



## 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 Orders (TRO's) required to implement highway improvement schemes for the following.

- Jewell Academy
- Belle Vue Rd Parallel Crossing
- Wimborne Rd Cycle Lane
- New residential disabled bays.

**Decision taken:**

To implement the Traffic Regulations Orders 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 improvement schemes.

**Call-in and Urgency:**

This decision is subject to the councils call in procedure.

**Background:**

- Jewell Academy improvement scheme includes a new shared cycle & pedestrian crossing on Ibbertson Rd and new limited waiting restrictions in the service road outside the Townsend Primary School.
- Belle Vue Rd scheme is the installation of a new Parallel Crossing to improve the crossing facilities for both cyclists and pedestrians.
- Wimborne Rd Cycle Lane scheme will install a new cycle lane in each direction along Wimborne Rd. The current parking will be relocated so there is no overall loss of parking spaces.
- All the requests for new residential disabled bays meet our required criteria/conditions.

**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. Individual decisions and the reasons for them are detailed in the attached record of decision.



**(PARKING REGULATION & ON-STREET PARKING PLACES) CONSOLIDATION ORDER 2015  
(VARIATION NO.4) (VARIATION NO.5) (VARIATION NO.6) (VARIATION NO.7) ORDER 2017  
AND  
(TRAFFIC MOVEMENT REGULATIONS) (CONSOLIDATION) ORDER 2007  
(VARIATION) (NO. 2) ORDER 2017**

**Legend:** DPP – Disabled Parking Place, NWAAT – No waiting at any time

Response details						
No.	Road Name(s)	Restriction	Location	Ward	Response	Decision
Jewell Academy Zebra Crossing						
1.	Ibbertson Road	Revoke NWAAT and replace with Zebra zig-zags	near junction with Jewell Rd	Strouden Park	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
2.	Jewell Road	NWAAT	Outside Jewell Academy at its junction with Stone Gardens		No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
3.	Jewell Academy Service Road	Waiting limited to 2 hours no return within 4 hours	Outside Jewell Academy		1 - support – suggests a disabled bay outside the convenience store.	Implement as advertised Reason: We will monitor the changes to the restrictions and could consider a disabled bay in the future.
Belle Vue Rd Parallel Crossing						
4.	Twynham Road	NWAAT	In the cul-de-sac end and at its junction with Belle Vue Rd and its junction with St Catherine's Rd	East Southbourne & Tuckton	3 objections – lack of nearby parking. The loss of more spaces will make it extremely difficult to find a safe parking place. Currently vehicles are often parked in irresponsible places in particular at school times.	Implement as advertised Reason: the NWAAT at/near the junction is to improve the visibility at a new buildout which is part of works to relocate the School Crossing Patrol location. This moves the crossing point from a location which is currently obscured by the school bus parking. Improving the facilities for walking and cycling aims to reduce the number of car journeys to the school and thus help to

						reduce the demand for parking at school times.
5.	Belle Vue Road	Revoke NWAAT and replace with Zebra zig-zags	At its junction with Twynham Rd		No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
Wimborne Rd Cycle Lane						
6.	Wimborne Road	DPP	near Richmond Hill	Central	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
7.		Mandatory with flow cycle lane	Along both sides of the road from its junction with Richmond Hill to Lansdowne Rd.		1 - support – suggestions and comments regarding other cycling improvement locations.	Implement as advertised Reason: Suggestions and comments will be considered as and when future schemes are developed.
8.		Braidley Rd	DPP		near its junction with Wimborne Rd	No response received
Residential Disabled Bays						
9.	Acres Road	DPP (permit)	Adjacent to No.12	Wallisdown & Winton West	2 objections - loss of parking for residents, and questions why a resident form another road can have a bay outside some else's house. Other solutions should be considered.	Implement as advertised Reason: other off road parking locations have been investigated and all the other access routes considered. There is no other viable solution. This proposal enables the disabled resident to park as close to their home as possible.
10.	Bishop Road	DPP (permit)	Adjacent to No.20	Winton East	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
11.	Shelbourne Road	DPP (permit)	Adjacent to No.86	Queen's Park	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
12.	Spring Road	DPP	Adjacent to No.52	East Cliff & Springbourne	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received

**Consultations undertaken:**

The public consultation for the parking restriction amendments for all the schemes opened on 24<sup>th</sup> March 2017 and closed on 14<sup>th</sup> April 2017. The public consultation for the cycle lane opened on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017 and closed on 21<sup>st</sup> April 2017.

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 representations that were received are detailed in the attached appendix.

This fulfils the statutory consultation process required by the 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 have been accounted for and included in the individual scheme budgets.

The application fee for a residential disabled bay covers the costs associated with their implementation.

Name: ADAM RICHENS

Signature: (of Chief Finance Officer)

Date: 21/6/17

**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

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:

Signature: (of Officer completing assessment)

Date: 5/06/17

**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 MIKE GREENE..... (Print name)Cabinet Portfolio TRANSPORT, CLEANING + WASTESigned: Date of decision: 29/6/17

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

Date decision effective: 10/07/2017



# Equality Impact Needs Assessment

The Diversity Promise - *Better for all*



Building a Better Bournemouth

1. Title of Policy/Service/Project	Highway improvement schemes traffic regulation order amendment. Jewell Academy Zebra Crossing, Belle Vue Rd Parallel Crossing, Wimborne Rd Cycle Lane and new residential disabled bays.
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 amend the traffic regulation order to permit improvement schemes which aims include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jewell Academy improvement scheme is for a new shared cycle &amp; pedestrian crossing on Ibbertson Rd and new limited waiting restrictions in the service road outside the Townsend Primary School to help improve the availability of parking outside the convenience store.</li> <li>• Belle Vue Rd scheme is the installation of a new Parallel Crossing to improve the crossing facilities for both cyclists and pedestrians.</li> <li>• Wimborne Rd Cycle Lane scheme will install a new cycle lane in each direction along Wimborne Rd. The current parking will be relocated so there is no overall loss of parking spaces.</li> <li>• New residential disabled bays at four sites across Bournemouth as requested by members of the public in order to improve accessibility for disabled residents.</li> </ul>

9. Are there any associated services, policies or procedures?	Yes/No
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? 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? The public consultation for the parking restriction amendments opened on 24th March 2017 and closed on 14th April 2017. The public consultation for the cycle lane opened on 31st March 2017 and closed on 21st April 2017.  Notices were placed in the Bournemouth Daily Echo and on the council's website for both consultation.  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 representations that were received are detailed in the attached appendix.

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

	<b>Actual or potential positive benefit</b>	<b>Actual or potential negative outcome</b>
<b>17. Age</b>	No impact	No impact
<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

	Actual or potential positive benefit	Actual or potential negative outcome
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

				<b>Equality Action Plan/Team Plan</b>
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:

Highway improvement schemes traffic regulation order amendment.  
Jewell Academy Zebra Crossing, Belle Vue Rd Parallel Crossing, Wimborne Rd Cycle Lane and new residential disabled bays.

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:

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

Initial Risk Assessment

Initial Risk Assessment (P4 P5 P6 P7 2017 &amp; M2 2017)