

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 1)

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.

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 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 reason for them are detailed in the attached Record of Decision (Part 1)

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 will be covered by income from the disabled bay application fees.

Name: *A Richards*
Date: *25/8/16*

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: *ANNA CONNOR*
Date: *24/08/16*

Signature: (of Monitoring Officer)

Risk assessment:

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

Name: *J GRIFFITHS*
Date: *30/8/16*

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 MIKE GREEN (Print name)

Cabinet Portfolio TRANSPORT, SUSTAINABILITY & CARBON MANAGEMENT

Signed: 

Date of decision: 8/9/16

Date of publication of record of decision: 9 September 2016

Date decision effective: 16 September 2016

Legend: DPP – Disabled Parking Place,
DPP (permit) – Disabled Parking Place permit holder only

No.	Road Name(s)	Restriction	Location	Ward	Response	Decision
9.	Leaphill Rd	DPP	Adjacent to No.45	Boscombe East	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
37.	Southcote Rd	DPP	Adjacent to No. 25	East Cliff & Springbourne	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
41.	Rowena Rd	DPP	Adjacent to No.14	East Southbourne & Tuckton	1 objection (objects to distance from Tuckton shops)	Implement as advertised Reason: Objector has misunderstood the proposal – it is not for access to shops, but for a resident of Rowena Road.
47.	England's Way	DPP	Adjacent to No. 2	Kinson South	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
63.	Draycott Road	DPP	Adjacent to No. 9	Redhill & Northbourne	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
66.	Birch Dr	DPP	Near No 17	Strouden Park	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
67.	Birch Dr	DPP	Adjacent to No.53	Strouden Park	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
96.	Calvin Rd	DPP	Adjacent to No. 88	Winton East	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
98.	Cardigan Rd	DPP	Adjacent to No. 74	Winton East	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
101.	Cranmer Rd	DPP	Adjacent to No.2 to 4	Winton East	No response received	Implement as advertised

						Reason: no objections received
5.	Cromwell Rd	DPP (permit)	Adjacent to No.21	Boscombe East	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
7.	Gloucester Rd	DPP (permit)	Adjacent to No.54	Boscombe East	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
10.	Morley Rd	DPP (permit)	Adjacent to No.29	Boscombe East	1 objection (concern at the number of disabled bays in the surrounding area)	Implement as advertised Reason: applicant meets the conditions for a residential disabled bay
11.	Parkwood Rd	DPP (permit)	Adjacent to No.142	Boscombe East	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
36.	South Rd	DPP (permit)	Adjacent No. 39	East Cliff & Springbourne	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
42.	Anstey Rd	DPP (permit)	Adjacent to No. 51a	Kinson North	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
44.	Vince Cl	DPP (permit)	Adjacent to No. 7a	Kinson North	1 objection (concerns about lack of parking for residents and position of the proposed disabled bay)	Implement as advertised Reason: applicant meets the conditions for a residential disabled bay – the proposed bay will be installed to maximise the space left available for residents
55.	Ripon Rd	DPP (permit)	Adjacent to No. 148	Moordown	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
74.	Jewell Rd	DPP (permit)	Convert existing DPP bay adjacent to War Memorial Homes to permit DPP's and extend by 2 spaces	Strouden Park	1 in support (Cllr)	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
77.	Wilverley Avenue	DPP (permit)	Existing northernmost disabled bay adjacent to No.1	Strouden Park	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
91.	Sunnyhill Rd	DPP (permit)	Adjacent to No.41	West Southbourne	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received

21.	Palmerston Rd	DPP with waiting limited to 3 hours 8am-6pm, no return within 1 hour & No Stopping Except Taxis 6pm-8am	Shared disabled and taxi bays in the lay by near Christchurch Rd (x2)	Boscombe West	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received
64.	Hillview Rd	DPP with waiting limited to 3 hours 8am-6pm, no return within 1 hour	Extend by 1 additional bay eastwards outside Hill View Primary School	Redhill & Northbourne	No response received	Implement as advertised Reason: no objections received

Equality Impact Needs Assessment

The Diversity Promise – *Better for all*



1. Title of Policy/Service/Project	Spring / Summer 2016 Traffic Regulation Order Review
2. Service Unit	Environment
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:	8 August 2016
6. Date assessment completed:	12 August 2016

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, 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?

Disabled Blue Badge Holders

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?

A public consultation was undertaken from 24 June 2016 to 22 July 2016. 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.

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

	Actual or potential positive benefit	Actual or potential negative outcome
18. Disability	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
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
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-	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

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:

Spring / Summer 2016 Traffic Regulation Order Review (Part 1)

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+