

**TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY GROUP**

**WEDNESDAY, 22ND JANUARY, 2020**

**Present:** Cllr A Hadley – **Chairman**  
Cllr Dr F Rice – **Vice-Chairman**

Cllr N Brooks, Cllr S Bull, Cllr G Farquhar, Cllr N C Geary,  
Cllr M Greene, Cllr M Howell and Cllr T Trent

**Officers:** Julian McLaughlin, Director of Growth and Infrastructure  
Richard Pincroft, Head of Transportation inc. Sustainable Transport  
Richard Pearson, Transport Network Manager  
Tim Forrester, DLEP & Capital Programme Manager  
Chris Parkes, Traffic Management Team Leader

**1     Apologies**

There were no apologies for absence.

**2     Substitute Members**

There were no substitutes.

**3     Declarations of Interests**

There were no declarations of interest made on this occasion.

**4     Terms of Reference**

The Terms of Reference were noted.

**5     Public Issues**

No public issues were raised.

**6     South East Dorset (SED) City Region Transforming Cities Fund (TCF) Progress Report**

The Head of Transportation presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'A' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

Officers responded to comments and requests for clarification, details included:

- The Council had done everything to ensure that the bid for this funding was within the parameters set by the Department for Transport.
- It was uncertain whether the project would be threatened by the government's pledge to support the north of England.
- The bid that BCP Council had submitted was one of twelve for a share of £1.22bn, originally this process had only been open to 10 city regions for a sum of £1.1bn, with our South East Dorset City Region and Preston added at a later date.
- The sum of money bid for was lower than original aspirations, in the early stages of bidding, the Government was clear that the Council would have the opportunity to bid for more of the funding. This advice had from government had changed, possibly due to oversubscription, hence the reduced sum being bid for at this later stage.

**Transportation Advisory Group  
Wednesday, 22 January 2020**

- There was an Officer capacity issue to address, as at present, the proposed schemes would be a challenge to deliver over a course of three years and even partnership organisations had raised concerns. There was a need for the Council to remain a credible delivery partner throughout.
- The Aim of this project was to enhance and deliver a host of sustainable transport options across the conurbation and beyond in partnership with Dorset Council.
- It was only possible to include packages of work within the project that could be delivered within three years, this meant that park and ride schemes would not be looked at through TCF, but would be explored as part the strategic car parking review being undertaken. The output from this would include the determination of the conurbation's needs for park and ride solutions and whether it would be financially viable to operate and maintain.
- The park and ride site in Creekmoor had recently been resurfaced for use as a potential contingency site for post Brexit planning in the event that lorries needed to be stored, so could not be utilised at this point in time.
- Cabinet had engaged with the Department for Transport and had spent a day discussion options and concerns. Additionally, the Leader of the Council had written to DfT to best make the case for the bid.
- Separately to the TCF Project, Officers would be recommending a refresh to the Local Transport Plan in view of recent changes.
- Due to the multi-centred nature of the conurbation, there was a great need to evaluate the options that were open to it.

In summing up, the Chairman expressed his thanks to Officers for the report and all of the work that had gone into the bid, and that he had found the discussion to be incredibly useful and highlighted that this item would return to the Transportation Advisory Group at a later date.

## **7 Traffic Regulation Orders**

The Head of Transportation presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'B' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

He explained that this was the covering report to a series of sub-reports which would be considered individually.

### **a) Stourbank Road Residents Parking Scheme**

The Traffic Management Team Leader presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'C' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

Member comments in relation to the proposals included:

- Residents warmly welcomed the introduction of the proposed restrictions and there was no reason for them not to be implemented.
- There would be great benefit in limiting the restrictions to just the times where the existing problems caused were at their worst.
- Resident's schemes could be difficult to manage, created an inflationary pressure in car ownership and existing problems generally ended being displaced elsewhere, generally surrounding roads which, in this case would be Riverlea Road and Kings Avenue to name a few.
- Additional parking area had been created by the school for support staff and teachers, with scope for students to park in as well.

- It would be disappointing if schools started offering parking to sixth formers in times of greater environmental and climate awareness.
- There were other options to resolve the problems caused by student parking near to the school and resolving issues as they arose with a piecemeal approach should be avoided.
- Would like to see this delayed and considered after strategic parking review has taken place.

Officers responded to comments and requests for clarification, details included:

- The restrictions imposed would be from 8am to 6pm as this is what had been advertised.
- There was no opportunity for the majority of residents of Stourbank Road to park anywhere but on the road as there was no suitable offroad parking.
- This was a legacy request that came from Dorset County Council.
- This committee existed to advise cabinet and take a temperature from the discussion.
- Residents would need to pay a nominal fee of £50 for a parking permit to cover the administration costs of the scheme.
- Dorset Council had not been able to implement the scheme previously due to timescales – not all processes had been completed before its abolition, hence the need for the process to start from scratch through BCP Council.

b) Disabled Bay Proposals (P1 2019 September 2019)

The Traffic Management Team Leader presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'D' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

Member comments in relation to the proposals included:

- This was a request based on need and there should therefore be no issues.
- Good idea that these general discussions are had at this point. Seems that fees have changed over the years.
- It was important to consider this individual's needs.

Comments and discussion included:

- Residents applying for a disabled parking bay were charged for this service which would also include subsequent removal at a later date, in the event that it was no longer needed.
- Applicants in Bournemouth were charged £300 for a general disabled bay or £400 for a specific permit-based bay. A general bay could be occupied by any blue badge holder.
- In Christchurch and Poole it was only possible to apply for a general bay.
- In Bournemouth, anyone that applied for a general bay was able to 'upgrade' it to a permit bay if required, subject to a fee of £200
- Strict criteria needed to be met when applying for a disabled bay, particularly if applying for the permit based one.
- 

c) Beresford Road (Cul-de-Sac)

The Transport Network Manager presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'D' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

Officers responded to a request for clarification, details included:

- The proposed restriction would be for both sides of the road, which was in the region of 4.5m wide. The Road needed to be accessible for larger vehicles such as emergency vehicles and waste collection vehicles.

d) Alipore Close

The Traffic Network Manager presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'E' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

Member comments in relation to the proposals included:

- Residents made heavy use of the cul-de-sac
- It was considered more important that full size refuse vehicles were able to access the properties than it was for a small number of residents to park outside their homes and if refuse vehicle vehicles were unable to access a route, consideration also needed to be given to emergency vehicle access as they would also likely have the same difficulty.
- The streetview image had “painted a thousand words”

Officers responded to comments and requests for clarification, details included:

- There were a couple of substantially large properties at the end of Alipore Close, which housed at least 10 flats, the number of bins that the blocks of flats utilised was not known by highways officers.
- It was estimated that the distance from Birchwood Road to the top of Alipore Close was approximately 70m.

e) Doyme Road

The Transport Network Manager presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'F' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

Member comments in relation to the proposals included:

- The head of the road already had double yellow lines in place but when reviewing the alignment of the road, it was clear to see that it was indeed very narrow, which would make it nearly impossible for emergency vehicles to pass and residents were parking on the pavement.

Officers responded to comments and requests for clarification, details included:

- Parking restrictions would be implemented on the left-hand side of the road as the road was entered. There was more opportunity to park on the other side of the road and so it would not have been conducive to have introduced restrictions on that side as there would have been a greater impact to all.
- The objections received were not necessarily objections but more of a request to vary the proposed scheme to residents parking only.
- H bar markings otherwise known as access protection markings could be introduced at the request of any resident, for a fee of £150. The parking enforcement team would be able to fine offenders where permission not given by resident. This was now available now across whole of the conurbation.

- There could be a variety of reasons for dropped kerbs extending further than necessary, generally this would be due to historical or construction reasons. Capital improvement schemes would often reinstate full height schemes, but these were not dealt with as a priority.

f) Dunford Road

The Transport Network Manager presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'G' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

Member comments in relation to the proposals included:

- Requests like this raised some alarm bells in terms of safeguarding because of previous experiences which had led to intimidation.
- There were already double yellows on one side of the road and this proposal seemed a reasonable relocation of an existing bay.
- The pavements on this road seemed very narrow.
- These kinds of requests can get very emotive.
- The request effectively took a parking space which already existed and just sought to relocate it.

Officers responded to comments and requests for clarification, details included:

- The resident that had made the request was having to pay for the new bay to be implemented.
- There would be no net loss of parking, despite concerns raised by other residents.
- It was possible to withhold the details of an applicant during the application process, but once implemented it would become abundantly clear as to who was using a space.
- Double yellow lines were present on both sides further down the road to allow for emergency vehicles to pass as the road narrowed.
- When there were roads which had issues with width, the council did work with residents and emergency services to identify the severity of problems.

g) Advertisement of Traffic Regulation Orders (Ref P20 2019)

The Traffic Management Team Leader presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'H' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

Member comments in relation to the proposals included:

- These reports should explain why the changes are needed.
- The majority of people liked the idea of being able to park outside their homes, but this was not a right.
- Pleased that a number of these proposals were now coming forward to resolve historic difficulties.
- Would like to see parking meters with an option for cash payments as not all residents had access to smart phones and there was a need to think of payment options across the borough.
- One of the key benefits of introducing restrictions was that it could help encourage modal shift.
- Need to ensure that app parking methods are charging the appropriate seasonal rates where appropriate.

- Need to review requests and ensure that they're in the public interest, not just in the interest of a couple of residents.

Officers responded to comments and requests for clarification, details included:

- The measures detailed at items 6 and 8 were being reinstated because the roads in question were close to the seafront in Southbourne which were often congested during the summer months due to seasonal visitors trying to avoid parking charges. The previous seasonal restriction had previously been removed a couple of years ago, but residents were now requesting its reinstatement.
- There needed to be balance when implementing restrictions to parking due to the displacement that often occurred as a result.
- Ward councillors would be consulted on proposals as a matter of course in the future, this was not currently always the case.
- Would like to see parking meters with an option for cash. Comes back to strategic car parking review.
- The proposals along the Broadway which would use PayByPhone were a cheap and efficient to administer option and, despite many concerns, a smartphone was not required because it was possible to call and use the automated phone system. There was the option for visitors to use the nearby car park which accepted credit/debit card payments as well as PayByPhone.
- Officers were working with the Portfolio Holder to review the TRO process including the scheme of delegation, there was a need to harmonise processes across the conurbation.

h) Advertisement of Changes to On-Street Disabled Bays (Ref P19 2019)

The Traffic Management Team Leader presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'I' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

There were no comments received

Officers responded to a request for clarification, details included:

- There was a conversion fee to take a general disabled bay to a permit bay.

**8 James Road Footpath**

The Chairman advised Members that the item was withdrawn prior to the meeting and would be considered at the next meeting of the Transportation Advisory Group on 26 February 2020

**9 BCP Council Local Transport Plan (LTP) Capital Programme 2020/21**

The DLEP and Capital Programme Manager presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'J' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

Member comments in relation the LTP included:

- The Wallisdown crossroads was a difficult area to manage due to the ability for cars to park on shop forecourts and also the fact that it was a major bus route which did not have a dedicated layby for it to pull into allowing passengers to board and alight, which led to regular and significant congestion and proved to be one of the key problems road users experienced when navigating east-west. It was important that great thought

was given to this arterial road on the network and how best the problems could be remedied.

- It was disappointing that the trees would be lost as part of the work to be undertaken at the Boundary Road roundabout, but this was necessary as it was a fatal injury blackspot, and at least they would be replanted. The layout was also not ideal but it was acknowledged that it was not possible to redesign at this late stage as this would incur significant costs.
- There was a need to address problems in the Highcliffe area, which had several sections of the A337 that were very dangerous due to the volume of traffic that it handled. The Parish Council in Highcliffe and Walkford would be keen to assist highways officers in identifying resolutions.
- It was Important that this body wasn't used for pushing ward issues as its main purpose was to be advising on the decision to be made from a BCP council-wide point of view.
- Realtime info for buses needs to be properly delivered.
- Cabinet were seeking to introduce a sub-committee which would look at local centres and the issues that they faced, it was intended that this would work as a place audit.

Officers responded to comments and requests for clarification, details included:

- A report would be provided to the next meeting of TAG which would set out the proposed enhancements for the Boundary Road roundabout.
- Bus companies did not like laybys due to the difficulty faced by drivers when trying to re-join the main carriageway, which proved to be a challenge for tackling congestion.
- The Safer routes to schools line would include was funded part funded by the Council and part funded by the TCF Scheme on a 50/50 basis.
- It would be inadvisable to recommend any changes to the figures quoted within the appendices because it would undermine the strategic bid for the Transforming Cities Fund.
- The figure of £185k for bus facilities would largely be spent on the provision and upgrading of bus shelters and real time information boards, although this would primarily be focussed within the Christchurch area due to the historic underfunding of its bus infrastructure.
- There were multiple lines referring to shelters and RTI, the TCF would fund these on routes within identified corridors, whereas the 'Bus Facilities' line would focus on other routes.
- There was some funding coming from the South East Dorset Contribution Scheme which pre-dated CIL, its purpose was to top up travel planning activity with capital improvements. The council was actively trying to work with partners such as businesses and schools to develop travel plans and would invite them to bid for funding to make improvements. It was hoped that over time this project would grow and expand, although over the years, there had been varying degrees of success for the predecessor councils and so the Council needed to be challenging schools and business to expand on this programme, which in turn, was hoped would change behaviours of residents and businesses.
- The Council's pothole funding allocation for 2020/21 financial year from DfT had not been announced yet. The three-year programme for the structural maintenance area detailed several resurfacing activities, these activities were aimed at preventing potholes. Structural maintenance area amount of funding was calculated by DfT based on several elements, including the length of network, number of structures etc. Part of the award was an 'Incentive Fund' element and the amount allocated to authorities for this portion of structural maintenance fund was determined by how well DfT considers the highway authority manages the maintenance of its network. BCP was classed as a Band 3 authority, which was the highest level. Officers would report the final funding amount that BCP Council will receive once it is in receipt of the letter from the DfT at a later TAG meeting as part of a monitoring report.

**Transportation Advisory Group  
Wednesday, 22 January 2020**

- There were ways to apply for additional funding from the Government to undertake larger scale maintenance projects such as the Challenge Fund.
- Bus RTI equipment had been updated recently and should be more reliable but any issues experienced should be reported to transportation officers and the bus companies to address. Issues could be experienced if the bus lost contact with the equipment.
- Quite often, residents believed that potholes hadn't been infilled/repared adequately, however there was a process that meant that potholes were generally inspected once they had reported and they were then temporarily infilled with cold lay asphalt to prevent any risks of trips and falls. The potholes were then permanently infilled permanently at a later date, when they were batched together, the purpose being to ensure that the costs were cheaper and the permanent repairs were of a higher quality.

**10     Forward Plan**

The Forward Plan was noted

**11     Dates and Times of Future Meetings**

The dates and times of future meetings were noted

Comments and discussions included:

- 7pm start is an acceptable time to start as this was more convenient to some councillors and also members of the public.
- Bournemouth was the most suitable venue to hold meetings due to its central location.

**Duration of the meeting:** 7.00 - 9.48 pm

Chairman at the meeting on  
Wednesday, 22 January 2020