

Appendix 1 – Consultation Outcome and Recommendations – Residential Disabled Parking Bays (P45 2023)

Consultation dates: 04 December 2023 – 29 December 2023

Schedule Legend: **DPP** – Disabled Parking Place; **General** – DPP available for any Blue Badge holder; **LWEPH** – Limited waiting except permit holders; **Permit** – DPP for sole use of permit holder; **Revoke** – removal of restriction; **SPPC&M** – Street Parking Place for Cars & Motorcycles.

Item No.	Road Name	Location	Proposed Restriction	Existing Restriction	BCP Ward	Summary of Responses & Points Raised	Decision
1.	Arnewood Rd, BH6	Adjacent to western side of No. 80 Cranleigh Rd	New Permit DPP	Unrestricted	West Southbourne	No response received.	Implement as advertised. Reason: no objections.
2.	Boreham Rd, BH6	Outside No. 7	New General DPP	Unrestricted	West Southbourne	No response received.	Implement as advertised. Reason: no objections.
3.	Briar Cl, BH23	Outside rear of No. 6.	New Permit DPP	Unrestricted	Burton & Grange	No response received.	Do not implement as advertised. Reason: applicant has cancelled their application.
4.	Capstone Rd, BH8	Outside No. 97	Revoke General DPP	General DPP	Queen's Park	No response received.	Implement as advertised. Reason: no objections.
5.	Castle Ln W (service road not A3060), BH8	Outside No. 378	New General DPP	Unrestricted	Muscliff & Strouden Park	No response received.	Implement as advertised. Reason: no objections.
6.	Charminster Rd, BH8	Outside No. 617	New Permit DPP	Unrestricted	Muscliff & Strouden Park	One objection received: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will limit where other residents can park. 	Implement as advertised. Reason: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant currently parks their vehicle within this area, meaning the ratio between the number of vehicles and the level of on-street parking spaces will remain the same. Therefore, it is not anticipated that any significant change in parking behaviour will occur.
7.	Dale Cl, BH15	Outside pedestrian entrance to Nos. 47-53	New Permit DPP	Unrestricted	Oakdale	No response received.	Implement as advertised. Reason: no objections.

Item No.	Road Name	Location	Proposed Restriction	Existing Restriction	BCP Ward	Summary of Responses & Points Raised	Decision
8.	Durley Gdns, BH2	Outside No. 3 (Napier Ct)	New Permit DPP	Unrestricted	Westbourne & West Cliff	<p>Three objections received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will limit where other residents can park. New commercial waste bins on the highway have reduced parking spaces. Currently unable to park outside my house. Private car parks are underutilised and should be made available for others to use. Hotel guests are exacerbating parking stress. 	<p>Implement as advertised.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant currently parks their vehicle within this area, meaning the ratio between the number of vehicles and the level of on-street parking spaces will remain the same. Therefore, it is not anticipated that any significant change in parking behaviour will occur. Collection points for the council's commercial waste service are outside the scope of this consultation. Collection points are determined by the council following a site visit. Further information can be found at bpcouncil.gov.uk/bins-waste-and-recycling/commercial-waste-and-recycling. On public roads (such as Durley Gardens), ownership or tenancy of a property does not give any entitlement for a person to park outside of it. This of course may be different on private roads, or where there is a Traffic Regulation Order for designated parking spaces (for example a RDPB). Private car parks do not form part of the public highway and are outside the scope of this consultation. Hotel parking is outside the scope of this consultation.
9.	Endfield Rd, BH23	Outside No. 56	New Permit DPP	Unrestricted	Commons	No response received.	Implement as advertised. Reason: no objections.
10.	Florence Rd, BH5	Outside No. 24	Revoke Permit DPP	Permit DPP	Boscombe West	No response received.	Implement as advertised. Reason: no objections.
11.	Green Cl, BH15	Outside rear of No. 3	New Permit DPP (to replace LWEPH)	LWEPH	Poole Town	<p>One objection received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unnecessary as Blue Badge holders can park on single or double yellow lines. Will limit where other residents can park. <p>One observation received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It appears that new parking bays are proposed in addition to the RDPB. 	<p>Implement as advertised.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Blue Badge holders are only permitted to park on single or double yellow lines for up to three hours and not where there are loading restrictions. The applicant currently parks their vehicle within this area, meaning the ratio between the number of vehicles and the level of on-street parking spaces will remain the same. Therefore, it is not anticipated that any significant change in parking behaviour will occur. The existing restrictions will remain in place except the location where it is proposed to replace them with a RDPB.
12.	Hankinson Rd, BH9	Outside No. 14	New Permit DPP	Unrestricted	Winton East	No response received.	Implement as advertised. Reason: no objections.
13.	Ivamy Pl, BH11	Outside No. 12	New Permit DPP	Unrestricted	Wallisdown & Winton West	<p>One observation received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are already four RDPBs on the street. RDPBs take up excessive space reducing parking capacity. 	<p>Implement as advertised.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each of the four existing RDPBs are for individual permit holders only. In addition to the proposed new RDPB, this consultation is also proposing the removal of the existing RDPB outside No. 17 Ivamy Pl because it is no longer required. The dimensions of a RDPB are subject to statutory requirements set out by central government.
14.	Ivamy Pl, BH11	Outside No. 17	Revoke Permit DPP	Permit DPP	Wallisdown & Winton West	No response received.	Implement as advertised. Reason: no objections.
15.	Mallard Rd, BH8	Outside No. 82	Revoke Permit DPP	Permit DPP	Muscliff & Strouden Park	No response received.	Implement as advertised. Reason: no objections.

Item No.	Road Name	Location	Proposed Restriction	Existing Restriction	BCP Ward	Summary of Responses & Points Raised	Decision
16.	Oxford Ln, BH11	Outside No. 2	Revoke General DPP (replace with SPCC&M)	General DPP	Kinson	No response received.	Implement as advertised. Reason: no objections.
17.	Queen Mary Ave, BH9	Outside No. 20	New Permit DPP	Unrestricted	Moordown	<p>12 objections received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant has a driveway which they can park on. • Applicant does not warrant a RDPB because the parking stress is caused by them owning more than two vehicles. • RDPBs are already provided on Queen Mary Avenue. • Applicant parks in a way which causes an obstruction. • Proposed RDPB would hinder access for emergency services. • Applicant's adapted vehicle is an eyesore. • Applicant's adapted vehicle is too long. • Will limit where other residents can park. 	<p>Implement as advertised.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has been determined that the applicant's driveway cannot accommodate their adapted vehicle with its tail ramp deployed. • Applicant meets the eligibility criteria for a RDPB (number of vehicles in a household is irrelevant). • The RDPB outside No. 1 Queen Mary Avenue is too far away from the applicant's home, whilst the RDPB outside No. 19 Queen Mary Avenue is for permit 069 only. • Information on how to report illegally parked vehicles can be found at bcpcouncil.gov.uk/parking/pay-or-report-parking-problems/report-an-illegally-parked-vehicle-in-bournemouth-christchurch-and-poole. • Queen Mary Avenue is approximately 7.0 metres wide. This is considered sufficient to allow for parking on either side and for traffic to pass through in a 'give and take' arrangement. The proposed RDPB would be approximately 2.0 metres wide. • The visual aesthetics of a vehicle are not relevant to a proposed traffic restriction. • In accordance with statutory requirements set out by central government, RDPBs are a minimum 6.6 metres long and can be longer if required. • The applicant currently parks their vehicle within this area, meaning the ratio between the number of vehicles and the level of on-street parking spaces will remain the same. Therefore, it is not anticipated that any significant change in parking behaviour will occur.
18.	Ripon Rd, BH9	Outside No. 10	New Permit DPP	Unrestricted	Winton East	No response received.	Implement as advertised. Reason: no objections.
19.	Somerset Rd, BH23	Outside No. 6	New Permit DPP	Unrestricted	Commons	<p>Three objections received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident at No. 8 who owns the front garden adjacent to the proposed RDPB is considering applying for a dropped kerb. • Will limit where other residents can park. 	<p>Implement as advertised.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As of 31 January 2024 (when this report was submitted to Cabinet), no formal application for a dropped kerb outside No. 8 had been received by the Council. The proposed RDPB would not prevent the resident from applying, however all dropped kerb applications are charged a fee to cover the cost of any changes to parking restrictions that may be required. Further information is available at bcpcouncil.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/dropped-kerbs/before-you-apply-for-a-dropped-kerb. • The applicant currently parks their vehicle within this area, meaning the ratio between the number of vehicles and the level of on-street parking spaces will remain the same. Therefore, it is not anticipated that any significant change in parking behaviour will occur.

Item No.	Road Name	Location	Proposed Restriction	Existing Restriction	BCP Ward	Summary of Responses & Points Raised	Decision
20.	Sw ay Gdns, BH8	Outside No. 1	New Permit DPP	Unrestricted	Muscliff & Strouden Park	<p>Eight objections received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RDPB is not justified as the applicant has access to off-street parking. Applicant does not warrant a RDPB because the parking stress is caused by them owning more than two vehicles. Applicant tries to bully other neighbours out of the parking spot in question. Applicant thinks that because the parking bay is located outside their house that only members of their household should be allowed to park there. Will limit where other residents can park. Applicant has been observed walking unaided to their vehicle. Will make it harder for other disabled residents to park. <p>Three follow up responses received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same points raised as those in the objections. <p>One observation received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same points raised as those in the objections. 	<p>Implement as advertised.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It has been determined that the Blue Badge holder does not have access to suitable off-street parking. Applicant meets the eligibility criteria for a RDPB (number of vehicles in a household is irrelevant). Antisocial behaviour is outside the scope of this consultation. Information on what help is available can be found at bcpcouncil.gov.uk/communities/crime-disorder-and-antisocial-behaviour/antisocial-behaviour. On public roads (such as Sw ay Gardens), ownership or tenancy of a property does not give any entitlement for a person to park outside of it. This of course may be different on private roads, or where there is a Traffic Regulation Order for designated parking spaces (for example a RDPB). The applicant currently parks their vehicle within this area, meaning the ratio between the number of vehicles and the level of on-street parking spaces will remain the same. Therefore, it is not anticipated that any significant change in parking behaviour will occur. It has been verified that the applicant has a valid Blue Badge. Subject to eligibility, other Blue Badge holders can also apply for a RDPB by visiting bcpcouncil.gov.uk/parking/blue-badges-for-disabled-parking/residential-disabled-parking-bays.
21.	Vanguard Rd, BH8	Outside No. 4	New Permit DPP	Unrestricted	Muscliff & Strouden Park	No response received.	<p>Implement as advertised.</p> <p>Reason: no objections.</p>
22.	Washington Ave, BH1	Outside No. 21	Revoke General DPP	General DPP	East Cliff & Springbourne	<p>Four in support received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RDPB is no longer used and exacerbates parking stress. Resident Parking Permits need to be implemented to mitigate against parking issues which arise on AFC Bournemouth matchdays. 	<p>Implement as advertised.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objections. Changes to other parking restrictions are outside the scope of this consultation.
23.	Washington Ave, BH1	Outside No. 27	Revoke Permit DPP	Permit DPP	East Cliff & Springbourne	<p>Five in support received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RDPB is no longer used and exacerbates parking stress. RDPB is being abused and is not used for its intended purpose. Resident Parking Permits need to be implemented to mitigate against parking issues which arise on AFC Bournemouth matchdays. 	<p>Implement as advertised.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objections. Changes to other parking restrictions are outside the scope of this consultation.
24.	York Pl, BH7	Outside No. 17	Revoke General DPP	General DPP	Boscombe East & Pokesdown	No response received.	<p>Implement as advertised.</p> <p>Reason: no objections.</p>