

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:
Spring/Summer 2016 Traffic Regulation Order Review (Part 2)

Decision taken:
To implement the Traffic Regulations Orders detailed in the attached Detailed Record of Decision

Reasons for the decision:
To progress the implementation of the advertised restrictions to improve the parking facilities available to the local community, improve road safety and to ensure essential services can take place

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 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 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 reason for them are detailed in the attached Record of Decision (Part 2)

Consultations undertaken:
The public consultation opened on Friday 24th June 2016 and closed on Friday 22 July 2016. 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 consultation was advertised in the Bournemouth Daily Echo, on the council's website, on TraffWeb (the council's online TRO website), and on street notices in the relevant locations.

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 (estimated to be £10,000) will be met by the Permanent Traffic Regulation Order budget - KE0400 4680 K0402

Name: *ADAM RICHENS*
Date: *21/9/16*

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 COWARD*
Date: *20/9/16*

Signature: (of Monitoring Officer)

Risk assessment:

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

Name: *JAMIE GRIFFITHS*
Date: *27/9/16*

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:

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 M. HS GREENE (Print name)

Cabinet Portfolio TRANSPORT, SUSTAINABILITY + CARBON MANAGEMENT

Signed:



Date of decision: 27/9/16

Date of publication of record of decision: 30/09/16

Date decision effective: 7/10/16

Legend: AAT - At Any Time, NWAAT - No Waiting At Any Time (double yellow lines), SPP - Street Parking Place, DPP - Disabled Parking Place

No.	Road Name(s)	Restriction	Location	Ward	Response	Decision
1.	Alexandra Rd / Herberton Rd	NWAAT	5m around the junction	Boscombe East	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
2.	Alexandra Rd / Oxford Ave	NWAAT	5m around the junction	Boscombe East	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
3.	Colville Rd / Harvey Rd	NWAAT	5m around the junction	Boscombe East	1 in support, 1 objection (lack of parking for residents due to parked vehicles associated with a particular business)	Implement as advertised Reason: restriction required to maintain essential council services and emergency access. Restrictions have been kept to the absolute minimum to reduce the impact on residents as much as possible.
4.	Cromwell Rd / Wyncombe Rd	NWAAT	5m around the junction	Boscombe East	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
6.	Cromwell Rd	NWAAT	Southern side, Ashbourne Rd to Southbourne Rd	Boscombe East	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
8.	Gloucester Rd	SPP with waiting limited to 1 hour Mon-Sat 8am-6pm no return 1 hour	Revoke the existing Police Bay opposite No. 50 and replace with the same restriction as the adjacent SPP bay	Boscombe East	3 objections (lack of parking available for residents)	Implement as advertised Reason: The proposal does not remove parking currently available to residents, but converts it from a Police bay to a limited waiting bay. Parking would be possible overnight from 5pm to 9am for residents and all day on Sundays.

12.	Wolverton Rd	Revoke DPP	Adjacent to No.104	Boscombe East	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
13.	Aylesbury Rd	NWAAT	Adjacent to No.1	Boscombe West	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
14.	Aylesbury Rd / The Crescent	NWAAT	5m around the junction	Boscombe West	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
15.	Aylesbury Rd / Donoughmore Rd	NWAAT	5m around the junction	Boscombe West	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
16.	Borthwick Rd	No entry except cyclists / cycle contra flows	At the Walpole Rd end of the existing one way system	Boscombe West	8 in support	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
17.	Centenary Way	NWAAT and No Loading AAT	Both sides for the whole length	Boscombe West	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
18.	Christchurch Rd / Palmerston Rd / The Crescent / Salisbury Rd / Carnarvon Rd	20mph zone	From the roundabout with Centenary Way to: i) the junction of Walpole Rd / The Crescent ii) Christchurch Rd 3m southwest of the bus stop opposite No. 499 iii) Adeline Rd southern end of the Police Bay	Boscombe West	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
19.	Churchill Rd	Revoke DPP	Adjacent to No.13	Boscombe West	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
20.	Gladstone Rd West	Right turn exemption for cyclists	At its junction with Palmerston Rd	Boscombe West	7 in support	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
22.	Roumelia Ln	No entry except cyclists / cycle contra flows	At the Sea Rd end	Boscombe West	10 in support	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
23.	The Crescent	Car Club Bay	Eastern end, eastern side from the RPZ for 6m north	Boscombe West	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
24.	Albert Rd	Revoke DPP & install NWAAT & No Loading AAT	Opposite Nos.10-14 - between the existing No Loading AAT and the Loading Bay	Central	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received

25.	Cambridge Rd	Payment parking place Tariff 2 (see below)	All existing parking places and unrestricted sections between Suffolk Rd and the Wessex Way	Central	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
26.	Exeter Park Rd	Payment parking place Tariff 4 Payment parking place Tariff 1 (see below)	All Street Parking Places for cars & motorcycles (excluding permit bays)	Central	2 comments - covenant exists that prevents charging for parking in this location - Advertised tariff is not suitable for the location and an option that allows all day parking would better serve, residents and hotel guests.	Implement under Tariff 1 as indicated left Reason: Investigation by legal services has resulted in no covenants being identified that would prevent the proposal from progressing, and land in question is Adopted Public Highway. The tariff was given full consideration and a more suitable / flexible tariff has been adopted.
27.	Hinton Rd	No entry except cyclists / cycle contra flows	At the Bath Rd end	Central	8 in support	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
28.	Post Office Rd	Loading Ban AAT & new loading bay	Loading bay on the southern side near the turning head. Extended the existing disabled bay west by 2 metres. NWAAT and loading ban both sides for the remainder of Post Office Rd from Richmond Hill to the Ped Zone	Central	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
29.	Richmond Hill	Loading Bay for Goods Vehicles Only 9.30am-4.30pm (unrestricted at other times)	Existing loading bay / limited waiting north of Yelverton Rd	Central	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
30.	St Paul's PI / St Paul's Ln	Payment parking place Tariff 2	All unrestricted sections of the public highway	Central	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
31.	St Peters Rd	No Loading and NWAAT	Adjacent to the Burlington Arcade	Central	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
32.	Curzon Rd	No entry except cyclists / cycle contra flows	At the Holdenhurst Rd end	East Cliff & Springbourne	6 in support	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
33.	Garfield Ave	Revoke DPP	Revoke the bay adjacent to No.8 and install one adjacent to No.16	East Cliff & Springbourne	No response received	Implement as advertised

						Reason: no objections received
34.	Grants Ave junctions with Grants Cl, Harrison Ave, Madison Ave, Jefferson Ave, Curzon Rd	NWAAT	5m around the corners of each junction	East Cliff & Springbourne	2 objections (concerns about lack of parking for residents – both mention only problems are when there is a football match on)	Implement as advertised Reason: restriction required to maintain essential council services and emergency access (refuse team have frequent difficulties on non-match days). Restrictions have been kept to the absolute minimum to reduce the impact on residents as much as possible.
35.	Grants Cl	NWAAT	North-eastern side for the whole length	East Cliff & Springbourne	1 objection (concerns about lack of parking for residents)	Implement as advertised Reason: restriction required to maintain essential council services and emergency access. Road becomes blocked when parking occurs on both side of the road.
38.	Spring Rd	NWAAT	5m around the unrestricted corners	East Cliff & Springbourne	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
39.	Stanley Rd	NWAAT	Entire length of the north-western side	East Cliff & Springbourne	2 objections (1 expressed concerns about lack of parking for residents the other advised that they were not aware of any problems caused by parking)	Implement as advertised Reason: restriction required to maintain essential council services and emergency access (refuse team have frequent difficulties accessing the full length of the road)
40.	Foxholes Rd	No entry except cyclists / cycle contra flows	At the Douglas Rd end	East Southbourne & Tuckton	5 in support	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
43.	Ferncroft Rd	Revoke DPP	Adjacent to No. 2	Kinson North	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
45.	Cherford Rd / Widget Cl	NWAAT	5m around the junction	Kinson South	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received

46.	Deepdene Ln	NWAAT	Both sides from 5m west of the boundary of Nos. 3/5 eastwards around all sides of the turning head. From 7.5m southeast of No.3 on the southern side around the turning head to 1m northwest of the driveway to No. 2 on the northern side.	Kinson South	1 in support, 5 objections, 1 petition with 7 signatures (residents) in objection – (duplications of the 5 objections). Main concerns are lack of parking and displaced parking. Most do not see parking in this area as a problem.	Implement a reduced proposal as detailed left. Reason: Boundary wall of No.2 has been knocked down a number of times due to vehicles turning when cars parking in the turning head. The amended proposal is a compromise that will protect a small turning head but still allow three parking spaces if parked sensibly.
48.	Paddington Grove / Stilmore Rd	NWAAT	5m around the junction	Kinson South	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
49.	Hillbrow Rd / Droxford Rd	NWAAT	5m around the junction	Littledown & Iford	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
50.	Coronation Ave	Revoke NWAAT	Shorten NWAAT to the western boundary of No. 4	Moordown	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
51.	Evelyn Road	Revoke DPP	Adjacent to No. 60	Moordown	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
52.	Middleton Rd / Comely Rd	NWAAT	5m around the junction	Moordown	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
53.	Moorvale Rd	No entry except cyclists / cycle contra flows	At the Minterne Rd end	Moordown	6 in support (including cycling networks / organisations), 3 objections (2 concerning perceived loss of parking and 1 concern about safety of cyclists)	Implement as advertised. Reason: The proposal will not remove any parking. It has been requested by cycling groups and would permit activity that is already taking place unofficially without issue.
54.	Queen Mary Ave / Mayfield Rd	Revoke NWAAT	Reduce the NWAAT to 5m around all corners	Moordown	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
56.	Southill Rd / Gresham Rd	NWAAT	5m around the junction	Moordown	1 in support	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received

57.	West Way	NWAAT	Extend the existing NWAAT on the western side for 10m south of Priory View Rd	Moordown	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
58.	Cecil Ave / Cecil Hill	NWAAT	5m around the junction (Corners only)	Queen's Park	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
59.	Richmond Park Rd	NWAAT	Southern side between Bennett Rd and Howard Rd	Queen's Park	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
60.	Richmond Park Rd	NWAAT	Adjacent to the build out next to No. 32	Queen's Park	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
61.	Shelbourne Rd	Revoke DPP	Adjacent to No.155	Queen's Park	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
62.	St George's Ave	No entry except cyclists / cycle contra flows	At the existing Queens Park West Dr no entry	Queen's Park	5 in support (including cycling networks / organisations), 4 objections (concerns about safety of cyclists / residents on a steep hill with blind bends – some mention incidents that's have already occurred)	Delete Proposal Reason: Objections received were carefully considered and deemed reasonable despite the support shown.
65.	Wimborne Rd service Rd (Nos.1244-1254)	Street Parking Place with waiting limited to 2 hours 10am-7pm no return within 1 hour	Northern side adjacent to Northbourne Roundabout	Redhill & Northbourne	1 objection (no problems with parking – it will displace parking to other areas. Request residents permits)	Implement as advertised Reason: The objection was given full consideration however the original proposal was to mitigate ongoing parking problems relating to nearby businesses, and the proposal regulates parking but does not remove it.
68.	Castle Gate Cl	Amend restrictions to the new kerb lines.	No Loading AAT from the existing No Loading AAT to 5m south-east of the boundary of Nos. 305/307	Strouden Park	1 in support (Cllr)	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
69.	Castle Gate Cl	No entry into Castle Gate Cl	Western arm at the junction with Castle Lane West	Strouden Park	1 in support (Cllr)	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
70.	Charminster Rd	NWAAT	Eastern side from No. 410 to Queens Park Ave	Strouden Park	1 in support (Cllr), 3 objections (mainly	Implement a reduced proposal as detailed.

			Eastern side from the southern boundary of No.410 to Queens Park Ave		concerned with parking for residents and an increase in speed of traffic. Will not ease congestion at roundabout	Reason: The reduced proposal allows 3 or 4 cars to park compared to the original proposal, but still improves capacity and safety on the immediate approach to the roundabout.
71.	Curlew Rd	NWAAT	10m across entrance to the flats	Strouden Park	1 in support (Cllr), 1 objection (concerns about lack of parking for residents)	Implement as advertised Reason: restriction required to maintain essential council services and emergency access. Restrictions have been kept to the absolute minimum to reduce the impact on residents as much as possible.
72.	East Way	No Loading and NWAAT	Westbound at the junction with Charminster Rd	Strouden Park	1 in support (Cllr), 1 objection (current restrictions already ignored, concerns about deliveries and lack of disabled parking)	Implement as advertised Reason: Deliveries are not expected to cause an issue as there is no access to any properties where the restriction is proposed. Disabled bays are already present in the area close to property access points however usage can be monitored to assess the need for further facilities
73.	Ibbertson Rd	NWAAT	Western side from 20m north of No.45 for 30m north	Strouden Park	1 in support (Cllr)	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
75.	Jewell Rd / Cheshire Dr	NWAAT	10m around the junction	Strouden Park	1 in support (Cllr)	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
76.	Mallard Rd	NWAAT	Replace the SYL on the north-eastern side and extend to just south of Seagull Rd	Strouden Park	1 in support (Cllr)	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
78.	Branksome Hill Rd	NWAAT	from existing NWAAT to just past the access to No. 3 southern side, and No. 6 on the northern side	Talbot & Branksome Woods	No response received, previous consultation with residents resulted in this proposal being advertised	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received

79.	Branksome Wood Rd	NWAAT	Unrestricted sections opposite The Cedars and Bourne Banks.	Talbot & Branksome Woods	9 in support (mainly citing improved safety), 8 objections (concerns about knock on effects to other roads, increase in speed of traffic on Branksome Wood Road and need for residents and visitor parking in the area), 1 comment (would enable street cleaning, but would increase traffic speed and push parking to other roads)	Implement as advertised Reason: All objections were given full consideration and balanced against those comments in support. The overall assessment deemed the concerns raised in the objections did not significantly outweigh the benefits raised in support.
80.	Kings Rd & Gerald Rd	NWAAT	10m around the junction 5m around the junction	Talbot & Branksome Woods	2 in support, 1 objection (concerns about lack of parking for residents – disabled driver)	Implement reduced proposal as detailed. Reason: To maintain the safety of the junction but keep restrictions to the absolute minimum to reduce the impact on residents as much as possible.
81.	Rothestay Rd	NWAAT	Both sides from the bridge over the railway to the boundary of Nos. 23/25	Talbot & Branksome Woods	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
82.	Shillingstone Dr	School Keep Clear Mon-Fri 8am-5pm	Adjacent to Muscliffe Primary School	Throop & Muscliff	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
83.	Beswick Ave / Zinnia Cl	NWAAT	5m around the junction	Wallisdown & Winton West	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
84.	Ensburry Ave	School Keep Clear Mon-Fri 8am-5pm & NWAAT	SKC from the exit to Tregonwell School for 25.5m east with NWAAT between the new and existing SKC around the bend near Winton Way	Wallisdown & Winton West	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
85.	Firs Glen Rd / Heathwood Rd	School Keep Clear Mon-Fri 8am-5pm	At the junction of Firs Glen Rd / Heathwood Rd	Wallisdown & Winton West	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
86.	Gorsecliff Rd	Revoke NWAAT	Covering the drive of No. 36	Wallisdown & Winton West	No response received	Implement as advertised

						Reason: no objections received
87.	Noble Cl	Revoke DPP	Adjacent to No. 5	Wallisdown & Winton West	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
88.	Oswald Rd	No entry except cyclists / cycle contra flows	At the Oswald Close end	Wallisdown & Winton West	8 in support	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
89.	Burleigh Rd	Revoke DPP	Adjacent to No. 35	West Southbourne	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
90.	Fisherman's Ave	Revoke SYL	Adjacent to No.1	West Southbourne	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
92.	Alum Chine Rd	Motorcycle bays with Waiting Limited to 1 hr 10am-7pm no return with 1 hr	All existing M/C bays between Seamoor Rd and West Cliff Rd	Westbourne & West Cliff	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
93.	Exeter Rd / Terrace Rd	No Loading & NWAAT	Western side from Cranborne Rd to Upper Terrace Rd, eastern side from Exeter Cres to the taxi bay on Terrace Rd	Westbourne & West Cliff	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
94.	St Michaels Ln	Revoke NWAAT	Both sides for the whole length	Westbourne & West Cliff	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
95.	St Michaels Rd	NWAAT	The existing limited waiting bays on the eastern side of the one way section	Westbourne & West Cliff	3 objections (concerns about reduction in parking for local residents and businesses, wider issues adding to parking problems which need addressing)	Implement as advertised Reason: An assessment undertaken by the Fire & Rescue service with a fire tender resulted in serious concerns about their ability to access the area, which resulted in this proposal. Emergency access is of paramount importance with potentially severe consequences should action fail to be taken. Whilst fully considering the reasons for the objections, it is felt they do not

						significantly outweigh the reason for implementation.
97.	Calvin Rd	Limited Waiting bay	Move the existing bay outside Nos. 5 /7 approx. 4m towards Wimborne Rd	Winton East	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
99.	Charminster Rd	Waiting Limited to 1 hr 9am-6pm no return 1 hr	Opposite Richmond Wood Ave - join two bays together	Winton East	2 objections (concerns about loss of parking – objectors may have misunderstood the proposal)	Implement as advertised Reason: the proposal increases parking provision in this location which allay the reasons stated in the objections
100.	Cranmer Rd / Luther Rd	NWAAT	Extent of the existing SYL	Winton East	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
102.	Frampton Rd / Acland Rd	NWAAT	5m around the junction	Winton East	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
103.	Green Rd / Crichel Rd	NWAAT	5m around the junction	Winton East	2 objection (concerns about the lack of parking available for residents)	Implement as advertised Reason: restriction required to maintain essential council services and emergency access. Restrictions have been kept to the absolute minimum to reduce the impact on residents as much as possible.
104.	Green Rd	No entry except cyclists / cycle contra flows	At the Somerley Rd end	Winton East	6 in support (including cyclist networks / organisations), 4 objections (concerns about the perceived loss of parking, concerns about safety of cyclists)	Implement as advertised Reason: The proposal does not remove any parking from the road, therefore the reasons stated in the objections are not valid. The safety concerns regarding cyclists travelling against the flow of traffic in a one-way street have been considered. Comments from cyclists organisations do not perceive any additional dangers from this activity. There are also a number of case studies

									from across the country where this type of scheme has been operating safely for a number of years (including elsewhere in Bournemouth). All cycle schemes are designed by qualified highway engineers with road safety being the highest priority. Appropriate signage will be installed to warn drivers of the cycle contraflow system.
105.	Hankinson Rd / Brazier Cl	NWAAT	5m around the junction & adjacent to Nos. 130/132	Winton East	3 objections (concerns about loss of parking)				Delete proposal Reason: the objections received were given careful consideration and operational discussions with the refuse team resulted in an agreement not to implement the proposal in light of the objectors concerns
106.	Leamington Rd / Heron Court Rd	NWAAT	5m around the junction	Winton East	No response received				Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
107.	Markham Rd / Frampton Rd	NWAAT	5 around the junction	Winton East	1 in support				Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
111.	Portland Rd	NWAAT	Revoke NWAAT adjacent to No. 126, and place NWAAT adjacent to No. 24-28	Winton East	No response received				Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
112.	Woodend Rd	No entry except cyclists / cycle contra flows	At the Talbot Rd end	Winton East	8 in support				Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received

Payment Parking Place Tariffs:

TARIFF 2	Times Charges are applicable	Up to 1 hr	Up to 2 hrs	Up to 3 hrs	Up to 4 hrs	Up to 6 hrs	Up to 8 hrs	Response	Recommendation
Cambridge Rd, St Paul's Place, St Paul's Lane	Mon - Sun 09:00 – 17:00	£1.00	£2.00	£2.50	£3.00	£4.00	£5.00	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

TARIFF 4 Road Name	Times Charges are applicable	Maximum stay	Up to 20 mins	Up to 40 mins	Up to 1 hour	Up to 1hr 20 mins	Up to 1hr 40 mins	Up to 2 hrs	Response	Recommendation
Exeter Park Rd	Mon – Sat 09:00 – 20:00 Sun 10:00 – 20:00	2 hours no return within 3 hours	£0.50	£1.00	£1.50	£2.00	£2.50	£3.00	2 comments - covenant exists that prevents charging for parking in this location - Advertised tariff is not suitable for the location and an option that allows all day parking would better serve, residents and hotel guests.	Implement under Tariff 1 as indicated. Reason: Investigation by legal services has resulted in no covenants being identified that would prevent the proposal from progressing, and the land in question is adopted public highway and so legitimately can be subject to such a tariff. The tariff was given full consideration and a more suitable / flexible tariff has been adopted.
TARIFF 1 Road Name	Times Charges are applicable	Up to 1 hr	Up to 2 hrs	Up to 3 hrs	Up to 4 hrs	Up to 6 hrs	Up to 11 hrs	3 day (via phone payment only)		
Exeter Park Rd	Mon – Sun 09.00 – 20.00	£1.00	£2.00	£3.00	£4.00	£6.00	£8.00	£15.00	£30.00	

EINA Screening Record

Title of Policy/Service/Project	Spring / Summer Review 2016 Traffic Regulation Order
Date of screening	08/09/2016
Service Unit	Environment
Lead Responsible Officer	Jamie Griffiths
Job Title	Team Leader - Traffic Management
Members of the Assessment Team	Jamie Griffiths, Chris Parkes

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 restrictions confirmed in this process are widely used elsewhere in the borough and do not have an equalities impact.

G2 Initial Risk Assessment



PROJECT NAME:

Spring / Summer 2016 Traffic Regulation Order Review (Part 2)

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+