour	-	£1.80																		
Up to 1 hour 20 mins	-	£2.40																		
Up to 1 hour 40 mins	-	£3.00																		
Up to 2 hours	-	£3.60																		

Equality Impact Needs Assessment

The Diversity Promise – *Better for all*

1. Title of Policy/Service/Project	Bourne Ave, Braidley Rd & Avenue Rd Highway Improvement Scheme Traffic Regulation Order.
2. Service Unit	Environment
3. Lead Responsible Officer and Job Title	Chris Parkes – Team Leader, Traffic Management
4. Members of the Assessment Team:	Chris Parkes Jamie Griffiths
5. Date assessment started:	9 May 2017
6. Date assessment completed:	10 May 2017

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 to progress the scheme to improve the area around the Central Gardens/The Square by creating a safer and more attractive pedestrian orientated environment. To implement Traffic Regulation Orders to install new disabled bays at a number sites across Bournemouth as requested by members of the public in order to improve accessibility for disabled residents.

9. Are there any associated services, policies or procedures?	Yes
If 'Yes', please list below: Parking Enforcement, 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? Disabled Blue Badge Holders, cyclists and pedestrians	
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? Two public consultations were undertaken. The second introduced amendments to address concerns raised by the first consultation. The first consultation opened on 25th November 2016 and closed on 16th December 2016. The second consultation opened on 24th March 2017 and closed on 14th April 2017

For both consultations notices were placed in the Bournemouth Daily Echo, on the council's website and 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).

Representations received are detailed in the attached appendix.

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

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 resident's properties who are registered disabled and meet the requirements	Non-disabled residents do not receive 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

	Actual or potential positive benefit	Actual or potential negative outcome
23. Race	No impact	No impact
24. Religion or Belief	No impact	No impact
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 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

G2 Initial Risk Assessment



PROJECT NAME:

Bourne Ave, Braidley Rd & Avenue Rd Highway Improvement Scheme Traffic Regulation Order.

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
				Risk Score
				17

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+