



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:

Street Parking Places for Cars and Motorcycles Signing and Lining Maintenance Scheme

Decision taken:

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

Reasons for the decision:

No representations were received to the public consultation. Therefore, the recommendation is to progress the implementation of the Traffic Regulation Order which will support the aims of the scheme. These aims are to clarify the restrictions currently in place for on-street parking (with easy to understand, clear signage and lining) and assist enforcement of the parking places.

Call-in and Urgency:

This decision is subject to the councils call in procedure.

Background:

Over the years, slight variations to the design of the signage used to indicate the numerous street parking places for cars and motorcycles has introduced slight confusion to the message conveyed by the signage. Although all the current signage correctly conveys the meaning of the Traffic Regulation Order it is not ideal. Therefore, firstly the scheme aims to update the current signage with a clear and consistent sign design. Secondly, the scheme removes any anomalies between the restrictions on-street and the relevant description in the current Traffic Regulation Order. There will not be any fundamental changes to the restrictions on-street. The scheme covers many streets across the whole of the borough but only relates to the restrictions regarding the Street Parking Places for Cars and Motorcycles. The scheme does not include any other type of parking restriction.

Options - and reasons for rejection:

Options are, to implement the TRO as advertised, amend it or not implement it at all and keep the restrictions as they currently are.

No representations were received. Therefore, the recommendation is to implement the amendments as advertised

Consultations undertaken:

A public consultation was undertaken which opened on 24th March 2017 and closed on 14th April 2017

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).

No representations were received.

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 this TRO will be met by the permanent TRO budget.

Name: ADAM RICHENS

Signature: (of Chief Finance Officer)

Date: 21/6/17

Legal implications:

It is felt that that as there were no objections from the public consultation to take into account there are no grounds for challenge to the making of the TRO in this case.

Name: TANYA COULTER

Signature: (of Monitoring Officer)

Date: 21/6/17

Risk assessment:

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

Name: CHRIS PACE

Signature: (of Officer completing assessment)

Date: 27/6/17

Impact Assessments:

An EINA Screening Record 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 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 Mills GREENE (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

EINA Screening Record

Title of Policy/Service/Project	Street Parking Places for Cars and Motorcycles Signing and Lining Maintenance Scheme
Date of screening	10/05/17
Service Unit	Environment
Lead Responsible Officer	Chris Parkes
Job Title	Team Leader - Traffic Management
Members of the Assessment Team	Chris Parkes and Jamie Griffiths

If the answers to the following questions are Yes or Don't know, then a full EINA will need to be carried out.

Is there likely to be a positive or negative impact in terms of equalities?	No
Does it involve a significant commitment of resources?	No

It is not necessary at the screening stage to identify adverse or differential impact

It is important to remember that even when it is decided that a policy/service/project does not require an EINA, it remains subject to the general duties. Not carrying out a full EINA places our council at greater risk of legal challenge because it cannot use the EINA process to meet our [Public Duties](#) around equality. It also means, more importantly, that opportunities may have been missed to promote equality.

If you have answered no to the questions above and do not intend to carry out an EINA, please explain why?

The Traffic Regulation Order is being progressed to correct anomalies in the order. It will not fundamentally change the restrictions on the highway.

G2 Initial Risk Assessment



PROJECT NAME:

Street Parking Places for Cars and Motorcycles Signing and Lining Maintenance Scheme

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:

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