

# PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISION POST ENGAGEMENT FINAL DECISION



Report subject	<b>Traffic Regulation Order – Sealing of Traffic Regulation Order ref P20 2019 Parking and Traffic Proposals Spring Review 2020</b>
Decision maker	<b>Councillor Mike Greene – Portfolio Holder for Transport and Sustainability</b>
Proposed decision	<b>To make and seal the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) and implement the restrictions which are outlined in Appendix 1</b>
Proposed decision publication date	17 June 2021 A copy of the proposed decision, background, options, etc., is appended to this final decision record.
Engagement period	Following the publication of the proposed decision, interested parties were invited to comment on the proposal for a period of five-clear days from 4 June 2021 to 11 June 2021 inclusive.
Comments received	No comments or representations were received during the engagement period.
Decision taken	<b>The Portfolio Holder for Transport and Sustainability has considered any representations received and determined to confirm the decision outlined above without modification.</b>
Date of final decision	15 June 2021
Call-in and urgency:	Subject to any urgency provisions which shall be identified, this decision will not come into force, and may not be implemented, until the expiry of 5 clear working days after the decision was made, recorded and published.

# PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISION RECORD



Report subject	<b>Traffic Regulation Order – Sealing of Traffic Regulation Order ref P20 2019 Parking and Traffic Proposals Spring Review 2020</b>
Decision maker	<b>Councillor Mike Greene – Portfolio Holder for Transport and Sustainability</b>
Decision date	Not before 14 June 2021
Decision taken	<b>To make and seal the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) and implement the restrictions which are outlined in Appendix 1</b>
Reasons for the decision	To consider representations following the advertisement of the Traffic Regulation Order and to approve the making and sealing of the TRO. This will enable the implementation of new waiting restrictions which have been designed to improve the parking facilities available to the local community, to improve road safety and to ensure essential services can take place.
Call-in and urgency:	Subject to call-in and will come into effect on the expiry of 5 clear working days after the date of the decision if not called in.
Chief Operations Officer	Kate Ryan
Responsible officer	Andy Brown, Sally Swaine
Wards	Bearwood & Merley; Bournemouth Central; Burton & Grange; Christchurch Town; East Southbourne & Tuckton; Highcliffe & Walkford; Kinson; Moordown; Queen's Park; Redhill & Northbourne; West Southbourne.
Status	Open
Background	The restrictions listed in Appendix 1 have been requested by members of the public, councillors and council officers. Cabinet approved the advertisement of the TRO for these restrictions.
Options appraisal	The options are to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• make the TRO and implement the restrictions as advertised;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• amend and make the TRO and implement amended restrictions that are less restrictive than advertised (as set out in Appendix 1);</li> <li>• not make the TRO.</li> </ul>
Consultation undertaken	<p>The statutory consultation process set out in The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 has been carried out as detailed below.</p> <p>The 21-day public consultation opened on Friday 31 July 2020 where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Notice was placed in the Bournemouth Echo.</li> <li>• Notification emails were sent to all councillors and all statutory consultees (including emergency services, disability groups, local public transport provided, national transport associations and various council departments).</li> <li>• Street Notices with consultation details were displayed in relevant locations.</li> <li>• The Deposit Documents (consultation documents) were published on the council's website.</li> </ul>
Financial/Resource implications	<p>The costs associated with both the consultation and implementation of the Traffic Regulation Order would be covered by the Permanent Traffic Regulation Order budget. The whole review cost is estimated to be £6,000.</p>
Summary of legal implications	<p>The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, as amended provides Highway Authorities the power to make Traffic Regulation Orders.</p> <p>The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 sets out the statutory process Highway Authorities must follow to make a TRO. The statutory consultation required by these regulations has been carried out as detailed above.</p> <p>All representations received have been formally considered as outlined in Appendix 1 and taken into account in making this decision.</p>
Summary of sustainability impact	Negligible.
Summary of public health implications	Negligible.
Summary of equality implications	<p>The implementation of waiting restrictions affects all sections of the community. Through the statutory consultation process all road users have been given a fair opportunity to express their views and needs. Having taken into account the points raised, it is considered</p>

	that the proposed on-street changes to be made by this TRO will not impact any one group with protected characteristics.
Summary of risk assessment	None.
Conflicts of interest declared by Cabinet member consulted on this decision	Not applicable
Background papers	Cabinet Report 11 September 2019 – Agenda Item 11.1 Traffic Regulation Orders Cabinet Report 12 February 2020 – Agenda Item 16 Traffic Regulation Orders

## Equality Impact Assessment: conversation screening tool

<b>Policy/Service under development/review:</b>	New Traffic Regulation Order
<b>What changes are being made to the policy/service?</b>	New Traffic Regulation Order
<b>Service Unit:</b>	Transport and Engineering
<b>Persons present in the conversation and their role/experience in the service:</b>	Sally Swaine – Interim Traffic Team Leader (20 July 2020) Clare Griffiths – Traffic Technician (20 July 2020) Sally Swaine – Traffic Consultant (26 April 2021) Andrew Brown – Traffic Team Leader (26 April 2021)
<b>Conversation dates:</b>	20 July 2020 26 April 2021
Do you know your current or potential client base? Who are the key stakeholders?	Yes, road users
Do different groups have different needs or experiences in relation to the policy/service?	No specific group with protected characteristics is affected by the proposed waiting restrictions in the TRO.
Will the policy or service change affect any of these service users?	No specific group with protected characteristics is affected by the proposed waiting restrictions in the TRO.  Disability groups are a consultee for the statutory consultation; no responses from these consultees were received.  The waiting restrictions will have the usual dispensations for blue badge holders.
What are the benefits or positive impacts of the policy/service change on current or potential service users?	The waiting restrictions have been designed to improve the parking facilities available to the local community, to discourage parking where this causes a road safety issue, and to discourage parking where this causes disruption to essential services.
What are the negative impacts of the policy/service change on current or potential service users?	The proposals should not have a negative impact on any group with protected characteristics. Some of the waiting restrictions in the TRO will reduce the availability of on-street parking; possibly resulting a negative effect on the individuals currently parking in those locations.
Will the policy or service change affect employees?	No, or only in so far as they are also road users.
Will the policy or service change affect the wider community?	Yes, as the waiting restrictions in the TRO will affect road users.

<p>What mitigating actions are planned or already in place for those negatively affected by the policy/service change?</p>	<p>The statutory consultation provided the opportunity for members of the public to provide their views on the proposed waiting restrictions. The representations have helped inform the equality implications of the proposals. Moreover, as a result of the comments received, and where appropriate certain restrictions are to be reduced in scale to that advertised or will not be implemented (as set out in Appendix 1).</p>
<p><b>Summary of Equality Implications:</b></p>	<p>The implementation of waiting restrictions affects all sections of the community. Through the statutory consultation process all road users have been given a fair opportunity to express their views and needs. Having taken into account the points raised, it is considered that the proposed on-street changes to be made by this TRO will not impact any one group with protected characteristics.</p>

---

For any questions on this, please contact the Policy and Performance Team by emailing [performance@bcpcouncil.gov.uk](mailto:performance@bcpcouncil.gov.uk)

## Appendix 1 - Consultation Outcome and Recommendations Parking and Traffic Proposals Spring Review 2020 (P20 2019)

Consultation dates: 31 July 2020 – 21 August 2020

**Legend:** NWAAT – No waiting at any time, NLAAT – No Loading at any time, LW- Limited Waiting, DYL – Double yellow lines

Item No.	Road Name(s)	Location	Proposed Restriction	Existing Restriction	BCP Ward	Summary of Responses	Decision
1.	Broadway	Adjacent to the service road near its junction with Kingsley Avenue.	Limited waiting to 2 hours 8am-6pm no return within 1 hour	Unrestricted	East Southbourne & Tuckton	2 objections: Loss of (unrestricted) parking. The Service Road has short stay restrictions all year round now. Will have to park a considerable distance from home.	Not to be implemented. Reason: Lack of community support for the scheme.
2.	Broadway	Northern side of carriageway from the entrance to Hengistbury Head car park to existing disabled parking place.	Pay By Phone Payment parking place 5am-10pm (Tariff 6 – same as Hengistbury Head Car Park). No Waiting 10pm-5am.	NWAAT	East Southbourne & Tuckton	No response received.	Not to be implemented. Reason: The advertised payment times conflict with the road closure times. Furthermore, the scheme would need to be reduced in length to avoid a pinch point at the bus stops.
3.	Broadway/ Brightlands Avenue	Extend to 10m into Brightlands Ave on north-western corner of junction & 10m around the south-eastern corner of junction.	NWAAT	Unrestricted	East Southbourne & Tuckton	3 in support: Will improve safety at junction. Agrees despite more vehicles parked near own house.  1 objection Loss of on-street parking. Insufficient congestion or incidents to warrant a change.	Implement as advertised. Reason: The council as Highway Authority has duties related to road safety hence it is seeking to prevent parking where it is unsafe. The proposed restriction will improve visibility at the junction.
4.	Castlemain Avenue	Extend NWAAT on south-eastern side of carriageway to boundary with No. 21.	NWAAT	Unrestricted	West Southbourne	No response received.	Implement as advertised. Reason: No objections.
5.	Cecil Hill/St Alban's Crescent	Around the junction.	NWAAT	Unrestricted	Queen's Park	1 objection: Loss of on-street parking. There have been no accidents. Money would be better spent on other locations.	Implement as advertised. Reason: The council as Highway Authority has duties related to road safety hence it is seeking to prevent parking where it is unsafe. The proposed restriction will improve visibility at the junction.

Item No.	Road Name(s)	Location	Proposed Restriction	Existing Restriction	BCP Ward	Summary of Responses	Decision
6.	Cellars Farm Road	Both sides of carriageway for its entire length.	No waiting 10am-7pm 1 May - 30 September	Unrestricted	East Southbourne & Tuckton	<p>9 in support: Driveways are regularly obstructed by parked cars. Parking causes visibility issues when exiting driveways. Beach goers cause noise and disturbance. There's a constant stream of summer visitors motoring along this road looking for a parking spot. Would like residents permit parking. Residents pay a premium to live in this area. Offering free parking to hundreds of visitors is not environmentally friendly. Supports the proposal on safety grounds. Will improve visibility at junctions.</p> <p>6 objections: Loss of on-street parking. The existing signs &amp; lines have no legal basis. No reason to have any parking restrictions in Hengistbury Road or Cellars Farm Road as neither is a main road, a bus route or contains a school, where parking could cause a danger to children. Bournemouth is a tourist town and should welcome beach goers. The reintroduction of the seasonal restriction will displace parking onto nearby unrestricted roads adversely affecting residents on those roads. Would like residents permit parking. If unimpeded by parked vehicles, vehicle speeds will increase to a dangerous level. Proposal appears to be based solely and selfishly on a "nimby" mindset. If parking is more evenly spread along the roads there is more chance of people being cautious when driving from one part of the road to another.</p> <p>2 observations: During the winter there seems to be no problem amongst the residents of both roads, it's only during the summer restrictions that chaos and sometimes disharmony with neighbours can form. Better options would be residents permit parking, limited waiting or restrictions protecting junctions. Would like residents permit parking.</p>	<p>Implement a reduced scheme. to provide junction protection only. No waiting 10am-7pm 1 May-30 September for 10m at the junctions of Cellars Farm Road with Dalmeny Road and Cellars Farm Road with Hengistbury Road.</p> <p>Reason: Divided community opinion for the advertised proposal. The proposed restriction now recommended has been reduced to a minimum so as much kerbside parking can be retained. Restrictions at the junctions will deter unsafe parking. The council's Civil Enforcement Officers can issue Penalty Charge Notices for vehicles blocking driveways without the need for a waiting restriction. Residents permit parking/ limited waiting restrictions fall outside the scope of the consultation.</p>



Item No.	Road Name(s)	Location	Proposed Restriction	Existing Restriction	BCP Ward	Summary of Responses	Decision
7.	Duncliff Road/ Riversdale Road	Around the junction.	NWAAT	Unrestricted	East Southbourne & Tuckton	<p>9 in support (including a joint letter with 16 signatures): The restriction should improve access out of Duncliff Road and access for emergency vehicles/refuse vehicles. Increased parking charges at Wick Lane car park has increased on-street parking in surrounding roads. A number of suggested extensions of the DYLS have been made. In support of proposal, displaced vehicles will make a dangerous situation at the corner (outside No. 19) &amp; Nos. 24-34.</p> <p>2 observations: As elderly persons (in the process of applying for a Blue badge) parking on Riversdale Road provides, convenient, free, accessible parking close to the Tuckton Riverside. There would be no obstruction if cars are parked responsibly. DYLS should be restricted to the minimum required by the Highway Code, maximum straight road length (inc outside No. 24) should be maintained, there are too few spaces available for visitors, council should consider restrictions for large vehicles/vehicles with trailers. Additional restrictions suggested by other residents will require separate consultation.</p>	<p>Implement as advertised. Reason: No objections.</p> <p>Parking for the River Stour is available at the Riverlands-Wick Lane Car Park. Blue badge holders have dispensation to park on DYLS. Extended restrictions fall outside the scope of the consultation.</p>

Item No.	Road Name(s)	Location	Proposed Restriction	Existing Restriction	BCP Ward	Summary of Responses	Decision
8.	Hengistbury Road	From junction with Harbour Road to outside Nos. 33/36.	No waiting 10am-7pm 1 May - 30 September	Unrestricted	East Southbourne & Tuckton	<p>14 in support: Visitors park inconsiderately blocking accesses and cause noise and disturbance. Visitors cause litter. Would like residents' permit parking. Residents pay a premium to live in this area. Visitors should be using pay &amp; display car parks. Pollution caused by circulating cars. Emergency services would find great difficulty in accessing properties with unrestricted parking both sides. Unrestricted parking both sides has caused collisions on several occasions. Supports the proposal on safety grounds. Will improve visibility at junctions.</p> <p>8 objections: Loss of on-street parking. The existing signs &amp; lines have no legal basis. No reason to have any parking restrictions in Hengistbury Road or Cellars Farm Road as neither is a main road, a bus route or contains a school, where parking could cause a danger to children. Bournemouth is a tourist town and should welcome beach goers. The reintroduction of the seasonal restriction will displace parking onto nearby unrestricted roads adversely affecting residents on those roads. Would like residents permit parking. If unimpeded by parked vehicles, vehicle speeds will increase to a dangerous level. There is enough space to allow for free parking at all times. It's only occasional days when day visitors take up these spaces. If parking is more evenly spread along the roads there is more chance of people being cautious when driving from one part of the road to another.</p> <p>2 observations: During the winter there seems to be no problem amongst the residents of both roads, it's only during the summer restrictions that chaos and sometimes disharmony with neighbours can form. Better options would be residents permit parking, limited waiting or restrictions protecting junctions. Would like residents permit parking scheme</p>	<p>Implement a reduced scheme to provide junction protection only. No waiting 10am-7pm 1 May-30 September for 10m at the junctions of Hengistbury Road with Cellars Farm Road and Hengistbury Road with Harbour Road.</p> <p>Reason: Divided community opinion for the advertised proposal. The proposed restriction now recommended has been reduced to a minimum so as much kerbside parking can be retained. Restrictions at the junctions will deter unsafe parking. The council's Civil Enforcement Officers can issue Penalty Charge Notices for vehicles blocking driveways without the need for a waiting restriction.</p> <p>Residents permit parking/ limited waiting restrictions fall outside the scope of this consultation</p>

Item No.	Road Name(s)	Location	Proposed Restriction	Existing Restriction	BCP Ward	Summary of Responses	Decision
9.	Madeira Road	Outside Turtle Bay.	Restricted Parking Zone-NWAAT/ NLAAT except in signed bays (as per existing signs & markings)	Loading bay (not marked on ground)	Bournemouth Central	No response received.	Implement as advertised. Reason: No objections received. This amendment will correct an anomaly in the TRO; no changes will be made on the ground.
10.	Newlands Road	From the front boundary of No. 23 to end of the carriageway.	Restricted Parking Zone NWAAT/ NLAAT	Unrestricted	Burton & Grange	No response received.	Not to be implemented. Reason: Advertised in error. The advertised restriction could cause problems for residential properties receiving deliveries and will not address the amenity issues caused by vans/ large vehicles turning around at the end of the cul-de-sac.
11.	Paddington Grove	On southern side of carriageway from boundary of Nos. 50/52 to opposite the boundary of Nos. 57/59.	NWAAT	Unrestricted	Bearwood & Merley	1 objection: Large vehicles can struggle to manoeuvre when vehicles are parked on both sides of the road. Parking will be displaced. The parking restrictions may result in residents having to park a considerable distance from their homes. Would agree if off-street parking was provided.	Implement as advertised. Reason: The restriction will reduce obstructive parking and allow improved access for refuse vehicles (and delivery vehicles).
12.	Pine Vale Crescent	Northern junction with Redhill Drive. Extend 10m into junction.	NWAAT	Unrestricted	Redhill & Northbourne	9 in support: The proposed restriction will improve access/egress and visibility at junction. The restriction will improve road safety. Entering vehicles have had to be reversed back onto Redhill Drive when two cars meet at the junction. Parked vehicles would prevent emergency vehicle access.  5 objections Loss of on-street parking. Parking will be even harder for residents. Parking further away from home will cause personal safety issues in the winter due to poor street lighting. Parking is already at a premium. No recorded accidents. Parking on DYLS should be tackled.	Implement as advertised. Reason: The reduction in the availability of kerbside parking would be minimal and not materially increase walking distances to unrestricted sections of Pine Vale Crescent. The council as Highway Authority has duties related to road safety and access hence it is seeking to prevent parking where it is unsafe and obstructive. The proposed restriction will reduce unsafe and obstructive parking, enabling improved visibility at the junction and improved access for refuse vehicles.

Item No.	Road Name(s)	Location	Proposed Restriction	Existing Restriction	BCP Ward	Summary of Responses	Decision
13.	Redhill Drive	Southern junction with Pine Vale Cres. Extend 5m to north.	NWAAT	Unrestricted	Redhill & Northbourne	1 in support: Regularly struggles to enter and leave as do refuse vehicles via the southern junction  1 observation: The DYLs should be extended beyond the bus stop	Implement as advertised. Reason: No objections. The suggested amendment falls outside the scope of the consultation.
14.	Seaton Road/ Seaton Close	10m around the junction.	NWAAT	Unrestricted	Highcliffe & Walkford	1 in support: Parking on the pavement and forces children to walk in the road. If they park on the road - the road is impassable.	Implement as advertised. Reason: No objections. The council can enforce against footway parking when there is a parking restriction in place. Outside of the times of the restriction the council has no powers to take action. The police has the necessary powers to enforce against wilful obstruction of the highway.
15.	The Grove/ Ashton Road	5m around the junction.	NWAAT	Unrestricted	Moordown	1 in support: People park too close to the corners causing dangers both as a pedestrian and in a vehicle. A similar restriction should be implemented at the junction with Cary Road. Ashton Road experiences problems with excessive speed.	Implement as advertised. Reason: No objections. The suggested amendments fall outside the scope of the consultation.
16.	Whitehall	From No. 2a to the junction with Wick Lane.	LW to 1 hr 10am-6pm no return 1 hr	LW to 30mins 10am-6pm no return 1 hour 1 May to 30 Sept	Christchurch Town	1 objection: Amending the seasonal restriction will make it difficult for residents to park all year round. Nearby resident permit parking schemes are oversubscribed.	Not to be implemented. Reason: No community support for the scheme.
17.	Wilverley Road	From its junction with Somerford Road to the car park entrance No. 1 Wilverley Road.	NWAAT	Unrestricted	Burton & Grange	No response received.	Implement as advertised. Reason: No objections received.
18.	Wimborne Road	Outside Nos. 1512 to 1516.	LW to 1 hr Mon – Sat 9am-6pm no return 2 hours	LW bay (Road markings/ correct signage missing for a number of years)	Kinson	No response received.	Not to be implemented. Correct the TRO anomaly by revoking the LW restriction. Reason: No responses have been received during the consultation to indicate the level of community support for or against the restriction. A LW restriction can be re-assessed if requested by business owners.
19.	Wimborne Road	Extend by 5m outside No. 1537.	NWAAT	Unrestricted	Kinson	No response received.	Implement as advertised. Reason: No objections.

Item No.	Road Name(s)	Location	Proposed Restriction	Existing Restriction	BCP Ward	Summary of Responses	Decision
20.	Wimborne Road	Northern side of carriageway outside Nos. 1603 to 1619.	NWAAT	Waiting prohibited 8am- 7pm	Kinson	<p>1 observation: The no waiting at any time restriction will not solve the issues of the cars driving on the pavement. Barriers or bollards are required across the pavement to stop cars driving up and down.</p>	Implement as advertised. Reason: No objections. Driving on the footway is an offence which the police has powers to enforce (powers the council does not have). The council can however enforce against footway parking during the times where there is a waiting restriction in place.
21.	Wimborne Road (Service Road)	Both sides of the carriageway from its junction with Quayle Drive fronting Nos. 1803 to 1823 to its junction with Wimborne Road.	NWAAT	Unrestricted	Kinson	<p>6 in support: Inconsiderate, long term parking occurs blocking access to driveways and pedestrian crossing points. Parking causes problem with refuse vehicles and emergency vehicle access.</p> <p>2 objections: This is a residential service road. The restriction will move cars towards Longfield Drive. Objects as a disabled person, the restriction will cause problems accessing their car and property and expects disabled parking space to be provided.</p> <p>1 observation: The restriction should apply to the entire length of the service road or the problems will be moved to unrestricted parts.</p>	Implement a reduced scheme to exclude NWAAT from the turning area opposite No. 1813 and the western arm of the turning area adjacent to No. 1823. Reason: The council as Highway Authority has duties related to road safety and to access hence it is seeking to prevent parking where it is unsafe and obstructive. The proposed restriction now recommended has been reduced to allow parking in certain locations. The provision of a disabled bay falls outside the scope of this consultation. A blue badge holder can apply for a residential disabled bay which if successful would be located as close as practical to the person's address.