

PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISION RECORD



Report subject	Traffic Order – Sealing of Traffic Order Parking Restriction Proposals Autumn Review 2021 (Ref P12 2021)
Decision maker	Councillor Mike Greene – Portfolio Holder for Sustainability and Transport
Decision date	4 April 2023
Decision taken	To make and seal the Traffic Order and implement the restrictions which are outlined in Appendix 1
Reasons for the decision	<p>The Council regularly receives requests for changes to the regulation of the public highway that require a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to implement. The Council describes these requests as Community TROs. These requests are assessed and those that are considered to sufficiently assist in the improved management of the public highway are taken forward through the statutory process for a TRO, that includes carrying out a public consultation to help inform a final decision as to whether to make the TRO or not.</p> <p>This report covers a series of new Community Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) that have been proposed throughout the BCP Council area.</p> <p>This report considers the representations received following the advertisement of the Traffic Order and to approve the making and sealing of the Order which has been amended from that advertised to take account of the representations received during the consultation period.</p> <p>This will enable the implementation of new parking and waiting restrictions which have been designed to improve road safety, to ensure essential services can take place, such as access for waste and emergency services and to improve the parking facilities available to the local community.</p> <p>No material negative impacts have been identified in relation to the restrictions to be implemented including to matters such as access to premises, amenities and use of the road by public service vehicles.</p> <p>It is considered that the Traffic Order will help secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other</p>

	traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on the highway.
Call-in and urgency:	<p>This is a non-key decision. Only key decisions, as defined in the Constitution, are subject to call-in. Key decisions are Cabinet or Leader decisions which exceed the prescribed financial limit or significantly impact or effect two or more wards. Key decisions must also be published on the Forward Plan.</p> <p>To clarify non-key Portfolio Holder decisions are not subject to call-in and this decision may therefore be implemented immediately after the decision is taken.</p>
Chief Operations Officer	Jess Gibbons
Responsible officer	Julian McLaughlin
Wards	Bearwood & Merley; Boscombe East & Pokesdown; Bournemouth Central; Broadstone; Christchurch Town; Commons; Creekmoor; Highcliffe & Walkford; Moordown; Newtown & Heatherlands; Oakdale; Parkstone; Penn Hill; Queen's Park; Talbot & Branksome Woods; Wallisdown & Winton West; Westbourne & West Cliff;
Status	Open
Background	<p>The Council regularly receives requests for changes to the regulation of the public highway that require a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to implement. The Council describes these requests as Community TROs. These requests are assessed and those that are considered to sufficiently assist in the improved management of the public highway are taken forward through the statutory process for a TRO, that includes carrying out a public consultation to help inform a final decision as to whether to make the TRO or not.</p> <p>The proposals are the community list priorities that have been requested by road safety, ward councillors, schools, residents, town and parish councils, businesses, bus operators, waster services, emergency services etc. Requests are assessed and prioritised as per the Minor Traffic Scheme Guidance which includes council obligations and policies that support Road Safety, accessibility, Network Duty to keep traffic flowing, bus punctuality and the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan.</p> <p>The restrictions are listed in Appendix 1. The restrictions have been assessed by Officers using the Minor Traffic Scheme Guidance. This has prioritised the requests to enable the limited resources available to be allocated to the measures that will bring about the most benefit to our communities.</p>
Options appraisal	The options are to:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • make the Order and implement the provisions as advertised. • amend and make the Order and implement only some of the advertised provisions/vary some of the advertised provisions to be less restrictive than advertised (in consideration of the representations, as set out in Appendix 1). • not to make the Order.
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>A 21-day public consultation opened on Friday 12 November 2021 where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Notice was placed in the Bournemouth Echo. • Notification emails 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). • Street Notices with consultation details were displayed in relevant locations. • The Deposited Documents (consultation documents) were published on the council's website.
Financial/Resource implications	<p>The costs associated with both the consultation and implementation of the Traffic Order would be covered by the Permanent Traffic Order capital budget. The whole review cost is estimated to be £30,000 which includes officer time, advertising costs and implementation.</p>
Summary of legal implications	<p>The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, as amended (RTRA) provides local authorities the power to make Traffic Orders.</p> <p>Consultation and notice provisions as identified in The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 have 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> <p>In reaching a decision regard has been had to all relevant statutory provisions. They include, as appropriate, relevant requirements and duties as set out in s1, s32 and s122 of the RTRA 1984 and s16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004.</p>
Summary of sustainability impact	Negligible.
Summary of public health implications	Negligible.

<p>Summary of equality implications</p>	<p>The ethos of Traffic Orders is to resolve negative effects that can arise from traffic and parking as one of the means to make our transport network safer, encourage more sustainable forms of travel, improve traffic flow and provide disabled parking where there is a need. These measures provide benefits to many of the more vulnerable in our communities, particularly for those impacted by and more likely to be involved in road traffic accidents. For age both the young – children and the elderly will benefit where an order is done to improve safety. Locally evidence from the travel survey has shown that younger and older people, women, people that are not White British, non-Christian religions and LGBT+ people are generally less reliant on driving compared to the rest of the population. This makes them more likely to be vulnerable road users as pedestrians and cyclists and more likely to use public transport. Where Traffic Orders improve safety and encourage sustainable transport these groups are likely to benefit.</p> <p>Safety improvements resulting from Traffic Orders are likely to improve conditions for disabled people. Where an order provides for disabled parking, there are direct benefits for disabled people who drive who are better able to access services and be able to park near where they live if applicable.</p> <p>Some Traffic Orders, notably where some on-street parking is removed to create improved conditions for sustainable transport can meet local opposition from people who park there and affected businesses. Based on the local transport survey, people who drive are more likely to be middle aged groups, men, non-disabled, White British, Christian and Heterosexual. Such groups are more likely to be negatively impacted where a Traffic Order results in a loss of car parking.</p> <p>Overall, depending on how people usually travel relevant to the location and circumstances of a traffic order there will be different perspectives of any equality impact depending on their circumstances. Traffic Orders usually require a statutory consultation before they are implemented any equality impacts can be identified from consultations with mitigating outcomes proposed as required. Where a proposed order specifically has a known likely impact, this will be identified – likely as part of a project or scheme.</p> <p>The context of Traffic Orders is to improve the travel network for wider overall benefits considering safety and enabling better access to services and facilities those without access to cars.</p>
<p>Summary of risk assessment</p>	<p>No risks have been identified associated with the proposed traffic restriction changes.</p>

Conflicts of interest declared by Cabinet member consulted on this decision	Not applicable.
Background papers	None.

Equality Impact Assessment: conversation screening tool

Policy/Service under development/review:	<p>This EIA covers a series of new Community Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) that have been proposed throughout the BCP Council area.</p> <p>The proposals are the community list priorities that have been requested by road safety, ward councillors, schools, residents, town and parish councils, businesses, bus operators, waster services, emergency services etc. Requests are assessed and prioritised as per the Minor Traffic Scheme Guidance which includes council obligations and policies that support Road Safety, accessibility, Network Duty to keep traffic flowing, bus punctuality and the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan.</p> <p>This EIA covers the overall implications usual to reviews noting that's there may be specific circumstances to individual orders.</p>
What changes are being made to the policy/service?	A new Traffic Order to introduce/change waiting restrictions at various locations in the BCP area,
Service Unit:	Transport and Engineering
Persons present in the conversation and their role/experience in the service:	<p>Sally Swaine – Traffic Consultant (1 November 2021)</p> <p>Andrew Brown – Traffic Team Leader (9 May 2022)</p> <p>Clare Griffiths – Traffic Technician (11 May 2022)</p> <p>Rob Walter – Traffic Technician (11 May 2022)</p> <p>Matthew Carruthers – Traffic Technician (11 May 2022)</p> <p>Richard Barnes – Service Unit Equality Champion (27 May 2022)</p>
Conversation dates:	<p>1 November 2021</p> <p>11 May 2022</p> <p>EIA Panel – 9 June 2022</p>
Do you know your current or potential client base? Who are the key stakeholders?	<p>Road users. People who travel through the area – by all forms of transport.</p> <p>Local Residents. Local schools, Parents/carers and children/students travelling to/from local schools, Colleges and Bournemouth University. Local businesses. Visitors.</p> <p>Bus passengers in particular users of the bus services 1, 3, 3X, 12, 16, 18, 20, 33, 50 Breezer, 415, Unibus U4, m1 and m2 travelling through Westbourne.</p> <p>Organisations on the statutory consultation list for Traffic Orders including the emergency services – Police, Fire, Ambulances, Taxi associations/operators and DOTS Disability.</p> <p>More Bus & Yellow buses who operate bus services on Poole Road, Westbourne. (was this copied from another EIA)</p>

<p>Do different groups have different needs or experiences in relation to the policy/service?</p>	<p>Yes – the needs or experiences will be different depending on the form of transport, where people live, how travelling locally affects them, how safe they feel and will vary with the individual traffic regulation.</p> <p>There will be specific individual impacts where parking arrangements are changed at a specific location. Wider changes are also likely, where any changes affect the traffic network. The needs/experiences will vary according to how people travel, with some Traffic Orders designed to improve conditions for walking, cycling and bus travel. Motorists are likely to have a different need compared to people that walk, cycle or use the bus.</p> <p>Businesses usually determine that changes that reduce to car parking will affect their trade, but safety and environmental improvements as a result will be supported by others.</p>
<p>Will the policy or service change affect any of these service users?</p>	<p>The proposed changes to parking/waiting restrictions resulting from the Traffic Order impact all road users including those in protected characteristic groups, who may wish to park vehicles in the affected area.</p> <p>Where a traffic order is intended to improve safety, people from more vulnerable groups, some young, elderly, women and disabled people are likely to support the Traffic Order and what its intended to achieve. Where the traffic order is proposed to support more sustainable transport modes – walking, cycling and public transport, travel by these forms of transport will be improved, which will benefit some particular groups more than others.</p> <p>Where the traffic order involves changes in car parking arrangements people whose individual parking arrangements are affected may be opposed to proposed changes.</p> <p>The BCP Council Local Travel Survey provides detail on travel within our community and how this is related to protected characteristics.</p>
<p>What are the benefits or positive impacts of the policy/service change on current or potential service users?</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Where a Traffic Order is proposed on the grounds of road safety improvements many more vulnerable protected groups are intended to benefit. This is likely to include children and younger people, the elderly, women and many disabled people. These more vulnerable groups are both more likely to be involved in a traffic accident and also take more time to recover or have a more serious injury.</p> <p>Removal of some areas of parking restrictions (as outlined in Appendix 1) will have a positive effect as it improves parking options for all users.</p>

	<p>Proposed Parking restrictions at junctions will ensure that Dropped kerbs & tactile paving are kept clear thereby a positive affect as it improves access for all pedestrian users especially children, the elderly and those with disabilities. Where a Traffic Order is proposed to support cycling, walking and public transport, there are benefits for people that do not have access to a car. Locations with higher levels of social deprivation in the BCP Council area have lower levels of car ownership so there are socio-economic benefits.</p> <p>A number of Traffic Orders are provided with specific provision for creating or enhancing disabled parking. This provides a clear positive benefit for disabled people who drive.</p>
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. The waiting restrictions in the Traffic Order 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 – visitors from the wider area could be affected by new parking restrictions
What mitigating actions are planned or already in place for those negatively affected by the policy/service change?	<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>Some Traffic Orders are required to support specific schemes or projects. Equality considerations have been reviewed as part of the process and mitigating actions provided accordingly.</p> <p>Mitigation for specific sites following consultation: Poole Road: mitigating actions, bus bay lengthened and original bay moved Yeatminster Road: Objections from those with disabilities who live in the street as it would affect their accessibility to property. Proposal not being taken forward</p>
Summary of Equality Implications:	<p>The ethos of Traffic Orders is to resolve negative effects that can arise from traffic and parking as one of the means to make our transport network safer, encourage more sustainable forms of travel, improve traffic flow and provide disabled parking where there is a need. These measures provide benefits to many of the more vulnerable in our communities, particularly for those impacted by and more likely to be involved in road traffic accidents. For age both the young – children and the elderly will benefit where an order is done to improve safety. Locally evidence from the travel survey has shown that younger and older people, women, people that are not White British, non-Christian religions and LGBT+ people are generally less reliant on</p>

driving compared to the rest of the population. This makes them more likely to be vulnerable road users as pedestrians and cyclists and more likely to use public transport. Where Traffic Orders improve safety and encourage sustainable transport these groups are likely to benefit.

Safety improvements resulting from Traffic Orders are likely to improve conditions for disabled people. Where an order provides for disabled parking, there are direct benefits for disabled people who drive who are better able to access services and be able to park near where they live if applicable.

Some Traffic Orders, notably where some on-street parking is removed to create improved conditions for sustainable transport can meet local opposition from people who park there and affected businesses. Based on the local transport survey, people who drive are more likely to be middle aged groups, men, non-disabled, White British, Christian and Heterosexual. Such groups are more likely to be negatively impacted where a Traffic Order results in a loss of car parking.

Overall, depending on how people usually travel relevant to the location and circumstances of a traffic order there will be different perspectives of any equality impact depending on their circumstances. Traffic Orders usually require a statutory consultation before they are implemented any equality impacts can be identified from consultations with mitigating outcomes proposed as required. Where a proposed order specifically has a known likely impact, this will be identified – likely as part of a project or scheme. The context of Traffic Orders is to improve the travel network for wider overall benefits considering safety and enabling better access to services and facilities those without access to cars.