



Oversight and Governance

Chief Executive's Department

Plymouth City Council

Ballard House

Plymouth PL1 3BJ

T 01752 305155

www.plymouth.gov.uk/democracy

Published 25/08/21

Delegated Decisions

Delegated Executive/Officer Decisions

Delegated Executive and Officer decisions are published every Wednesday and are available at the following link - <https://tinyurl.com/ms6umor>

Cabinet decisions subject to call-in are published at the following link - <http://tinyurl.com/yddrqll6>

Notice of call-in for non-urgent decisions must be given to the Democratic Support Unit by 4.30 pm on Thursday 02 September 2021. Please note – urgent decisions and non-key Council Officer decisions cannot be called in. Copies of the decisions together with background reports are available for viewing as follows:

- on the Council's Intranet Site at <https://modgov/mgDelegatedDecisions.aspx>
- on the Council's website at <https://tinyurl.com/jhnax4e>

The decisions detailed below may be implemented on Friday 03 September 2021 if they are not called-in and the urgent decision can be implemented immediately.

Delegated Decisions

1. Councillor Nick Kelly - The Leader:

- 1.a Corporate Condition Surveys Contract Award (Pages 1 - 6)

2. Councillor Jonathan Dreaan (Cabinet Member for Transport):

- 2.a The City of Plymouth (Traffic Regulation Orders) (Amendment Order No. 2021.2137255 The Barcode) Order. The City of Plymouth (Off-Street Parking Places) (Amendment Order No. 2021.2137255 The Barcode - Bretonside B) Order. The City of Plymouth (Traffic Regulation Orders) (Taxi Ranks) (Amendment Order No. 2021.2137255 - The Barcode) Order. (Pages 7 - 18)
- 2.b The City of Plymouth (Traffic Regulation Orders) (Amendment Orders) (Amendment Order No. 2021.2137257 Millbay Boulevard) Order (Pages 19 - 32)
- 2.c The City of Plymouth (Traffic Regulation Orders) (Amendment Order No. 2021.2137253 Strode Road & Galileo Close) Order (Pages 33 - 40)
- 2.d The City of Plymouth (Traffic Regulation Orders) (Amendment Order No. 2021. 2137256 TRO Review. 7) Order. The City of Plymouth (Moving & Speed Traffic Regulation Orders) (Amendment Order No. 2021.2137256 TRO Review. 7) Order (Pages 41 - 84)
- 2.e Urgent Decision - To authorise Cornwall Council to carry out the procurement exercise for the Light Recovery of Vehicles, on the Tamar Bridge (Pages 85 - 94)

3. Councillor Mrs Maddi Bridgeman (Cabinet Member for Environment and Street Scene:

- 3.a Preventing Plastic Pollution - Waste Sculpture (Pages 95 - 102)

EXECUTIVE DECISION

made by a Cabinet Member



REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY BY AN INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER

Executive Decision Reference Number – L11 21/22

Decision				
1	Title of decision: Corporate Condition Surveys Contract Award			
2	Decision maker (Cabinet member name and portfolio title): Councillor Nick Kelly, Leader of the Council			
3	Report author and contact details: Dan Williams/ Maureen McDonald-Khan			
4	Decision to be taken: Allocates £219,592.80 into the capital programme to be funded by capital receipts. To authorise Service Director for HROD to award contracts relating to this project where they would otherwise not have authority to do so.			
5	Reasons for decision: Condition surveys required to understand backlog maintenance liability of the corporate estate and to inform future maintenance planning.			
6	Alternative options considered and rejected: Do nothing/ not award the contract – will result in a risk to the council not understanding its maintenance liability.			
7	Financial implications and risks: £219,592.80 funded by future capital receipts.			
8	Is the decision a Key Decision? (please contact Democratic Support for further advice)	Yes	No	Per the Constitution, a key decision is one which:
			X	in the case of capital projects and contract awards, results in a new commitment to spend and/or save in excess of £3million in total
			X	in the case of revenue projects when the decision involves entering into new commitments and/or making new savings in excess of £1 million
			X	is significant in terms of its effect on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards in the area of the local authority.

	If yes, date of publication of the notice in the Forward Plan of Key Decisions	
9	Please specify how this decision is linked to the Council's corporate plan/Plymouth Plan and/or the policy framework and/or the revenue/capital budget:	Caring for people and communities: Ensuring the council understands its maintenance liabilities in order to provide better services at locations that are fit for purpose within the community.
10	Please specify any direct environmental implications of the decision (carbon impact)	N/A

Urgent decisions

11	Is the decision urgent and to be implemented immediately in the interests of the Council or the public?	Yes		(If yes, please contact Democratic Support (democraticsupport@plymouth.gov.uk) for advice)
		No	X	(If no, go to section 13a)
12a	Reason for urgency:			
12b	Scrutiny Chair Signature:		Date	
	Scrutiny Committee name:			
	Print Name:			

Consultation

13a	Are any other Cabinet members' portfolios affected by the decision?	Yes		
		No	X	(If no go to section 14)
13b	Which other Cabinet member's portfolio is affected by the decision?			
13c	Date Cabinet member consulted			
14	Has any Cabinet member declared a conflict of interest in relation to the decision?	Yes		If yes, please discuss with the Monitoring Officer
		No	X	
15	Which Corporate Management Team member has been consulted?	Name		Andy Ralphs
		Job title		Strategic Director Customer and Corporate Services

		Date consulted	18/08/2021					
Sign-off								
16	Sign off codes from the relevant departments consulted:	Democratic Support (mandatory)	DS4I 21/22					
		Finance (mandatory)	ba.21.22.88					
		Legal (mandatory)	lt/ 37192/190821					
		Human Resources (if applicable)						
		Corporate property (if applicable)						
		Procurement (if applicable)	KK/PS/596/ED/08/21					
Appendices								
17	Ref.	Title of appendix						
	A	Briefing report for publication (<i>mandatory</i>)						
Confidential/exempt information								
18a	Do you need to include any confidential/exempt information?	Yes		If yes, prepare a second, confidential ('Part II') briefing report and indicate why it is not for publication by virtue of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 by ticking the relevant box in 18b below. (Keep as much information as possible in the briefing report that will be in the public domain)				
		No	X					
		Exemption Paragraph Number						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18b	Confidential/exempt briefing report title:							
Background Papers								
19	Please list all unpublished, background papers relevant to the decision in the table below. Background papers are <u>unpublished</u> works, relied on to a material extent in preparing the report, which disclose facts or matters on which the report or an important part of the work is based. If some/all of the information is confidential, you must indicate why it is not for publication by virtue of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 by ticking the relevant box.							

CORPORATE ESTATE CONDITION SURVEYS

Briefing Report for Executive Decision



BACKGROUND

There is currently no up to date building condition surveys for the corporate estate. As a consequence the risks to the council are:

- The council is unaware of its current backlog maintenance for the corporate estate
- General condition ratings for the buildings are historical and out of date
- Maintenance is reactive and not prioritised based on condition which results in funding not being targeted
- Decisions are not being made on whether to retain or release a building based on its condition score
- Maintenance issues identified are not given a high enough priority and eventually buildings further deteriorate requiring capital expenditure which has resulted in high levels of service borrowing for Facilities Management
- There is a lack of building information which has resulted in high costs of maintaining unoccupied buildings

SUMMARY

To procure a programme of condition surveys to be completed for the corporate estate

Condition surveys will provide:

- Data on significant maintenance issues and the associated estimated costs
- Priority rating for each property surveyed
- An overall condition rating for each property
- Allow decisions to be made on what property/ies to retain and what property/ies to identify alternative use for
- Allow a long term maintenance plan to be developed as part of a wider property asset management plan. This will allow targeted maintenance plans for the high priority buildings (in terms of condition and use I.E Ballard House, Council House)
- Allow identification of properties suitable for 'Community Asset Transfer'

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There has been under investment in some properties for a number of years which has resulted in the properties deteriorating and reactive maintenance being undertaken.

The reactive maintenance budget for the corporate estate is £2.8m per annum which is expended on reactive maintenance and health and safety compliance works e.g. asbestos, water management including legionella, electrical safety, fire risk assessment etc.

There is no budget for preventative planned maintenance (PPM) for corporate properties.

It is historically estimated that there is around £24M of backlog repairs for the corporate buildings. There is a long term benefit in establishing a preventative planned maintenance programme alongside the existing reactive maintenance budget.

Following a procurement process the condition survey programme will cost £219,592.80 and will be funded by capital receipts. As a result of completing the building condition surveys there will be a rationalisation of PCCs corporate properties. This will potentially result in future revenue savings and the generation of capital receipts for PCC.

NEED FOR DECISION

To award the contract to for Lots 1, 2 & 3 based on quality submission and submitted prices against The Call-Off Terms and Conditions.

EXECUTIVE DECISION

made by a Cabinet Member



REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY BY AN INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER


Executive Decision Reference Number – T10 21/22

Decision	
1	<p>Title of decision: THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH (TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS) (AMENDMENT ORDER NO. 2021.2137255 THE BARCODE) ORDER</p> <p>THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH (OFF-STREET PARKING PLACES) (AMENDMENT ORDER NO. 2021.2137255 THE BARCODE – BRETONSIDE B) ORDER</p> <p>THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH (TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS) (TAXI RANKS) (AMENDMENT ORDER No. 2021.2137255 – THE BARCODE) ORDER</p>
2	<p>Decision maker (Cabinet member name and portfolio title): Councillor Jonathan Drean, Cabinet Member for Transport</p>
3	<p>Report author and contact details: Amy Neale, Senior Traffic Management Technician, email: amy.neale@plymouth.gov.uk</p>
4	<p>Decision to be taken:</p> <p>To implement amendments to The City of Plymouth (Traffic Regulation and Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2004, The City of Plymouth (Traffic Regulation Orders) (Taxi Ranks) 2014 & The City of Plymouth (Off-Street Parking Places) Order 2007 (As amended).</p> <p>The effect of the order shall be to add/amend the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Waiting at Any Time on Bretonside & Exeter Street • Goods Loading Bay At All Times on Bretonside • Goods Loading Bay between 6am & 12pm on Exeter Street • Goods Loading Bay between 6am & 11pm on Exeter Street • Taxi Rank at all times (6 taxis) on Bretonside • Taxi Rank 12pm – 6am (4 taxis) on Exeter Street <p>As set out in the briefing report.</p>
5	<p>Reasons for decision:</p> <p>Following the construction of the Drake Leisure facility (The Barcode) and the associated highway works, it is deemed necessary to implement 3x loading bays and 2x taxi ranks to serve the development to avoid danger to persons or other traffic using the road and for preserving and improving the amenities within the area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Exeter Street, Western shared loading bay and taxi rank – the shared loading bay located on the western end of the Exeter Street viaduct will be in operation from 06.00 -12.00 midday and will then be used for taxis (4 in total) for the remainder of the day. - Exeter Street, Eastern loading bay – the loading bay located on the eastern end of the Exeter Street viaduct will be in operation from 06.00-23.00

	- Bretonside taxi rank – full time taxi rank to accommodate 6x taxis - Bretonside loading bay – 24 hour loading bay located to the rear of the development			
6	Alternative options considered and rejected: Without these restrictions there would be a detriment to public amenities and concerns with regard to highway safety therefore no other options were considered.			
7	Financial implications: The Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) and associated works is being funded by Planning.			
8	Is the decision a Key Decision? (please contact Democratic Support for further advice)	Yes	No	Per the Constitution, a key decision is one which:
			x	in the case of capital projects and contract awards, results in a new commitment to spend and/or save in excess of £3million in total
			x	in the case of revenue projects when the decision involves entering into new commitments and/or making new savings in excess of £1 million
			x	is significant in terms of its effect on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards in the area of the local authority.
	If yes, date of publication of the notice in the Forward Plan of Key Decisions			
9	Please specify how this decision is linked to the Council's corporate plan/Plymouth Plan and/or the policy framework and/or the revenue/capital budget:	The Local Transport Plan (LTP) details the transport strategies and policies that the City Council has adopted and will be key in helping the city meet its Corporate Plan priorities, and growth agenda.		
10	Please specify any direct environmental implications of the decision (carbon impact)	n/a		
Urgent decisions				
11	Is the decision urgent and to be implemented immediately in the interests of the Council or the public?	Yes		(If yes, please contact Democratic Support (democraticsupport@plymouth.gov.uk) for advice)
		No	x	(If no, go to section 13a)
12a	Reason for urgency:			

I2b	Scrutiny Chair Signature:		Date	
	Scrutiny Committee name:			
	Print Name:			
Consultation				
I3a	Are any other Cabinet members' portfolios affected by the decision?	Yes		
		No	x	(If no go to section I4)
I3b	Which other Cabinet member's portfolio is affected by the decision?			
I3c	Date Cabinet member consulted	08/07/2021		
I4	Has any Cabinet member declared a conflict of interest in relation to the decision?	Yes		If yes, please discuss with the Monitoring Officer
		No	x	
I5	Which Corporate Management Team member has been consulted?	Name	Anthony Payne	
		Job title	Strategic Director for Place	
		Date consulted	09/08/2021	
Sign-off				
I6	Sign off codes from the relevant departments consulted:	Democratic Support (mandatory)	DS37 21/22	
		Finance (mandatory)	pl.21.22.82.	
		Legal (mandatory)	LS/37139/JP/160 821.	
		Human Resources (if applicable)		
		Corporate property (if applicable)		
		Procurement (if applicable)		

Appendices								
17	Ref.	Title of appendix						
	A	Briefing report						
	B	Equalities Impact Assessment						
Confidential/exempt information								
18a	Do you need to include any confidential/exempt information?	Yes		If yes, prepare a second, confidential ('Part II') briefing report and indicate why it is not for publication by virtue of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 by ticking the relevant box in 18b below. (Keep as much information as possible in the briefing report that will be in the public domain)				
		No	x					
		Exemption Paragraph Number						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18b	Confidential/exempt briefing report title:							
Background Papers								
19	Please list all unpublished, background papers relevant to the decision in the table below. Background papers are <u>unpublished</u> works, relied on to a material extent in preparing the report, which disclose facts or matters on which the report or an important part of the work is based. If some/all of the information is confidential, you must indicate why it is not for publication by virtue of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 by ticking the relevant box.							
Title of background paper(s)		Exemption Paragraph Number						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cabinet Member Signature								
20	I agree the decision and confirm that it is not contrary to the Council's policy and budget framework, Corporate Plan or Budget. In taking this decision I have given due regard to the Council's duty to promote equality of opportunity, eliminate unlawful discrimination and promote good relations between people who share protected characteristics under the							

	Equalities Act and those who do not. For further details please see the EIA attached.		
Signature		Date of decision	23/08/2021
Print Name	Councillor Jonathan Drear		

This page is intentionally left blank



THE BARCODE TRO

I. INTRODUCTION

This report seeks delegated authority to implement amendments to The City of Plymouth (Traffic Regulation and Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2004, The City of Plymouth (Traffic Regulation Orders) (Taxi Ranks) 2014 & The City of Plymouth (Off-Street Parking Places) Order 2007 (As amended), in association with the TRO for The Barcode

TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS REQUIRED

2.1 The elements that need a Traffic Regulation Order are as follows:

To Add:

A Taxi rank section to Bretonside B Off Street Car Park – No charge, Mo maximum stay.

No Waiting At Any Time

- (i) Bretonside, the north side from a point 77 metres west of its westerly junction with Bilbury Street to its junction with Kinterbury Street
- (ii) Bretonside, the north side from a point 3 metres east of the junction with Moon Street to a point 34 metres west of its westerly junction with Bilbury Street
- (iii) Exeter Street, the south side from its junction with St Andrews Cross roundabout for a distance of 42 metres in a north easterly direction

Goods Loading Bay At Any Time

Bretonside, the north side from a point 34 metres west of its westerly junction with Bilbury Street for a distance of 43 metres in a westerly direction

Goods Loading Bays 6am-12pm

Exeter Street, the south side from a point 42 metres north east of its junction with St Andrews Cross roundabout for a distance of 24 metres in a north easterly direction

Goods Loading Bays 6am-11pm

Exeter Street, the south side from a point 20 metres south west of its junction with Charles Cross roundabout for a distance of 25 metres in a south westerly direction

No Stopping except Taxis 12pm (midday) – 6am

Permitted Number – 4:

- (i) Exeter Street – south side, from a point 42 metres north east of its junction with St Andrews Cross roundabout, for a distance of 24 metres in a north easterly direction

Revocations**No Waiting At Any Time**

- (i) Bretonside, the north side, from a point 3 metres east of the junction with Moon Street
to the junction with Kinterbury Street
- (ii) Exeter Street, the south-east side, from its junction with St Andrews Cross Roundabout
for a distance of 54 metres in a north easterly direction

Taxi Rank at Any Time Permitted Number: 4

- (i) Exeter Street (Viaduct) – south side

Taxi Rank at Any Time Permitted Number: 9

- (i) Bretonside – north side

2. STATUTORY CONSULTATION**Proposals**

The proposals for The Barcode were advertised on street, in the Herald and on the Plymouth City Council website on 14th July 2021. Details were sent to the Councillors representing the affected ward and statutory consultees on 12th July 2021.

There have not been any representations received relating to the Traffic Regulation Order proposals.

4. RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended to proceed with original proposals as advertised and make the Traffic Regulation Order.

5. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

The lawful implications and consequences of the proposal have been considered and taken into account in the preparation of this report.

When considering whether to make a traffic order it is the Council's responsibility to ensure that all relevant legislation is complied with. This includes Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) that sets out that it is the duty of a local authority, so far as practicable subject to certain matters, to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. It is considered that the proposals comply with Section 122 of the Act as they practically secure the safe and expeditious movement of traffic in and around Plymouth and provide for suitable and adequate associated parking facilities.

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The Barcode TRO



STAGE 1: WHAT IS BEING ASSESSED AND BY WHOM?

What is being assessed - including a brief description of aims and objectives?	<p>To implement amendments to The City of Plymouth (Traffic Regulation and Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2004 (as amended).</p> <p>The effect of the order shall be to Add/Amend:</p> <p>A Taxi rank section to Bretonside B Off Street Car Park</p> <p>Goods loading bay at any time on Bretonside</p> <p>Goods loading bays 6am-12pm on south side of Exeter Street (western end)</p> <p>Goods loading bays 6am-11pm on south side of Exeter Street (eastern end)</p> <p>No stopping except Taxis 12pm (midday)-6am</p> <p>As set out in the briefing report.</p>
Author	Abbie Perry
Department and service	Transport Planning, Transport Planning Officer
Date of assessment	06/08/2021

STAGE 2: EVIDENCE AND IMPACT

Protected characteristics (Equality Act)	Evidence and information (eg data and feedback)	Any adverse impact See guidance on how to make judgement	Actions	Timescale and who is responsible
Age	No issues raised in consultation	No adverse impact anticipated		
Disability	No issues raised in consultation	No adverse impact anticipated		

Faith/religion or belief	No issues raised in consultation	No adverse impact anticipated		
Gender - including marriage, pregnancy and maternity	No issues raised in consultation	No adverse impact anticipated		
Gender reassignment	No issues raised in consultation	No adverse impact anticipated		
Race	No issues raised in consultation	No adverse impact anticipated		
Sexual orientation - including civil partnership	No issues raised in consultation	No adverse impact anticipated		

STAGE 3: ARE THERE ANY IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FOLLOWING? IF SO, PLEASE RECORD ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN

Local priorities	Implications	Timescale and who is responsible
Reduce the gap in average hourly pay between men and women by 2021.	No adverse impact has been identified	
Increase the number of hate crime incidents reported and maintain good satisfaction rates in dealing with racist, disablist, homophobic, transphobic and faith, religion and belief incidents by 2020.	No adverse impact has been identified	
Good relations between different communities (community cohesion)	No adverse impact has been identified	

Human rights Please refer to guidance	No adverse impact has been identified	
---	---------------------------------------	--

STAGE 4: PUBLICATION

Responsible Officer: Scott Smy, Transport Development Co-ordinator

Date: 09/08/2021

Strategic Director, Service Director, Head of Service or Group Manager

This page is intentionally left blank

EXECUTIVE DECISION

made by a Cabinet Member



REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY BY AN INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER

Executive Decision Reference Number – T11 21/22


Decision	
1	Title of decision: THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH (TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS) (AMENDMENT ORDER NO. 2021.2137257 MILLBAY BOULEVARD) ORDER
2	Decision maker (Cabinet member name and portfolio title): Councillor Jonathan Drean, Cabinet Member for Transport
3	Report author and contact details: Amy Neale, Senior Traffic Management Technician, email: amy.neale@plymouth.gov.uk
4	<p>Decision to be taken: To implement amendments to The City of Plymouth (Traffic Regulation and Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2004. (As amended). The effect of the order shall be to add/amend;</p> <p>No Waiting At Any Time on lengths of the following roads: Bath Lane, Bath Place, Bath Place West & Bath Street</p> <p>Limited Waiting To 10 Minutes No Return for 1 Hour, Limited Waiting To 2 Hours No Return for 3 Hours - Electric Vehicles exempt, Goods Loading Bay At Any Time & Disabled Driver Only Parking Bay At Any time on lengths of the following road: Bath Street</p> <p>As set out in the briefing report.</p>
5	<p>Reasons for decision:</p> <p>Millbay Boulevard - To provide car parking control in the newly formed Millbay Boulevard proposal in line with our current parking strategy for the Millbay area, and to emphasise the sustainable transport dominance of this route for the city. The order will restrict vehicle parking in all areas except in marked bays only. This is avoid the new street and its public realm being randomly parked upon prejudicing the sustainable transport measures of wide footpaths and possible restriction of pedestrian movement and degradation of these new routes.</p> <p>Bath Lane, Bath Place West & Bath Place - To provide car parking control in this narrow side street preventing wholesale parking here given its constrained nature. The order will prevent vehicle parking on this very narrow street effectively a single carriageway as originally envisaged by our parking team in line with wider parking measures for the Millbay Area. This</p>

	will create a safer more accessible street for the public to use and allow improved access for all modes.			
6	<p>Alternative options considered and rejected:</p> <p>Not to implement any parking restrictions on any of the streets. This was rejected as it did not fit with the parking strategy for the Millbay Area being applied by our Parking Team.</p> <p>Specifically it would cause the new Boulevard Project and its public realm to be randomly parked upon prejudicing the sustainable transport measures of wide footpaths and the benefit of generous safe pedestrian movement.</p> <p>And for Bath Lane, Bath Place West & Bath Place it will prevent vehicles otherwise parking on this very narrow street, effectively a single carriageway, causing obstruction and frustration to other modes of movement including safe pedestrian, cycle, vehicle and emergency vehicle movement.</p>			
7	<p>Financial implications:</p> <p>The implementation of this order is already budgeted for within the capital programme for delivering Millbay Boulevard and its Associated Works.</p>			
8	<p>Is the decision a Key Decision? (please contact Democratic Support for further advice)</p>	Yes	No	Per the Constitution, a key decision is one which:
			x	in the case of capital projects and contract awards, results in a new commitment to spend and/or save in excess of £3million in total
			x	in the case of revenue projects when the decision involves entering into new commitments and/or making new savings in excess of £1million
			x	is significant in terms of its effect on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards in the area of the local authority.
	<p>If yes, date of publication of the notice in the Forward Plan of Key Decisions</p>			
9	Please specify how this decision is linked to the Council's corporate plan/Plymouth Plan and/or the policy framework and/or the revenue/capital budget:	The Local Transport Plan (LTP) details the transport strategies and policies that the City Council has adopted and will be key in helping the city meet its Corporate Plan priorities, and growth agenda.		
10	Please specify any direct environmental implications of the decision (carbon impact)	n/a		

Urgent decisions

11	Is the decision urgent and to be implemented immediately in the interests of the Council or the public?	Yes		(If yes, please contact Democratic Support (democraticsupport@plymouth.gov.uk) for advice)
		No	x	(If no, go to section 13a)
12a	Reason for urgency:			
12b	Scrutiny Chair Signature:		Date	
	Scrutiny Committee name:			
	Print Name:			
Consultation				
13a	Are any other Cabinet members' portfolios affected by the decision?	Yes		
		No	x	(If no go to section 14)
13b	Which other Cabinet member's portfolio is affected by the decision?			
13c	Date Cabinet member consulted	24/06/2021		
14	Has any Cabinet member declared a conflict of interest in relation to the decision?	Yes		If yes, please discuss with the Monitoring Officer
		No	x	
15	Which Corporate Management Team member has been consulted?	Name	Anthony Payne	
		Job title	Strategic Director for Place	
		Date consulted	04/08/2021	
Sign-off				
16	Sign off codes from the relevant departments consulted:	Democratic Support (mandatory)	DS38 21/22	
		Finance (mandatory)	pl.21.22.76.	

		Legal (mandatory)	LS/37177/JP/170821.					
		Human Resources (if applicable)						
		Corporate property (if applicable)						
		Procurement (if applicable)						
Appendices								
I7	Ref.	Title of appendix						
	A	Briefing report						
	B	Equalities Impact Assessment						
Confidential/exempt information								
I8a	Do you need to include any confidential/exempt information?	Yes		If yes, prepare a second, confidential ('Part II') briefing report and indicate why it is not for publication by virtue of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 by ticking the relevant box in I8b below. (Keep as much information as possible in the briefing report that will be in the public domain)				
		No	x					
		Exemption Paragraph Number						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I8b	Confidential/exempt briefing report title:							
Background Papers								
I9	Please list all unpublished, background papers relevant to the decision in the table below. Background papers are <u>unpublished</u> works, relied on to a material extent in preparing the report, which disclose facts or matters on which the report or an important part of the work is based. If some/all of the information is confidential, you must indicate why it is not for publication by virtue of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 by ticking the relevant box.							

Title of background paper(s)		Exemption Paragraph Number						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cabinet Member Signature								
20	I agree the decision and confirm that it is not contrary to the Council's policy and budget framework, Corporate Plan or Budget. In taking this decision I have given due regard to the Council's duty to promote equality of opportunity, eliminate unlawful discrimination and promote good relations between people who share protected characteristics under the Equalities Act and those who do not. For further details please see the EIA attached.							
Signature				Date of decision		23/08/2021		
Print Name		Councillor Jonathan Drear						

This page is intentionally left blank



MILLBAY BOULEVARD

I. INTRODUCTION

This report seeks delegated authority to implement amendments to The City of Plymouth (Traffic Regulation and Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2004 (as amended) in association with the Millbay Boulevard TRO.

TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS REQUIRED

2.1 The elements that need a Traffic Regulation Order are as follows:

To Add:

No Waiting At Any Time

- (i) Bath Lane, all sides for its entirety
- (ii) Bath Place, both sides for its entirety
- (vi) Bath Place West, both sides for its entirety
- (x) Bath Street, the north-west & north-east side from its junction with Millbay Road in a north easterly direction, to its closed end, including its closed end
- (xiv) Bath Street, the south-east side from a point 27.5 metres north east of its junction with Millbay Road for a distance of 4.6 metres in a north easterly direction
- (xviii) Bath Street, the south-east side from a point 61 metres north east of its junction with Millbay Road for a distance of 15.6 metres in a north easterly direction
- (xxii) Bath Street, the south-east side from a point 92.4 metres north east of its junction with Millbay Road for a distance of 49.3 metres in a north easterly direction
- (xxvi) Bath Street, the south-east side from a point 164 metres north east of its junction with Millbay Road for a distance of 42.5 metres in a north easterly direction
- (xxx) Bath Street, the south-east side from its junction with Millbay Road for a distance of 17.8 metres in a north easterly direction

Limited Waiting 10 Minutes No Return for 1 Hour

Bath Street, the south-east side from a point 17.8 metres north east of its junction with Millbay Road for a distance of 9.7 metres in a north easterly direction

Limited Waiting To 2 Hours No Return for 3 Hours - Electric Vehicles exempt

Bath Street, the south-east side from a point 141.7 metres north east of its junction with Millbay Road for a distance of 22.3 metres in a north easterly direction

Goods Loading Bay At Any Time

Bath Street, the south-east side from a point 76.6 metres north east of its junction with Millbay Road for a distance of 15.8 metres in a north easterly direction

Disabled Driver Only Parking Bay At Anytime

Bath Street, the south-east side from a point 32.1 metres north east of its junction with Millbay Road for a distance of 28.9 metres in a north easterly direction

Revocations**No Waiting At Any Time**

- (i) Bath Street, both sides, for the entire length
- (ii) Bath Lane, the all side, for its entirety
- (vi) Bath Place, both sides, for its entirety
- (x) Bath Place West, both sides, for its entirety

2. STATUTORY CONSULTATION**Proposals**

The proposals for the Millbay Boulevard Scheme were advertised on street, in the Herald and on the Plymouth City Council website on 12th July 2021. Details were sent to the Councillors representing the affected ward and statutory consultees on 7th July 2021.

There have not been any representations received relating to the Traffic Regulation Order proposals.

4. RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended to proceed with original proposals as advertised and make the Traffic Regulation Order.

5. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

The lawful implications and consequences of the proposal have been considered and taken into account in the preparation of this report.

When considering whether to make a traffic order it is the Council's responsibility to ensure that all relevant legislation is complied with. This includes Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) that sets out that it is the duty of a local authority, so far as practicable subject to certain matters, to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. It is considered that the proposals comply with Section 122 of the Act as they practically secure the safe and expeditious movement of traffic in and around Plymouth and provide for suitable and adequate associated parking facilities.

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Millbay Boulevard - Parking TRO



STAGE 1: What is being assessed and by whom?

What is being assessed - including a brief description of aims and objectives?	What is being assessed - including a brief description of aims and objectives? Including Bath Lane, Bath Place West & Bath Place to control car parking in line with the Millbay Parking Strategy.
Responsible Officer	Richard Bara
Department and Service	Strategic Planning & Infrastructure, Strategic Growth
Date of Assessment	3 August 2021

STAGE 2: Evidence and Impact

Protected Characteristics (Equality Act)	Evidence and information (e.g. data and feedback)	Any adverse impact?	Actions	Timescale and who is responsible?
Age	The ONS mid-year population estimates from 2016 are as follows: Under 5 15,881 6.0% Under 16 46,808 17.7%	There will be some minor disruption to vehicle and pedestrian movement within the public highway during implementation.	Ensure that the execution of works allows for the safe movement of vehicles and people of all ages	August to September 2021 Nov 2018 – Responsible Officer Design Team and Principal Contractor throughout the implementation of this TRO.

STAGE 2: Evidence and Impact				
Protected Characteristics (Equality Act)	Evidence and information (e.g. data and feedback)	Any adverse impact?	Actions	Timescale and who is responsible?
	<p>Under 18 52,354 19.8%</p> <p>18-24 33,253 12.6%</p> <p>15-64 172,805 65.4%</p> <p>65 and over 47,112 17.8%</p> <p>75 and over 21,401 8.1%</p> <p>85 and over 6,224 2.4%</p>		with advance notice of works and clear signage for diversions of vehicle and pedestrian routes.	<p>implementation process</p> <p>Lead contractor and Design Team throughout design and implementation of this Parking TRO.</p>
Disability	<p>More people are living with a disability now than in the past because we're living longer and improved medical treatments are enabling more people to manage long-term health problems. The Equality and Human Rights Commission says that the majority of people over 50 will have a long-term health condition by 2020.</p>	<p>Enhancing the safe movement of people of all abilities is one of the guiding principles of the Millbay Boulevard & Associated Works programme and as such the completed scheme will improve the environment for people with disabilities. There will be some minor disruption during the implementation of the TRO mainly signage works.</p>	<p>Streets and spaces have been designed to meet requirements under the Equalities Act 2010, Inclusive Mobility Standard DFT Guidance.</p> <p>The provision of disabled parking will make it easier for those with disabilities in vehicles to access this part of Plymouth and use the available facilities.</p>	<p>August 2021 – September 2021 Responsible Officer</p> <p>Design Team and Principal Contractor throughout the timespan above .</p> <p>Lead contractor and Principal Designer throughout design and construction process</p>

STAGE 2: Evidence and Impact				
Protected Characteristics (Equality Act)	Evidence and information (e.g. data and feedback)	Any adverse impact?	Actions	Timescale and who is responsible?
	<p>A total of 31,164 people declared themselves as having a long-term health problem or disability in the 2011 Census.</p> <p>1,297 adults currently registered with a GP in Plymouth have some form of a Learning Disability (2013/14).</p>		<p>wherever possible and Building Regulations Approved Document Part M for access to any buildings.</p> <p>Ensure the construction methodology, procurement of contractors and execution of works allows for the safe movement of people of all abilities throughout the construction process with advance notice of works and clear signage for diversions to accessible pedestrian routes</p>	
Faith, Religion or Belief		No adverse impact	No action required	
Gender - including marriage, pregnancy and maternity		No adverse impact	No action required	

STAGE 2: Evidence and Impact				
Protected Characteristics (Equality Act)	Evidence and information (e.g. data and feedback)	Any adverse impact?	Actions	Timescale and who is responsible?
Gender Reassignment		No adverse impact	No action required	
Race	The racial composition of the City is changing and not all residents and visitors understand English.	No adverse impact	New or replacement signage where proposed to be assessed for ease of understanding	Nov 2018 – Responsible Officer
Sexual Orientation -including Civil Partnership		No adverse impact	No action required	

STAGE 3: Are there any implications for the following? If so, please record 'Actions' to be taken		
Local Priorities	Implications	Timescale and who is responsible?
Reduce the inequality gap, particularly in health between communities.	Positive impact – this action will support the general objective of improving this environment to encourage safe walking and cycling and active play. The encouragement of such activities is proven to achieve more healthy lifestyles. However for those who cannot, the scheme provides some disabled parking spaces.	The benefits will be realised upon completion of the TRO in August 2021 and onwards. Responsible Officer.

STAGE 3: Are there any implications for the following? If so, please record 'Actions' to be taken

Local Priorities	Implications	Timescale and who is responsible?
Good relations between different communities (community cohesion).	Positive impact – The TRO supports improved public spaces within Millbay which in turn will promote increased use by all sectors of the community leading to improved social cohesion with the new pedestrian spaces offering opportunities to host events.	Benefits to be realised upon completion of the TRO, expected to be in August 2021 and onwards. Responsible Officer.
Human Rights	No implications	

STAGE 4: Publication

Director, Assistant Director/Head of Service approving EIA.		Date	3 August 2021
---	--	------	---------------

This page is intentionally left blank

EXECUTIVE DECISION

made by a Cabinet Member




REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY BY AN INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER

Executive Decision Reference Number – T9 21/22

Decision				
1	Title of decision: THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH (TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS) (AMENDMENT ORDER NO. 2021.2137253 STRODE ROAD & GALILEO CLOSE) ORDER			
2	Decision maker (Cabinet member name and portfolio title): Councillor Jonathan Drean, Cabinet Member for Transport			
3	Report author and contact details: Amy Neale, Senior Traffic Management Technician, email: amy.neale@plymouth.gov.uk			
4	Decision to be taken: To implement amendments to The City of Plymouth (Traffic Regulation and Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2004. (As amended). The effect of the order shall be to add/amend; No Waiting At Any Time on lengths of the following roads: Strode Road & Galileo Close As set out in the briefing report.			
5	Reasons for decision: Following the construction of the Aldi store development off Galileo Close and the associated highway works to provide a mini roundabout in place of the priority junction at Galileo Close and Strode Road, it is deemed necessary to implement double yellow lines along a length of Strode Road and Galileo Close. This is to maintain the free flow of traffic and avoid danger to persons or traffic travelling along these roads.			
6	Alternative options considered and rejected: Not adding these restrictions would restrict the free flow of traffic along these roads and give rise to highway safety concerns and therefore no other options were considered.			
7	Financial implications: The Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) and associated works is being funded by Planning.			
8	Is the decision a Key Decision? (please contact Democratic Support for further advice)	Yes	No	Per the Constitution, a key decision is one which:
			x	in the case of capital projects and contract awards, results in a new

				commitment to spend and/or save in excess of £3million in total
			x	in the case of revenue projects when the decision involves entering into new commitments and/or making new savings in excess of £1million
			x	is significant in terms of its effect on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards in the area of the local authority.
	If yes, date of publication of the notice in the Forward Plan of Key Decisions			
9	Please specify how this decision is linked to the Council's corporate plan/Plymouth Plan and/or the policy framework and/or the revenue/capital budget:		The Local Transport Plan (LTP) details the transport strategies and policies that the City Council has adopted and will be key in helping the city meet its Corporate Plan priorities, and growth agenda.	
10	Please specify any direct environmental implications of the decision (carbon impact)		n/a	
Urgent decisions				
11	Is the decision urgent and to be implemented immediately in the interests of the Council or the public?	Yes		(If yes, please contact Democratic Support (democraticsupport@plymouth.gov.uk) for advice)
		No	x	(If no, go to section 13a)
12a	Reason for urgency:			
12b	Scrutiny Chair Signature:		Date	
	Scrutiny Committee name:			
	Print Name:			
Consultation				
13a	Are any other Cabinet members' portfolios affected by the decision?	Yes		
		No	x	(If no go to section 14)

I3b	Which other Cabinet member's portfolio is affected by the decision?			
I3c	Date Cabinet member consulted			
I4	Has any Cabinet member declared a conflict of interest in relation to the decision?	Yes		If yes, please discuss with the Monitoring Officer
		No	x	
I5	Which Corporate Management Team member has been consulted?	Name	Anthony Payne	
		Job title	Strategic Director for Place	
		Date consulted	09/08/2021	
Sign-off				
I6	Sign off codes from the relevant departments consulted:	Democratic Support (mandatory)	DS36 21/22	
		Finance (mandatory)	pl.21.22.83.	
		Legal (mandatory)	LS/37140/JP/160821	
		Human Resources (if applicable)		
		Corporate property (if applicable)		
		Procurement (if applicable)		
Appendices				
I7	Ref.	Title of appendix		
	A	Briefing report		
	B	Equalities Impact Assessment		
Confidential/exempt information				
I8a	Do you need to include any confidential/exempt information?	Yes		If yes, prepare a second, confidential ('Part II') briefing report and indicate why it is

		No	x	not for publication by virtue of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 by ticking the relevant box in 18b below. (Keep as much information as possible in the briefing report that will be in the public domain)				
		Exemption Paragraph Number						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18b	Confidential/exempt briefing report title:							
Background Papers								
19	<p>Please list all unpublished, background papers relevant to the decision in the table below.</p> <p>Background papers are <u>unpublished</u> works, relied on to a material extent in preparing the report, which disclose facts or matters on which the report or an important part of the work is based. If some/all of the information is confidential, you must indicate why it is not for publication by virtue of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 by ticking the relevant box.</p>							
Title of background paper(s)		Exemption Paragraph Number						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cabinet Member Signature								
20	<p>I agree the decision and confirm that it is not contrary to the Council's policy and budget framework, Corporate Plan or Budget. In taking this decision I have given due regard to the Council's duty to promote equality of opportunity, eliminate unlawful discrimination and promote good relations between people who share protected characteristics under the Equalities Act and those who do not. For further details please see the EIA attached.</p>							
Signature				Date of decision		23/08/2021		
Print Name		Councillor Jonathan Drear						



STRODE ROAD & GALILEO CLOSE

I. INTRODUCTION

This report seeks delegated authority to implement amendments to The City of Plymouth (Traffic Regulation and Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2004 (as amended) in association with the TRO for Strode Road & Galileo Close.

TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS REQUIRED

2.1 The elements that need a Traffic Regulation Order are as follows:

To Add:

No Waiting At Any Time

- (i) Galileo Close, the north side from its junction with Strode Road for a distance of 139 metres in a westerly direction
- (ii) Galileo Close, the south side from its junction with Strode Road for a distance of 134 metres in a westerly direction
- (iii) Strode Road, the east side from its junction with Lister Close for a distance of 146 metres in a southerly direction
- (iv) Strode Road, the east side from its junction with Lister Close for a distance of 26.5 metres in a northerly direction
- (v) Strode Road, the west side from its junction with Galileo Close for a distance of 56.5 metres in a northerly direction
- (vi) Strode Road, the west side from its junction with Galileo Close for a distance of 100 metres in a southerly direction

Revocations

No Waiting At Any Time

Strode Road, the east side, from a point 13 metres north to a point 15 metres south of the junction with Lister Close

2. STATUTORY CONSULTATION

Proposals

The proposals for the Strode Road & Galileo Close were advertised on street, in the Herald and on the Plymouth City Council website on 14th July 2021. Details were sent to the Councillors representing the affected ward and statutory consultees on 12th July 2021.

There have not been any representations received relating to the Traffic Regulation Order proposals.

4. RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended to proceed with original proposals as advertised and make the Traffic Regulation Order.

5. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

The lawful implications and consequences of the proposal have been considered and taken into account in the preparation of this report.

When considering whether to make a traffic order it is the Council's responsibility to ensure that all relevant legislation is complied with. This includes Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) that sets out that it is the duty of a local authority, so far as practicable subject to certain matters, to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. It is considered that the proposals comply with Section 122 of the Act as they practically secure the safe and expeditious movement of traffic in and around Plymouth and provide for suitable and adequate associated parking facilities.

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Strode Road & Galileo Close



STAGE 1: WHAT IS BEING ASSESSED AND BY WHOM?

What is being assessed - including a brief description of aims and objectives?	<p>To implement amendments to The City of Plymouth (Traffic Regulation and Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2004 (as amended).</p> <p>The effect of the order shall be to Add/Amend:</p> <p>No Waiting At Any Time on lengths of the following roads:</p> <p>Strode Road and Galileo Close</p> <p>As set out in the briefing report.</p>
Author	Abbie Perry
Department and service	Transport Planning, Transport Planning Officer
Date of assessment	06/08/2021

STAGE 2: EVIDENCE AND IMPACT

Protected characteristics (Equality Act)	Evidence and information (eg data and feedback)	Any adverse impact See guidance on how to make judgement	Actions	Timescale and who is responsible
Age	No issues raised in consultation	No adverse impact anticipated		
Disability	No issues raised in consultation	No adverse impact anticipated		
Faith/religion or belief	No issues raised in consultation	No adverse impact anticipated		
Gender - including marriage, pregnancy and maternity	No issues raised in consultation	No adverse impact anticipated		
Gender reassignment	No issues raised in consultation	No adverse impact anticipated		

Race	No issues raised in consultation	No adverse impact anticipated		
Sexual orientation - including civil partnership	No issues raised in consultation	No adverse impact anticipated		

STAGE 3: ARE THERE ANY IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FOLLOWING? IF SO, PLEASE RECORD ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN

Local priorities	Implications	Timescale and who is responsible
Reduce the gap in average hourly pay between men and women by 2021.	No adverse impact has been identified	
Increase the number of hate crime incidents reported and maintain good satisfaction rates in dealing with racist, disablist, homophobic, transphobic and faith, religion and belief incidents by 2020.	No adverse impact has been identified	
Good relations between different communities (community cohesion)	No adverse impact has been identified	
Human rights Please refer to guidance	No adverse impact has been identified	

STAGE 4: PUBLICATION

Responsible Officer: Scott Smy, Transport Development Co-ordinator

Date: 09/08/2021

Strategic Director, Service Director, Head of Service or Group Manager

EXECUTIVE DECISION

made by a Cabinet Member



REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY BY AN INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER

Executive Decision Reference Number – T8 21/22

Decision	
1	<p>Title of decision: THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH (TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS) (AMENDMENT ORDER NO. 2021.2137256 TRO REVIEW.7) ORDER</p> <p>THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH (MOVING & SPEED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS) (AMENDMENT ORDER No. 2021.2137256 TRO REVIEW.7) ORDER</p>
2	<p>Decision maker (Cabinet member name and portfolio title): Councillor Jonathan Drean, Cabinet Member for Transport</p>
3	<p>Report author and contact details: Amy Neale, Traffic Management Technician, email: trafficmanagementinbox@plymouth.gov.uk</p>
4	<p>Decision to be taken:</p> <p>To implement the following amendments to The City of Plymouth (Traffic Regulation and Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2004 & The City of Plymouth (Speed Orders) (Consolidation) Order 2016.</p> <p>The effect of the order shall be to Add/Amend:</p> <p>No Waiting At Any Time on lengths of the following roads:</p> <p>Admiralty Street, Barn Park Road, Bartholomew Road, Beaumont Street, Browning Road, Sturdee Road, Carradale Road, Clowance Street, Coleridge Avenue, Copse Road, Dryden Avenue, Fore Street, Haye Road, Hill Close, Hirmandale Road, Holly Park Drive, Lakeview Drive, Lord Morley Way, Macaulay Crescent, Mulgrave Street, Pentyre Terrace, Sea View Terrace, Smallack Drive, South Down Road, Southway Lane, Springfield Close, Stirling Road, Tavistock Road, Trelawny Road.</p> <p>Permit Parking Mon-Sat 10am-5pm on the following road: Coleridge Avenue.</p> <p>Permit Parking Mon-Fri 10am-11am on the following road: Pentyre Terrace.</p> <p>Permit Parking Mon-Sat 2pm-6pm on the following road: Admiralty Street.</p> <p>No Loading/Unloading At Any Time on the following road: Tavistock Road.</p> <p>20mph Zone on the following road: Back Lane.</p>

	<p>It is recommended that the proposals are abandoned relating to Trelawny Road & Hirmandale Road</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposals on Holly Park Drive are reduced to remove the proposal on the south side.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposals on Haye Road are reduced to: Haye Road, east side from a point 38 metres south of its junction with King George V Playing Fields to its junction with Elburton Road. The rest is recommended to be abandoned following a meeting with Councillor Salmon.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposals on Stirling Road are reduced to cover just the junctions with Westcroft Rd and Seacroft Rd to continue to allow residents to park across their drives in response to 7 letters of objection received from residents of another part of Stirling Rd concerned about parking displacement.</p> <p>All other proposals are recommended to be implemented as advertised.</p>
5	<p>Reasons for decision:</p> <p>Budshead</p> <p>Smallack Drive – Double yellow lines need extending to add further junction protection and to allow vehicles (including refuse) to fit past parked vehicles.</p> <p>Holly Park Drive/ Lakeview – To add double yellow lines to allow buses to exit out of the Lakeview junction safely.</p> <p>Devonport</p> <p>Clowance Street – To add double yellow lines to allow buses to pass the gates safely and prevent congestion.</p> <p>Eggbuckland</p> <p>Dryden Avenue/ Macaulay Crescent – Add double yellow lines to prevent obstruction and pavement parking.</p> <p>Coleridge Avenue – To remove a section of permit parking in order to allow entrance to a legal access.</p> <p>Carradale Road – Add double yellow lines to protect a new pedestrian crossing that is being installed. To allow protection when leaving the Epping Crescent junction.</p> <p>Honicknowle</p> <p>Hirmandale Road – Add double yellow lines to provide protection to the access / exit.</p> <p>Moorview/Budshead</p> <p>Tavistock Road – To add double yellow lines and a no loading ban to prevent delivery drivers causing obstructions and congestion. The bus bay will also be made longer.</p> <p>Peverell</p> <p>Barn park Road – Add double yellow lines to allow buses to turn the corner safely by Central Park.</p> <p>South Down Road – Add double yellow lines on the junction to allow buses to turn into the road safely.</p>

	<p>Plympton St Mary</p> <p>Trelawny Road – Add double yellow lines on bends to allow safe passage and prevent grass verge parking / obstructions.</p> <p>Plympton Erle</p> <p>Back Lane – To extend the new 20mph zone in St Maurice to include a section of Back Lane Hill Close/ Copse Road – To add double yellow lines for junction protection.</p> <p>Fore Street – To change the single yellow lines to double yellow lines in order to match the official Traffic Regulation Order. (no change to street)</p> <p>Plymstock Dunstone</p> <p>Lord Morley Way/ Springfield Close – To add double yellow lines for junction protection.</p> <p>Haye Road – To add double yellow lines to improve visibility along Haye Road</p> <p>Southway</p> <p>Southway Lane – To add double yellow lines to a small section that should have double yellow lines. To connect the junctions.</p> <p>St Peter & The Waterfront</p> <p>Mulgrave Street – To add double yellow lines to prevent complete obstruction of this street.</p> <p>Admiralty Street – To reduce double yellow lines to allow parking.</p> <p>Stoke</p> <p>Browning Road/ Sturdee Road and Beaumont Street/ Bartholomew Road - To add double yellow lines for junction protection.</p> <p>St Budeaux</p> <p>Stirling Road – To add double yellow lines to allow vehicle visibility and to prevent vehicles parking on both sides of the road, which is causing obstruction.</p> <p>Sutton & Mount Gould</p> <p>Sea View Terrace / Pentyre Terrace – To remove some double yellow lines, extend some permit parking and add further double yellow lines to allow access to a legal entrance.</p>			
6	<p>Alternative options considered and rejected:</p> <p>The alternative option would be to do nothing. This option was discounted on the basis that improvements are needed for safety of all road users.</p>			
7	<p>Financial implications:</p> <p>The Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) and associated works is being funded via the Traffic Management Team and will be paid out of their budget.</p>			
8	<p>Is the decision a Key Decision? (please contact Democratic Support for further advice)</p>	Yes	No	<p>Per the Constitution, a key decision is one which:</p>
			x	<p>in the case of capital projects and contract awards, results in a new commitment to spend and/or save in excess of £3million in total</p>

			x	in the case of revenue projects when the decision involves entering into new commitments and/or making new savings in excess of £1 million
			x	is significant in terms of its effect on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards in the area of the local authority.
	If yes, date of publication of the notice in the Forward Plan of Key Decisions			
9	Please specify how this decision is linked to the Council's corporate plan/Plymouth Plan and/or the policy framework and/or the revenue/capital budget:		The Local Transport Plan (LTP) details the transport strategies and policies that the City Council has adopted and will be key in helping the city meet its Corporate Plan priorities, and growth agenda.	
10	Please specify any direct environmental implications of the decision (carbon impact)		n/a	

Urgent decisions

11	Is the decision urgent and to be implemented immediately in the interests of the Council or the public?	Yes		(If yes, please contact Democratic Support (democraticsupport@plymouth.gov.uk) for advice)
		No	x	(If no, go to section 13a)


12a Reason for urgency:

12b	Scrutiny Chair Signature:		Date	
	Scrutiny Committee name:			
	Print Name:			

Consultation

13a	Are any other Cabinet members' portfolios affected by the decision?	Yes		
		No	x	(If no go to section 14)
13b	Which other Cabinet member's			

	portfolio is affected by the decision?			
I3c	Date Cabinet member consulted			
I4	Has any Cabinet member declared a conflict of interest in relation to the decision?	Yes		If yes, please discuss with the Monitoring Officer
		No	x	
I5	Which Corporate Management Team member has been consulted?	Name	Anthony Payne	
		Job title	Strategic Director for Place	
		Date consulted	27/07/2021	
Sign-off				
I6	Sign off codes from the relevant departments consulted:	Democratic Support (mandatory)	DS35 21/22	
		Finance (mandatory)	pl.21.22.69.	
		Legal (mandatory)	LS/37063/JP/280721	
		Human Resources (if applicable)		
		Corporate property (if applicable)		
		Procurement (if applicable)		
Appendices				
I7	Ref.	Title of appendix		
	A	Briefing report for publication		
	B	Equalities Impact Assessment		
Confidential/exempt information				
I8a	Do you need to include any confidential/exempt information?	Yes		If yes, prepare a second, confidential ('Part II') briefing report and indicate why it is not for publication by virtue of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 by ticking the relevant box in I8b below. (Keep as much information as possible in the briefing report that will be in the
		No	x	

				public domain)				
		Exemption Paragraph Number						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18b	Confidential/exempt briefing report title:							
Background Papers								
19	<p>Please list all unpublished, background papers relevant to the decision in the table below.</p> <p>Background papers are <u>unpublished</u> works, relied on to a material extent in preparing the report, which disclose facts or matters on which the report or an important part of the work is based. If some/all of the information is confidential, you must indicate why it is not for publication by virtue of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 by ticking the relevant box.</p>							
Title of background paper(s)		Exemption Paragraph Number						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cabinet Member Signature								
20	<p>I agree the decision and confirm that it is not contrary to the Council's policy and budget framework, Corporate Plan or Budget. In taking this decision I have given due regard to the Council's duty to promote equality of opportunity, eliminate unlawful discrimination and promote good relations between people who share protected characteristics under the Equalities Act and those who do not. For further details please see the EIA attached.</p>							
Signature				Date of decision		23/08/2021		
Print Name		Councillor Jonathan Drear						



TRO REVIEW.7

I. INTRODUCTION

This report seeks delegated authority to implement amendments to The City of Plymouth (Traffic Regulation and Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2004 & The City of Plymouth (Speed Orders) (Consolidation) Order 2016 in association with the TRO Review.7 TRO.

2. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS REQUIRED

2.1 The elements that need a Traffic Regulation Order are as follows:

To Add;

No Waiting At Any Time

- (i) Admiralty Street, the east side from its junction with Saltash Road for a distance of 35 metres in a southerly direction
- (ii) Admiralty Street, the west side from its junction with Saltash Road for a distance of 45 metres in a southerly direction
- (vi) Barn Park Road, the north side from a point 21 metres west from its boundary of house numbers 45 & 47 Barn Park Road for a distance of 32 metres in a westerly direction
- (x) Barn Park Road, the south side from its junction with Trelawney Road for a distance of 30 metres in an easterly direction
- (xiv) Bartholomew Road, the south-west side from its junction with Beaumont Street for a distance of 6 metres in a north westerly direction and 6 metres in a south easterly direction
- (xviii) Beaumont Street, both sides from its junction with Bartholomew Road for a distance of 6 metres in a south westerly direction
- (xxii) Beaumont Street, both sides from its junction with Bartholomew Road for a distance of 6 metres in a north easterly direction
- (xxvi) Browning Road, both sides from its junction with Sturdee Road for a distance of 6 metres in a westerly direction and 6 metres in an easterly direction
- (xxx) Sturdee Road, both sides from its junction with Browning Road for a distance of 6 metres in a northerly direction and 6 metres in a southerly direction
- (xxxiv) Carradale Road, the south side from its boundary with numbers 64 & 66 Carradale Road for a distance of 39 metres in a westerly direction
- (xxxviii) Clowance Street, the south-east side from a point 59 metres south west of its junction with George Street for a distance of 10 metres in a south westerly direction
- (xlii) Coleridge Avenue, the south side from a point 26 metres east of its junction with Morshead Road for a distance of 10 metres in an easterly direction

- (xlv) Copse Road, the north side from its junction with Hill Close for a distance of 12 metres in a westerly direction and 10 metres in an easterly direction
- (l) Dryden Avenue, the east side from its junction with Sheridan Road for a distance of 8 metres in a northerly direction
- (liv) Dryden Avenue, the east side from its junction with Conrad Road for a distance of 7 metres in a southerly direction
- (lviii) Dryden Avenue, the west side from its junction with Sheridan Road for a distance of 7.5 metres in a northerly direction
- (lxii) Dryden Avenue, the west side from its junction with Macaulay Crescent to its junction with Conrad Road
- (lxvi) Fore Street, the south side from a point 5 metres east of its boundary with 69 & 71 Fore Street to a point 15 metres west of its westerly boundary of number 101 Fore Street
- (lxx) Haye Road, the east side from a point 38 metres south of its junction with King George V Playing Fields to its junction with Elburton Road
- (lxxiv) Haye Road, the east side from its junction with Hercules Road to its junction with King George V Playing Fields
- (lxxviii) Haye Road, the west side from its junction with Elburton Road to its junction with Hercules Road
- (lxxxii) Hill Close, both sides from its junction with Copse Road for a distance of 12 metres in a northerly direction
- (lxxxvi) Hirmandale Road, the north-west side from its boundary of numbers 2 & 4 Hirmandale Road for a distance of 18.5 metres in a north easterly direction
- (xc) Holly Park Drive, the north side from its junction with Milford Lane to its junction with Lakeview Drive
- (xciv) Holly Park Drive, the south side from its junction with Milford Lane for a distance of 28 metres in a westerly direction
- (xcviii) Lakeview Drive, the east side from its junction with Holly Park Drive for a distance of 17 metres in a northerly direction
- (cii) Lakeview Drive, the west side from its junction with Holly Park Drive for a distance of 12 metres in a northerly direction
- (cvi) Lord Morley Way, both sides from its junction with Springfield Close for a distance of 9 metres in a northerly direction
- (cx) Macaulay Crescent, the north side from its junction with Dryden Avenue for a distance of 8 metres in a westerly direction
- (cxiv) Macaulay Crescent, the south side from its junction with Dryden Avenue for a distance

of 9 metres in a westerly direction

(cxviii) Mulgrave Street, both sides from its junction with Alfred Street for a distance of 37 metres in a northerly direction

(cxxii) Pentyre Terrace, the west side from its junction with Sea View Terrace for a distance of 9 metres in a southerly direction

(cxxvi) Sea View Terrace, the south-east side from its junction with Pentyre Terrace for a distance of 19 metres in a south westerly direction

(cxxx) Smallack Drive, the north side from its junction with Grosvenor Road for a distance of 22 metres in an easterly direction and 17 metres in a westerly direction

(cxxxiv) South Down Road, both sides from its junction with West Down Road for a distance of 10 metres in an easterly direction

(cxxxviii) Southway Lane, the east side from its junction with Southway Drive to a point 57 metres north of its junction with the Access Road to/from The George Hotel Car Park

(cxl) Springfield Close, the north side from its junction with Lord Morley Way for a distance of 6 metres in a westerly direction

(cxli) Stirling Road, the north side from its junction with Westcroft Road to its junction with Seacroft Road

(cl) Tavistock Road, the west side from its junction with the Access Road exiting McDonalds for a distance of 27 metres in a northerly direction

(cliv) Tavistock Road, the west side from a point 68 metres north of its junction with the Access Road exiting McDonalds for a distance of 21 metres in a northerly direction

(clviii) Trelawny Road, the north & east side from a point 19 metres west of its boundary with 18 & 20 Trelawny Road for a distance of 25 metres in a westerly and northerly direction

(clxii) Trelawny Road, the south & east side from a point 23 metres west of the boundary of numbers 34 & 36 Trelawny Road for a distance of 18 metres in a westerly and southerly direction

(clxvi) Trelawny Road, the north & west side from a point 4 metres west of the boundary of numbers 53 & 55 Trelawny Road to a point 6 metres south of the boundary of numbers 47 & 49 Trelawny Road

(clxx) Trelawny Road, the west & south side from its southern boundary of number 35 Trelawny Road to a point 4 metres east of the boundary of numbers 27 & 29 Trelawny Road

8.08 Permit Parking Mon-Sat 10am-5pm

- (i) Coleridge Avenue, the south side from a point 14 metres east of its junction with Morshead Road for a distance of 12 metres in an easterly direction
- (ii) Coleridge Avenue, the south side from a point 36 metres east of its junction with Morshead Road for a distance of 15 metres in an easterly direction

8.11 Permit Parking Mon-Fri 10am-11am

- (i) Pentyre Terrace, the west side from a point 9 metres south of its junction with Sea View Terrace to a point 2 metres north of its junction with Thornton Avenue
- (ii) Pentyre Terrace, the west side from a point 3 metres south of its junction with Thornton Avenue to a point 2 metres north of its junction with Salisbury Road Lane North

8.26 Permit Parking Mon-Sat 2pm-6pm

- (i) Admiralty Street, the west side from a point 45 metres south of its junction with Saltash Road for a distance of 62 metres in a southerly direction

9.01 No Loading/Unloading At Any Time

- (i) Tavistock Road, the west side from a point 68 metres north of its junction with the Access Road existing McDonalds for a distance of 21 metres in a northerly direction
- (ii) Tavistock Road, the west side from its junction with the Access Road existing McDonalds for a distance of 27 metres in a northerly direction

Schedule 1 - 20mph Zone

- Back Lane – from its junction with Barbican Road for a distance of 114 metres in a southerly direction

SCHEDULE OF REVOCATIONS**No Waiting At Any Time**

- (i) Admiralty Street (keyham), both sides, from the junction with Saltash Road for a distance of 60 metres in a southerly direction
- (ii) Fore Street, the south & west side, from a point 168 metres west of the junction with Longbrook Street for a distance of 37 metres in a westerly direction
- (iii) Holly Park Drive, the east & north side, from the junction with Milford Lane for a distance of 15 metres

- (iv) Holly Park Drive, the south & west side, from the junction with Milford Lane for a distance of 14 metres
- (v) Pentyre Terrace, the west side, from the junction with Sea View Terrace for a distance of 15 metres in a southerly direction
- (vi) Sea View Terrace, the south side, from a point 13 metres west of the junction with Pentyre Terrace for a distance of 6 metres in a westerly direction
- (vii) Sea View Terrace, the south side, from the junction with Pentyre Terrace for a distance of 7 metres
- (vii) Southway Lane, the east side, from a point 13 metres south of its junction with the Access Road to/from The George Hotel Car Park northwards and westwards for a distance of 57 metres.
- (ix) Southway Lane, the east side, from its junction with Southway Drive to a point 22 metres south of its junction with the Access Road to/from The George Hotel Car Park.
- (x) Smallack Drive, the north side, from its junction with Grosvenor Road for a distance of 12 metres in an easterly direction and 9 metres in a westerly direction

Permit Parking Mon-Sat 10am-5pm

- (i) Coleridge Avenue, the south-east side, from a point 14 metres south of the junction with Morshead Road for a distance of 37 metres in a south easterly direction

Permit Parking Mon-Fri 10am-11am

- (i) Pentyre Terrace, the west side, from a point 15 metres south of the junction with Sea View Terrace to a point 2 metres north of the junction with Salisbury Road Lane North

Permit Parking Mon-Sat 2pm-6pm

- (i) Admiralty Street, the west side, from a point 60 metres south of its junction with Saltash Road for a distance of 47 metres in a southerly direction

No Waiting Mon-Fri 9am-5pm

- (i) Fore Street, the south side, from a point 31 metres west of its junction with the extended western kerb line of Castle Lane for a distance of 102 metres in a westerly direction

30 MPH Maximum Speed Limit

- (i) Back Lane – from its junction with Barbican Road for a distance of 114 metres in a southerly direction

3. STATUTORY CONSULTATION

Proposals

The proposals for the TRO Review.7 were advertised on street, in the Herald and on the Plymouth City Council website on 24th June 2021. Details of the proposals were sent to the Councillors representing the affected wards and statutory consultees on 21st June 2021

There have been representations received relating to the Traffic Regulation Order proposals as below:

There have been 7 representations received relating to Beaumont Street & Bartholomew Road

Consultation	Comments
<p>Hi with regards to the above I have lived in Beaumont Street for almost 50 Years and the parking has always been a problem I realise that extending the yellow lines at the bottom of Beaumont street will help the traffic entering the street from Bartholomew Terrace but extending yellow lines in Bartholomew Terrace will only exasperate the parking problem in Beaumont street and the surrounding streets.</p> <p>Perhaps at the next re review it could be discussed the proposal to make Beaumont Street one way only as cars parked on both sides of the street means that no two cars can pass causing a delay and potential accident at either end of the street especially Bartholomew Terrace as it is a blind spot for drivers entering Beaumont Street.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>First comment:</p> <p>I see there is a proposal to extend the length of the yellow lines into Beaumont St into Bartholomew Terrace.</p> <p>Having lived in Beaumont St since 1972 we have always had a problem with finding parking spaces due to the number of businesses that use our road for parking. The Dental practice in Milehouse use the street for their staff parking as well as the Pharmacy and Garage in Wolseley Road with customers using it for pick ups and Mot's etc.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p> <p>With regards to your proposal to reduce the lines on Beaumont Street at the junction with Wolseley Road. Unfortunately, we cannot add new requests to this</p>

<p>I realise that it will help with the junction and being able to help with access to and from the street for drivers.</p> <p>I did ask a time ago if the yellow lines with regard to the access from Wolseley Rd to Beaumont St could be reduced as they were extended because of the then Post Office that was there. While you are proposing one could you not look at compensating the residents by reducing the length of the lines at the other end. We as a group asked for residents parking when David Owen was MP but were told it couldn't be done to the number of jobs that it could cost with local businesses if it was imposed</p> <p>Second comment:</p> <p>As a resident of nearly 50 Years and knowing the problems of parking in both Browning Rd and Beaumont St I wish to object to the proposal to putting yellow lines on both sides of Bartholomew Terrace as this will serve no other purpose than to speed up traffic using it</p> <p>At present having vehicles parking on one side slows traffic down as it makes drivers think a lot more making it a clearway will only make the situation worst. In the number of years I have been here any accidents have occurred when vehicles travelling down either Beaumont St or Browning Rd have crossed into to the path of vehicles going up or down Bartholomew Terrace failing to see the Give way signs or stop lines.</p> <p>As i said restrictions on the spaces available for parking are extremely limited taking out this area to park would exasperate the situation.</p> <p>As I said previously I am in favour of the extension of white lines at the junctions as this will help all road users both vehicular and on foot'</p> <p>I would also submit that the white lines into Beaumont from Wolseley Rd are reduced as The Post Office which is why they are so long is now a domestic property</p>	<p>order. However, I can confirm I will carry out a site visit and if it is safe to do so I will add the reduction of double yellow lines to our next TRO review.</p> <p>Second response:</p> <p>Thank you for your comments. I have added this to your file for consideration.</p> <p>Note:</p> <p>A site visit has been carried out at Beaumont Street, junction with Wolseley Road and we have added a proposal to reduce the DYLS here which we will present to the ward Cllrs and the Portfolio Holder in our next TRO review.</p>
---	--

<p>I am writing to object to the proposals to include double yellow lines to the length of 6 meters on Beaumont Street (in both directions).</p> <p>I agree it would be safer to have double yellow lines on Bartholomew Road for 6 meters, but do not believe it is necessary to go beyond the property boundary lines of the four houses on each of the corners (54, 53, 48 and ??).</p> <p>See the attached pdf map which reflects my comments.</p> <p>I also disagree with you extending the yellow lines on Beaumont Street outside number 48 and the other house on the corner (which I couldn't see the door number for).</p> <p>Parking is already a problem on Beaumont Street with many residents having to park two or three streets away. If you increase or add yellow lines on Beaumont Street, this will only make it even worse and there will be less places to park.</p> <p>There are difficulties with being able to see up and down Bartholomew Road at the give way sign but this is because of how cars and vans park on Bartholomew Road. The 6 meter yellow lines on Bartholomew Road would help resolve this.</p> <p>Rather than adding or extending yellow lines on Beaumont Street, the safer thing to do, would be to make Beaumont Street one way and Browning Road one way. This would help ease traffic flow, stop incidents of road rage, prevent accidents, damage to cars and reduce the risk for cyclists and pedestrians.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>I strongly object to the council's proposals to add double yellow lines to Beaumont Street and Bartholomew Road. Although this might prevent accidents, it will cause chaos for residents who live here to park, which is already a nightmare.</p> <p>Safer options would be to:</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • remove the 'Give way' sign at the junction of Beaumont Street and Bartholomew Road, and replace it with a 'STOP' sign • make Beaumont Street one-way • reduce the speed limit to 20mph on Beaumont Street and Bartholomew Road. <p>I've lived in Beaumont St almost 30 years and the traffic has progressively worsened. I believe adding yellow lines is not the answer and will potentially create more problems and road rage, which I have observed many times over the years.</p>	<p>whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>I would like to lodge my objection to the above planned traffic amendment order.</p> <p>I have lived for 55 years on and off in Beaumont Street and I have very rarely if ever seen any accidents caused by parking at the road junctions as we are allowed to do today.</p> <p>I know recently there may have been a slight incident but that was caused by an unroadworthy vehicle jacked up on bricks left by Oakdens garage awaiting spare parts which is hardly comparable to a proper parking issue.</p> <p>The officers involved in this plan may be unaware that the last few years has seen an explosive growth in the customer base of the Britannia Inn, once a simple pub now a very busy Wetherspoons with many customers parking in Beaumont Street.</p> <p>Also the two local garages Russell Ham and especially Oakdens have expanded hugely and regularly park their vehicles for days in our road awaiting spare parts making parking outside our homes impossible. Very often these vehicles have no MOT and no Road Tax, myself like many residents report them regularly on the DVLA website but we have very rarely seen any action taken as by the time the inspector visits the cars have gone.</p> <p>The questions I ask are-</p> <p>Where will the residents be expected to park? Most homes have no garage or a</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>The restrictions have been proposed for junction protection and residents will be able to park on street where restrictions are not in situ. Plymouth City Council do not currently have any other plans for any other engineering schemes for Beaumont Street.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>

<p>garage from the 1930s that is affectively too small for modern cars.</p> <p>Many residents have two vehicles a leisure car and a work van, where will they be parking their van which is their passport to paid employment?</p> <p>We have several elderly residents here including myself with disability who for various reasons are not eligible for a disabled parking bay and this will make life even harder for them as they will be parking an extremely long way away.</p> <p>I would suggest that road safety can be improved in a different more acceptable way to the residents by:</p> <p>1/ reduce speed limit in Beaumont Street, Browning Road and Bartholomew Road to 20 mph</p> <p>2/ make Beaumont Street a one way road, entering at the eastern end and leaving at the western end.</p> <p>3/introduce a mandatory residence parking scheme along one side of the road leaving the other side open to visitors and local businesses.</p> <p>4/ replaced existing giveaway signs with stop signs in both directions on Beaumont Street and possibly Browning Road</p> <p>The fact of the matter is by introducing these 6 m double yellow line extensions we will lose a very great number of parking spaces and we will be left with nowhere to park in an area where there have been little or no accidents for the last 55 years.</p> <p>I hope you consider my objection and suggestions.</p>	
<p>I am writing in response to the no waiting planning on Beaumont Street.</p> <p>The parking for residents who live on Beaumont street has become very hard due to non residents parking and leaving vehicles here. I feel this situation has become worse due to Oakdens Garage parking customers vehicles on the streets, the dentist customers and even people from city bus or local shops.</p> <p>I feel that permit parking would heavily improve the parking for people who actually live on this street. I find it very frustrating with two small children that</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p>

<p>often I have to park sometimes up to two streets away. I feel that putting yellow lines will not help the parking issue and only case more residents unable to park on the street they live in.</p> <p>I also feel that these streets should be one way for people's safety, you often get people racing up and down the streets using them as a rat run, it's dangerous with cars parked both sides of the road causing no passing points, which lead to reversing out on to the main road.</p>	<p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>I am writing this in reference to the proposed order for Beaumont St, MILEHOUSE PL2</p> <p>I understand why this order has been put forward but I would like to point out that this area is extremely bad for parking and placing double yellows as far as put forward means the residents lose more spaces making it even more difficult to park where we live. I have often found myself parking many streets away just so I can park and now with this proposed order it will become increasingly difficult. I should point out we have patients parking in the street from the dental practice as well as workers that work locally and now with reduced space the residents will increasingly find it difficult to park in the street that we live in.</p> <p>A resident mentioned making this road a one way system which makes alot of sense, we often get people reversing either end quite a way as there are no spaces to pull into. Due to the slight bend in the road at one end it can be very difficult to see a car coming until its to late. I hope something can be put forward that we are all happy with.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>

There have been 3 representations received relating to Browning Road & Sturdee Road

Consultation	Comments
<p>I fully support this order, not a moment too soon in my opinion.</p> <p>My concern is that this will force people to park in such a way as to obstruct access to Fullerton Road Lane South, the service</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a</p>

<p>lane between Browning Road and Fullerton Road.</p> <p>The emerge from the service lane onto Sturdee Road can be extremely hazardous at times already and this order will only exacerbate the problem. There have been occasions when I have not been able to emerge from Fullerton Road Lane South onto Sturdee Road due to vehicles overhanging the service lane and vehicles parked, legitimately, on the opposite side of Sturdee Road restricting my access.</p> <p>My question, will there be a parking restriction in place on the junction of Fullerton Road Lane South and Sturdee Road? If there is not such a restriction within this proposal can one be added please or my days, and the days of many other garage owners with garages on Fullerton Road Lane South, will certainly be starting and ending with conflict.</p>	<p>report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>As this Traffic Regulation Order has already been advertised Plymouth City Council cannot add any further restrictions, however if this proposal goes ahead the team will review this location and monitor the requirement for any further restrictions.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>Living on the junction of Browning Rd and Sturdee Rd as I do, I wish to assure you my arthritic left knee and I are both well aware of the constant issues with regard to parking in these and the surrounding streets. I also want to assure you I am well aware of the highway code with regard to minimum 6 metre distance from junctions.</p> <p>However, I wish to lodge a strong objection to the council's so-called resolution to the ongoing problems. I seriously doubt removing a further 48 metres of space on the junction outside my house from an already congested parking area.</p> <p>I have a garage and we use it and assure you we don't run 2 vehicles for the fun of it. I am aware some of my neighbours don't make use of existing garages and fully understand why. Electric vehicles being charged up in fire lanes blocking access points to garages and/or simply parked vehicles unable to find anywhere else to go.</p> <p>I have complained to our local councillor and have long been an advocate for residents only parking permits (even if that comes at a cost) and I'll happily share</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the Traffic Management Team do not deal with where residents parking schemes are implemented. I have copied the parking department into this email and should be able to confirm regarding this.</p>

<p>just one example as to why.... the tenant across the road owns no less than 3 different work transit vans and 2 private cars, but lives alone. (5 vehicles in total) I get there's nothing legally that can be done about that and have the joy of watching him juggling each vehicles position on the road each morning to ensure no one can use the space he needs to park them all and completes those manoeuvres in reverse every evening. He is well aware of his rights and our frustrations but simply doesn't care. To his credit he has got it all down to a fine art! There are 2 other families in my street I am aware of who also have 4 and 5 vehicles each respectively and never use their garages.</p> <p>Don't even get me started on the complete madness that descends during the football season when we're inundated with inconsiderate people who don't want to park at Argyle as it takes too long to get out of the car park after the match!</p> <p>Why can't we have residents only parking????</p> <p>The only people ultimately penalised will be those residents whose working life doesn't involve a 9-5 job like us nurses!!!!</p> <p>No doubt this will again fall on deaf ears.</p>	
<p>We are thrilled that the action being taken at the junction between Sturdee road and Browning road is going to happen, however I do feel that you are using a sledgehammer to crack a nut.</p> <p>The 6m double yellows will potentially take away 8 parking spaces from an already oversubscribed area, and I fear these cars will be forced to park in service lanes which are only just wide enough for 2 cars but it could lead to failed bin collections as bin lorries would not be able to complete the collections</p> <p>The 6m double yellow lines would actually allow drivers to increase their speed at the junction as they will have better visibility (which is the point of the exercise).</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>Six metres (vehicle length) is the minimum length that the Traffic Management team will consider for junction protection.</p>

<p>I believe that a 2m double yellow would not only preserve the number of parking spaces available, it would force people to park better, Pedestrians will be able to see all the way through the junction, but it also still means that cars will have to slow down to a near stop to ensure the way ahead is clear.</p> <p>I have lived here for over 4 years and I have only seen 1 accident at this junction in that time, thankfully it was between 2 very slow moving vehicles, there have been near misses I am sure but I think the action you are considering to take would do more harm than good.</p> <p>The 2m lines would also give enough room for larger vehicles to be able to negotiate the junction better.</p> <p>You are also considering the same yellow lines at the next junction up the hill, this would DOUBLE the loss of parking spaces and to be honest with you the area couldn't cope with having to find 16 extra parking spaces – there isn't anywhere to go.</p>	<p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
--	--

There has been 1 representation received relating to Dryden Avenue

Consultation	Comments
<p>Customer is in support of the double yellow lines:</p> <p>I know the signs have been put up regarding the lines, but we have had nothing but issues last couple of days, due to next door doing what he does every day!! Parking across from another car who was there first, blocking the road and won't move! No matter who knocks on his door, yet he knows who owns the other car and won't say a word to them! People have phoned the police and one man was told to send the phone to you and to them. Surely someone has the power to tell him to use his drive and stop blocking the road on purpose?? We can't come down the street and reverse on the drive as two cars there and even when we can with just him we</p>	<p>Thank-you for the e-mail and photograph.</p> <p>I will keep this on file.</p> <p>Unfortunately Plymouth City Council do not have the powers to make residents park on their drive and if the resident is causing an obstruction of the road then it would be a Police matter.</p> <p>We have proposed the Double Yellow lines and because a Traffic Regulation Order requires a statutory process it can take time before the restrictions can be implemented.</p>

<p>curb our wheels mounting the curb. If we drive on we have to reverse out on to cars coming around the bend. A serious accident will happen soon. Anyway here's the photo I've been asked to send by the man who contacted the police.</p>	
--	--

There have been 2 representations received relating to Haye Road

Consultation	Comments
<p>In our experience having lived here for almost 20 years, generally the only major obstructions occur when there is extensive parking on days when competitions happen at Elburton Villa Football Club grounds. That said, recent management through the use of traffic cones during competitions has eased the parking along Haye Road.</p> <p>We seek reassurance and clarity of the proposals in the following areas please:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How would tradespeople, carers etc (i.e. necessary visitors) continue to visit our properties (those that need to park up outside residences to do business for longer than a quick delivery service and can't park on drives due to limited space available)? Would they have an exemption to enable them to still park? We are concerned that clearing the route of any parking by putting in double yellow lines would give a clearer run for cars and exacerbate speeding, that we now more often witness along this stretch of Haye Road. Are there any plans to put in speed checks (such as speed cameras), perhaps? Please could this be passed to the relevant person: we have experienced a marked increase in heavy goods traffic on Haye Road since the Sherford High Street link from Langage A38 junction has been opened. This is considered an added danger – is there a plan 	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>In regards to where trades people will park there can be exemptions for works if the company applies to Plymouth City Council. Deliveries can still continue as people can still load and unload the proposed double yellow lines. There is not an exemption for visitors, however with the large amount of off street parking carers should be able to park off road.</p> <p>Haye Road has a 30mp speed limit and we do not have a record of speeding on this road, this can be monitored if/when the proposals go ahead.</p> <p>Haye Road is a known route for heavy goods vehicles and there are no plans to restrict this.</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>

to limit vehicles over a certain size using this new route?	
<p>Having spoken with Cllr Pengelly we would both object to the proposed double lining of Haye Road in Elburton, your schedule 1:1 items lxx / lxxiv / lxxviii refers. We believe that further consultation with residents and other interested parties are necessary before this is allowed as currently proposed.</p> <p>Cllr David Salmon & Cllr Vivien Pengelly.</p>	<p>Thank you for your email. I will save your objection in the file. I can confirm I put out the street notices yesterday and whilst on site I put a notice and a plan in the resident's doors on Haye Road.</p>

A site visit was carried out with Councillor Salmon on 27/07/2021 and was discussed to reduce the lines rather than remove them all completely.

There have been 4 representations received relating to Hirmandale Road

Consultation	Comments
<p>As a business owner and a resident of Hirmandale Road I object to having double yellow lines in the street. We have parking issues currently, this will only be made worse by taking up at least two spaces with the parking restrictions being put into place. Only one home owner will benefit from this being done, the other 32 home owners will struggle even more.</p> <p>This is really unfair.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>I would like to strongly object to having double yellow line painted on Hirmandale road a distance of 18.5 metres to house numbers 2-4.</p> <p>This would impact on vehicles already parked in this area moving down the street to park and therefore making more of a congestion for the local community parking.</p> <p>This road is already busy enough with post office workers shop workers and other people parking for the whole day whilst at work. K and J carpets have their business right on the junction where they park their vans on the junction making it dangerous enough for anyone who wants to pull out onto the main road difficult and also putting pedestrians lives at risk of</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>

<p>being run over. And that is on double yellow lines.</p> <p>No one takes any notice of the 20 zone and parking on the kerb is common place.</p>	
<p>I am a resident at Hirmandale Rd and I object to the yellow lines on the road of Hirmandale down from my property due to lack of parking in the street already as most people own more than 2 cars per house hold and rely on street parking</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>I object to having more upheaval in Hirmandale Road. As a resident it is already difficult to park. However there is no trouble parking between the neighbours, we all budge up to allow for others to park. If double yellow lines are introduced then it will mean that some of the residence in Hirmandale Road will not be able to park so easily.</p> <p>It will also hinder a few local businesses, that in the current climate it is already difficult enough for people.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>

There have been 2 representations received relating to Holly Park Drive

Consultation	Comments
<p>First Comment:</p> <p>I just wanted to offer some comments on this proposed TPO, looking particularly at Holly Park Drive, Plymouth.</p> <p>It would appear to be proposed that the double yellow lines on Holly Park Drive are extended from their current placement to beyond the junction with Lake View Drive, to facilitate easier</p>	<p>First Comment:</p> <p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on</p>

<p>turning for the local buses. Please correct me if I have interpreted this wrong.</p> <p>While I support this, I do have to raise what I think may be an issue for residents further down Holly Park Drive. The introduction of longer double yellow lines is going to push more parked vehicles down the road to an area which is already over-capacity for parking. I live on Holly Park Drive, and can easily tell you what a nightmare parking can be sometimes. I fear that the displaced parked vehicles at the top of Holly Park Drive will need somewhere to go, and they will come down the road towards the junction with Holly Park Close, making it difficult for those without driveways to park. Many properties on Holly Park Drive towards the top (1, 3, 5, 7...) have driveways.</p> <p>What about introducing a permit parking zone? I don't know what constitutes having that installed, but it may reduce parking congestion?</p> <p>Second Comment:</p> <p>Sorry, an additional thought, another option instead of permits, what about installing allocated parking spaces along the length of the road for those without garages directly beside their property?</p>	<p>whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>The criteria for a Controlled Parking Zone in Plymouth considers the needs of all road users, residents, businesses and visitors to Plymouth. The following policy criteria must be met for a Controlled Parking Zone to be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not less than 85% if the kerb space regularly occupied between 8am to 6pm on 5 or more days of the week; • Not more than 50% of the car owning residents have, or could have parking within the curtilage of their own property or within 200 metres walking distance by the way of garages or other private off-street space such as a driveway; • The peak or normal working day demand for residents spaces should be up to a maximum of 125% of the zones parking capacity. <p>Holly Park Drive residents predominately have off street parking and therefore would not meet the criteria of a controlled parking zone. Due to the location of Holly Park Drive the impact of commuter parking would be minimal, when consideration is given to implementing schemes, they are done so to assist residents by preventing commuters and other long term parking in the area during the operational hours.</p> <p>As part of the Conservative Manifesto Pledge, pledge 72 , their aim is to encourage the use of driveways and garages to improve road safety and traffic flow and greater use of private garages and driveways for the parking of vehicles to leave roads clearer.</p> <p>Second comment:</p> <p>Individual Parking Bays are usually suitable where a charge is made for use of the bay or it is configured for specific vehicles e.g. Pay & Display, Disabled Parking or loading. This approach is particularly useful where vehicles take up more than one bay and will then have to purchase more than one ticket encouraging a quicker turnover of the spaces.</p>
--	---

	<p>In limited waiting and residents parking areas the use of individual marked bays will usually reduce the number of spaces available as they have to be long enough to accommodate larger cars and vans when many of the vehicles using the spaces will be much shorter in length. Whilst it is accepted that bays without individual marking may sometimes also lead to sterile areas, in general the utilisation of available parking space is much more efficient where drivers have more flexibility.</p>
<p>With reference to the plan to extend the double yellow lines in Holly Park Drive and Lakeview Drive , no waiting for 24hrs 7 days a week to allow buses to exit the Lakeview Drive junction safely, I would point out that there are no buses running on Sat and Sunday so don't see why this could not be a Mon - Fri order.</p> <p>In addition recent congestion seems to be due to a local resident on the junction of Lakeview Drive and Holly Park Drive having a lot of building works done and associated vehicles parking there.</p> <p>There have been no accidents at this junction as far as I am aware neither have I seen the police or anyone else there to sort out any problems.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>

There has been 1 representation received relating to Lord Morley Way

Consultation	Comments
<p>I noticed that you intend to make Springfield Close a 'no waiting at any time' road.</p> <p>There are very few cars that park outside their properties, and when they do it causes no inconvenience to other residents or cars travelling along Springfield Close.</p> <p>Keeping the road clear of all cars will lead to it being used, more than it is now, as a thoroughfare/race track to avoid the one-way direction on Reservoir Road.</p> <p>I object to any changes in Springfield Close. I see no valid reason for any changes that would inconvenience the residents and visitors to our properties.</p> <p>I fail to see why these changes are being implemented and as such ask, under the</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>Please see the proposed plan attached, the proposal is to add double yellow lines for junction protection only.</p> <p>We have received photographs and complaints from residents that show inappropriate parking on the junction which is a safety issue for visibility and can also cause damage to the footway</p>

Freedom of Information Act, to be sent copies of all documentation you hold related to this matter.	You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.
---	---

There have been 2 representations received relating to Mulgrave Street

Consultation	Comments
Comments have been invited regarding the above. I am in favour of the proposals regarding Mulgrave Street and hope that the restrictions will extend to include that part of the lane which runs parallel to Lockyer St. (accessed adjacent to No.1 Alfred St. and only one vehicle width wide) which is currently obstructed on a daily basis by vehicles parking there making it difficult to access the dwellings there and which does not seem to come under the jurisdiction of the parking wardens. Thank you for your consideration.	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
Customer sent in letter. Customer is in support of the proposals. Vehicles are blocking this lane and it is blocking access, especially for emergency services.	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>

There have been 2 representations received relating to South Down Road

Consultation	Comments
Having read the order carefully, I understand that the council intends to add double yellow line on both sides of	Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256

South Down Road, extending 10 metres from the junction with West Down Road. I believe that the purpose of this is to enable the once-an-hour number 31 bus to turn into South Down Road from West Down Road. In addition, it is intended for a “no waiting at any time” order to be imposed – although it is not clear from the document whether this refers to the double yellow lines only or the entire length of the road.

I agree that this would help the bus to turn into the road however I have several points to make:

a) Parking is already extremely difficult in South Down Road – due in part to some neighbours owning two or more vehicles (one has a large van plus two cars). This situation has been further exacerbated by the Council’s decision to allow No. 1 to be subdivided into two properties. (The new 1a property has additional vehicles.) Cars are not parked at the end of the road to inconvenience bus drivers; they are parked there due to lack other parking space near to their property;

b) As the route of the bus is a one-way circular route, always turning from West Down Road into South Down Road, and never vice versa, the only double yellow lines that would aid this turn are the ones on the north side of South Down Road (outside number 1);

c) The refuse collection lorries always travel in the opposite direction to the bus, and it is difficult for either vehicle to reverse for a long enough distance to find a temporary space to pull over as – as previously stated – the parking is congested along the stretch nearest to West Down Road;

d) Given the parking problems – only exacerbated by the intended removal of parking space on both sides of the end of the road – it is unclear how deliveries and removals are to be

Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.

I can confirm the current proposal is to place 10m of Double Yellow Lines on South Down Road, from its junction with West Down Road. Vehicles are permitted to load and unload on double yellow lines.

You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.

accomplished. I assume that post office vans will no longer be allowed to stop at the end of the road where it is intended that double yellow lines be placed. It appears that the council believes that there is excess parking space on the road, where delivery drivers, skips, building delivery supply vehicles and removal vans can be placed with ease; I wish that this were true but it is not;

e) I have previously had to reverse a distance to allow the bus to pass me as I returned to my property (as I was driving east to west and the bus was moving west to east). This same issue has arisen several times when vans are moving in the opposite direction to cars. If, like Lyndhurst Road, we only had a pavement on one side, this would not be a problem, but removing a pavement on one side is not a realistic solution;

f) The bus does not travel down South Down Road before 9am, nor does it travel after 5.30pm Monday to Friday, and this bus service does not exist at weekends.

While I use buses from time to time, along with my 91-year old mother (the 35a on Beacon Park Road or any bus at the Wolseley Rd/ Segrave Rd junction)), I have long been incredulous that Target Travel, followed by Stagecoach, received permission to allow the number 31 to travel along South Down Road (not to mention a couple of the roads near Ford Park Cemetery),

The best outcome as far as I am concerned would be for the bus to change its route to one where IT is not blocking traffic, and for a one-way system to be imposed on South Down Road (travelling from the junction with West Down Road east towards North Down Road). If a contract with the bus company means that this is not possible in the immediate future, I would ask that the “no waiting” – which is clearly aimed at aiding the bus driver – be limited to

times when the bus route is in operation i.e. between 9am and 5.30pm Monday to Friday.

I would like the council to clarify its “no waiting” expectations in regard to post office vans, delivery vans, lorries with building materials and removal vans, given the problems that I have already explained with local parking. If neighbours’ cars are parked outside one’s own, and nearby properties, are building supplies REALLY supposed to be dropped off half-way down the road? Are ambulances supposed to park around the corner in West Down Road? Our house went on fire in 1976; while the top floor was gutted, the house was saved thanks to prompt action by neighbours summoning the fire brigade. Naturally a fire truck HAS to stop outside the property on fire, even if it inconveniences a bus! While fires are – thankfully – rare events, so are removal vans and large vehicles which deliver building supplies. Even vans delivering white goods, televisions or furniture do not appear on a frequent basis.

If the consultation is merely a rubber-stamp exercise, I will await a letter from the council, justifying its implementation – especially at times when the bus service does not run. If the purpose of the consultation is genuinely to invite comments, pointing out problems that have possibly not been foreseen, I believe that the original plans will need to be amended, if not scrapped.

Please do not think that if you have few written comments from my neighbours that it means that we do not care; some people may not have fully understood the implications of these proposals, while others understand and either a) believe that they do not have a voice or b) do not want the burden of having to contact the council. I have always believed that it is one’s civic duty to evaluate and respond to changes in one’s local area – whether positive or negative – and I would like the council to consider my comments in this light.

<p>First comment:</p> <p>I read a notice posted in South Down Road, close to my house, regarding stopping parking at particular parts of the road. I understand that one of the places to get double yellow lines is at the junction of North Down and South Down Roads, because of parked vehicles obstructing the passage of the buses that go through South Down Road. I can fully understand that, as I have often observed the bus drivers having problems turning into South Down Road.</p> <p>I contact you to ask if the yellow lines will extend around the corner into North Down Road for a short distance? Regularly, large vehicles such as vans are parked in North Down Road, either side of the end of South Down Road, right up to the junction, completely blocking vision either way when trying to exit South Down Road. A serious accident is inevitable, as even though North Down Road has a 20 mph limit and speed bumps, cars still speed along it.</p> <p>Second comment:</p> <p>I sent an email yesterday regarding the above notification. I realised this morning that I had unfortunately made a mistake with the road naming. My concern is about the junction between South Down Road and West Down Road, not with South Down and North Down Roads as I mistakenly said.</p> <p>Third comment:</p> <p>Thanks for your response. There may not have been any accidents in the location, but parking is really noticeably increasing in the area each year due to increasing affluence, with many houses with multiple vehicles, including a lot of vans. This is pressurising parking right up to road junctions causing potentially dangerous situations, as well as the problems you are</p>	<p>First comment:</p> <p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>There are currently no plans to add double yellow lines on North Down Road but this will be reviewed in the next Traffic Regulation Order quarterly review.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p> <p>Second comment:</p> <p>I have reviewed this location and there have not been any collisions for at least five years in this location.</p> <p>However this location will continue to be monitored and reviewed.</p>
--	---

dealing with for the buses entering South Down Road.	
I certainly appreciate that you will continue monitoring the location.	

During consultation, Councillor Mahony asked if we could reduce the lines from 10m to 6m on South Down Road. However, after investigating, this wouldn't be possible, the complaint regarding parked vehicles near the junctions came in from the bus companies, and 6m of DYLS wouldn't be enough for a bus to get around the corner, and therefore we would recommend proceeding with the 10m as originally advertised.

There has been 8 representations received relating to Stirling Road

Consultation	Comments
<p>Regarding the intention to designate parts of Stirling Road No Waiting At Any Time:</p> <p>This is very welcome move as it will make the junctions with Westcroft Road and Seacroft Road much safer and allow residents to exit their driveways with a full view of the road.</p> <p>I would add though, that this arrangement will need to be monitored as drivers still ignore the double yellow lines on the opposite side of the Westcroft Road junction. They seem to think its OK as long as they sit in their vehicles, though some do just abandon their cars and go about their business. Drivers have historically been parking where they like with no thought for other road users, so it may take a while to re-educate them.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>7 of the representations were the same:</p> <p>I read recently that a proposal has been put forward to add double yellow lines along part of Stirling Road for the purpose of allowing vehicle visibility and to prevent parking on both sides of the road which, according to your proposal, is causing an obstruction. This is my objection to this proposal.</p> <p>There is no problem with vehicle visibility, even with vehicles parked along both sides of the road. It is a straight road, if you are driving along it you should be looking straight ahead and would see any vehicles approaching you. As for the issue of obstruction, I can only think that your intent is to widen the road to allow the</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>

ever increasing buses to load and offload passengers from the surgery – I will hasten to add that for the amount of buses that run very few people actually use them. The worst offenders for misuse of the road are taxis. Will putting double yellow lines in prevent them from stopping and causing an obstruction? Of course if wont, they will simply stop in the middle of the road, regardless of who is in front of behind them, as they have always done!

By adding double yellow lines you will force the residents who live in these three houses to find alternative parking for their second vehicles. This would be adjacent to the surgery which is fine in an ideal world but unfortunately in this road this is definitely not the case. Residents from Woodstock Gardens already use this stretch of road as their overflow parking as their vehicles cannot be accommodated along their own stretch of road. The knock on effect will be vehicles being pushed further along the road, adding to the chaos. Over the last two years we have seen a huge increase in traffic and parking problems along Stirling Road. This is mainly due to the extension of services that are now being offered at Stirling Road surgery and the closure of other surgeries within the area. Overnight we have experienced at least double the amount of traffic because of this. Parking by patients and staff is quite often inconsiderate and to be quite honest, downright dangerous. I can assure you that your proposals would just add to this nightmare. There have never been any consultation or warning of these changes, the chaos was suddenly just thrown onto the street overnight without any regard for local residents of safety. Just to make matters worse, I have now discovered that there is planning applications for the old state cinema to be turned into a block of flats. I cannot even bear to think of the long term turmoil and chaos that this new venture is going to present, especially with it being on a main through fare for all traffic travelling through St Budeaux. I will also add that

<p>this has never been advertised on the surrounding fencing and has come as a complete shock to many residents that it has been approved. Has any consideration at all been put into parking and impact that it will have on an already overloaded street? According to your plans and proposals, you have consulted with a great many groups and agencies and yet you have failed to consult with the most important group of people...the residents of Stirling Road! This doesn't just mean where the double lines are to be placed, I am talking about the residents further along the road who you seem to have forgotten about. They are the ones who will feel the full impact of this action. You talk of vehicles causing obstruction when parking on both sides of the road and yet you are more than happy to allow it further along the road where it is no less wider and has four times the amount of houses! Your logic almost seems comical but sadly I cannot find myself laughing. The only thing that I feel from it all is complete exasperation. The reality is your will not be solving anything. You will merely be aggravating a growing issue and will be forcing the problem further down the road. This situation has been completely mismanaged in every way possible, the lack of consultation has been beyond astounding. Come and live on the street for a week and by the end of it I'm sure that you will feel the same way.</p>	
--	--

There have been 14 representations received relating to Trelawny Road

Consultation	Comments
<p>I am writing to show my objections to the above proposal for Trelawny Road Plympton.</p> <p>I believe the proposed no waiting area is not required and a measure which is totally disproportionate to the quiet residential street.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p>

<p>To my knowledge, there has been no reported incidents to warrant these measures and so I would request that the planned measures are cancelled.</p>	<p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>Please note that my husband & I strongly object to the proposed yellow lines on Trelawny Road, Plympton TRO2021.2137256</p> <p>We feel the measures being considered are way over the top - & were shocked to learn that this was in response to one of our neighbours over reaction to personal parking disagreement.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>I wish to object the proposal of double yellow lines on the corner of Trelawney road as they would ruin the look of the quiet street and would cause disruptions on the street and become a massive hassle in regards to parking</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>Ward Councillor consultation:</p> <p>For completeness and in accordance with the statutory consultation process, Plympton St Mary Ward Councillors object to the proposal for double yellow lines in Trelawny Road, Plympton.</p> <p>In discussion with residents, our objection is that the matter was originally raised by one resident who was affected by the inconsiderate parking of one vehicle opposite the property and the City Council's proposal is a disproportionate and excessive response to an individual concern which if implemented would affect many residents and cause greater parking congestion in other parts of the road.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations.</p> <p>We will be in contact with you at the end of the consultation to discuss abandoning the scheme.</p>

<p>We look forward to the abandoning of this proposal.</p>	
<p>A notice of proposed no waiting lines (double yellow lines) to be placed on the corners of Trelawny Road. I strongly object to this proposal and feel it would cause more of a problem in future regarding parking and traffic along the road. The initial problem came from a neighbour who was struggling to reverse on and off of her drive due to a van parking opposite. This is no longer an issue. Other neighbours do not have this problem. Also, it is a very quiet road with only more cars appearing during school drop off and collection times. Still, not an issue as this is only for a short time each day.</p> <p>I feel that if the lines were to be put in place, the parking issue would be moved along the road causing more issues with other neighbours. I live on the corner and feel that whilst my stepson parks outside our house, the cars need to slow down to take the corner and the same for the bottom corner where people also park outside their homes.</p> <p>Please do not ruin this road with unsightly yellow lines. I have lived here for 3 years with very little if not any issue with speeding cars or parking.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>Please could I voice my objection to the above proposed line markings to Trelawny Road.</p> <p>I appreciate we have an issue with parking but this has been sorted, and all that will happen with this proposal is that the traffic will be shifted further on down the street.</p> <p>The issue was with a particular resident's daughter blocking the way which has been dealt with now.</p> <p>I feel that this street does not require the additional lines and the cost of implementing them would be wasted. The whole of Plymouth has parking issues and these lines will not solve this, they will simply move the issue and reduce the amount of on street parking we have.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>

<p>I am writing to voice my objections to the above proposal for Trelawny Road Plympton.</p> <p>I believe the proposed no waiting area is unnecessary and would disrupt the parking in the street.</p> <p>To my knowledge, there has been no reported incidents to warrant these measures and so I would request that the planned measures are cancelled.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>Do not go ahead with the double yellow lines on our street. There's absolutely no need for them. It's bad enough to park as it is most of the time and especially with school drop offs.</p> <p>And it'll be an eye sore!</p> <p>Reconsider it I ask. From myself and everyone else on the street</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>Can I register our objection to the proposal of double yellow lines in the street of Trelawny Road Plympton.</p> <p>We were assured this was not proceeding but looks as though it is. It is a total waste of time as will be too expensive to enforce and will not be observed by people, unsightly as well to our outlook on the pretty street from our home.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>Please accept this as my objection to the traffic management proposal as above. This proposal is non-sensical and a waste of budgets. Trelawny Road is, in the most part, a very quiet residential street. In 7 years we have never had an issue with parking on-street, there have been no traffic incidents. Children are able to play out safely. I cannot see any benefit to introducing double yellow lines that won't be enforced, as I said this would be entirely wasteful of resources.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p>

	<p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>Following the posting of a “Notice of Proposed Order” leading to parking restrictions on Trelawny Road, Plympton, I wish to strongly object to these measures, which are well over the top for a quiet suburban street in Plympton.</p> <p>Please accept this as my full and unreserved objection to your proposal.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>I would, as a resident of Trelawny Road, like to offer my comments of objection to the proposed, “No Waiting At Any Time lengths,” on Trelawny Road (PL7) as they are unnecessary, now that particular residents, who used to cause an issue by parking literally on the corners, no longer reside in the road.</p> <p>The road markings proposed would result in an unsightly eyesore, directly outside my property and, given the proposed lengths of these road markings, would simply cause an issue, along the rest of Trelawny Road, by mandating that residents, who may currently park “near” these corners, are forced to move further along the road to park, resulting in severe congestion along the remainder of Trelawny Road.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>A notice of proposed no waiting lines to be placed top and bottom of trelawny at the corners</p> <p>I strongly object to this proposal</p> <p>I first contacted Natalie Harrison as a blue car kept parking opposite my drive making it impossible to reverse into my driveway, it was discussed that a meeting to be held with the school to discuss less disruption to house owners from 6th form & parents to be considerate at all times.</p> <p>Since the lady who used to block my drive has sold, we no longer have had an issue in about 7 weeks.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>

<p>I have never asked for double lines. we were told fines etc would never be enforced.</p> <p>The Rd is only busy with school pickups for around 30 minutes aday so this proposal is completely over the top and a waste of taxpayer money approximately £3,000</p> <p>We discussed more larger boulders on the grass verges and even a large planter on the corner as cars go onto the pavement, ref concerns for children's safety</p> <p>Please do not ruin Our beautiful road with unsightly lines.</p>	
<p>I would, as a resident of Trelawny Road, like to offer my comments of objection to the proposed, "No Waiting At Any Time lengths," on Trelawny Road (PL7) as they are unnecessary, now that particular residents, who used to cause an issue by parking literally on the corners, no longer reside in the road.</p> <p>The road markings proposed would result in an unsightly eyesore, directly outside my property and, given the proposed lengths of these road markings, would simply cause an issue, along the rest of Trelawny Road, by mandating that residents, who may currently park "near" these corners, are forced to move further along the road to park, resulting in severe congestion along the remainder of Trelawny Road.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137256</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>

There have been no representations received relating to the other proposals included in the Traffic Regulation Order.

4. RECOMMENDATION

After reviewing all comments received our recommendations are below:

It is recommended that the proposals are abandoned relating to Trelawny Road & Hirmandale Road

It is recommended that the proposals on Holly Park Drive are reduced to remove the proposal on the south side. The new proposals are now:

Holly Park Drive, the north side from its junction with Milford Lane to its junction with Lakeview Drive

Lakeview Drive, the east side from its junction with Holly Park Drive for a distance of

17 metres in a northerly direction

Lakeview Drive, the west side from its junction with Holly Park Drive for a distance of

12 metres in a northerly direction

It is recommended that the proposals on Haye Road are reduced to: Haye Road, east side from a point 38 metres south of its junction with King George V Playing Fields to its junction with Elburton Road. The rest is recommended to be abandoned following a meeting with Councillor Salmon.

It is recommended that the proposals on Stirling Road are reduced to cover just the junctions with Westcroft Rd and Seacroft Rd to continue to allow residents to park across their drives in response to 7 letters of objection received from residents of another part of Stirling Rd concerned about parking displacement.

The new proposals are now:

Stirling Road – north side, from its junction with Westcroft Road for a distance of 14 metres in a westerly direction

Stirling Road – north side, from its junction with Seacroft Road for a distance of 8 metres in an easterly direction

All other proposals are recommended to be implemented as advertised.

5. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

The lawful implications and consequences of the proposal have been considered and taken into account in the preparation of this report.

When considering whether to make a traffic order it is the Council's responsibility to ensure that all relevant legislation is complied with. This includes Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) that sets out that it is the duty of a local authority, so far as practicable subject to certain matters, to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. It is considered that the proposals comply with Section 122 of the Act as they practically secure the safe and expeditious movement of traffic in and around Plymouth and provide for suitable and adequate associated parking facilities.

This page is intentionally left blank

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT
TRO Review.7



STAGE 1: WHAT IS BEING ASSESSED AND BY WHOM?

What is being assessed - including a brief description of aims and objectives?	
	<p>THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH (TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS) (AMENDMENT ORDER NO. 2021.2137256 TRO REVIEW.7) ORDER & THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH (MOVING & SPEED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS) (AMENDMENT ORDER NO. 2021.2137256 TRO REVIEW.7) ORDER</p> <p>To implement the following amendments to The City of Plymouth (Traffic Regulation and Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2004.</p> <p>The effect of the order shall be to add/amend:</p> <p>No Waiting At Any Time on lengths of the following roads:</p> <p>Admiralty Street, Barn Park Road, Bartholomew Road, Beaumont Street, Browning Road, Sturdee Road, Carradale Road, Clowance Street, Coleridge Avenue, Copse Road, Dryden Avenue, Fore Street, Haye Road, Hill Close, Hirmandale Road, Holly Park Drive, Lakeview Drive, Lord Morley Way, Macaulay Crescent, Mulgrave Street, Pentyre Terrace, Sea View Terrace, Smallack Drive, South Down Road, Southway Lane, Springfield Close, Stirling Road, Tavistock Road, Trelawny Road.</p> <p>Permit Parking Mon-Sat 10am-5pm on the following road:</p> <p>Coleridge Avenue.</p> <p>Permit Parking Mon-Fri 10am-11am on the following road:</p> <p>Pentyre Terrace.</p> <p>Permit Parking Mon-Sat 2pm-6pm on the following road:</p> <p>Admiralty Street.</p> <p>No Loading/Unloading At Any Time on the following road:</p> <p>Tavistock Road.</p> <p>20mph Zone on the following road:</p> <p>Back Lane.</p>

	<p>It is recommended that the proposals are abandoned relating to Trelawny Road & Hirmandale Road</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposals on Holly Park Drive are reduced to remove the proposal on the south</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposals on Haye Road are reduced to: Haye Road, east side from a point 38 metres south of its junction with King George V Playing Fields to its junction with Elburton Road. The rest is recommended to be abandoned following a meeting with Councillor Salmon.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposals on Stirling Road are reduced to cover just the junctions with Westcroft Rd and Seacroft Rd to continue to allow residents to park across their drives in response to 7 letters of objection received from residents of another part of Stirling Rd concerned about parking displacement.</p> <p>All other proposals are recommended to be implemented as advertised.</p>
Author	Amy Neale
Department and service	Plymouth Highways, Traffic Management Technician
Date of assessment	20/07/2021

STAGE 2: EVIDENCE AND IMPACT

Protected characteristics (Equality Act)	Evidence and information (eg data and feedback)	Any adverse impact <small>See guidance on how to make judgement</small>	Actions	Timescale and who is responsible
Age	No issues raised in consultation	No adverse impact anticipated		

		The introduction of No Waiting at Any Time will designate where is safe and acceptable to park. Ensuring visibility for drivers and pedestrians of all ages when using the road.		
Disability	No Waiting at any time	Some of the proposals will add no waiting at any time on junctions and to stop obstructions on footways, this will ensure safer places to cross and easier travel along streets.		
Faith/religion or belief	No issues raised in consultation	No adverse impact anticipated		
Gender - including marriage, pregnancy and maternity	No issues raised in consultation	No adverse impact anticipated		
Gender reassignment	No issues raised in consultation	No adverse impact anticipated		
Race	No issues raised in consultation	No adverse impact anticipated		
Sexual orientation - including civil partnership	No issues raised in consultation	No adverse impact anticipated		

STAGE 3: ARE THERE ANY IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FOLLOWING? IF SO, PLEASE RECORD ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN

Local priorities	Implications	Timescale and who is responsible
Reduce the gap in average hourly pay between men and women by 2020.	No adverse impact has been identified.	

Increase the number of hate crime incidents reported and maintain good satisfaction rates in dealing with racist, disablist, homophobic, transphobic and faith, religion and belief incidents by 2020.	No adverse impact has been identified.	
Good relations between different communities (community cohesion)	No adverse impact has been identified.	
Human rights <small>Please refer to guidance</small>	No adverse impact has been identified.	

STAGE 4: PUBLICATION

Responsible Officer: M. Artherton



Date 12/8/21

Group Manager (Parking, Marine and Garage Services)

EXECUTIVE DECISION

made by a Cabinet Member




REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY BY AN INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER

Executive Decision Reference Number – T13 21/22

Decision	
1	Title of decision: To authorise Cornwall Council to carry out the procurement exercise for the Light Recovery of Vehicles, on the Tamar Bridge.
2	Decision maker (Cabinet member name and portfolio title): Councillor Jonathan Dreaan (Cabinet Member for Transport)
3	Report author and contact details: Philip Robinson (Service Director for Street Services)
4	<p>Decision to be taken:</p> <p>To authorise Cornwall Council to carry out the procurement exercise for the Light Recovery of Vehicles, on the Tamar Bridge, to its maximum possible term of 6 years on behalf of the joint authorities. Estimated total contract value is anticipated to be in the region of £1.2 to £1.3 M.</p> <p>To delegate 'Contract Award' to the Service Director for Street Services, for the procured service.</p>
5	<p>Reasons for decision:</p> <p>The operation of the TBTF is a 'joint undertaking' between Plymouth City Council and Cornwall Council under Statute. Governance is by means of a Joint Committee, consisting of appointed Councillors from both Councils, responsible for the Policy and decision making regarding the operation and service delivery of the TBTF.</p> <p>This report seeks to approve the procurement of Light Recovery Vehicles and delegate contract award to Service Director for Street Services. The estimated total contract value anticipated to be in the region of £1.2 to £1.3 M and the contract is intended to be in place for a period of 6 years.</p> <p>Light Recovery Vehicles are required to ensure the safe and continued operation of the Tamar Bridge.</p>
6	<p>Alternative options considered and rejected:</p> <p>Not proceed with procurement and contract award – Rejected on the basis that Light Recovery Vehicles are required to ensure the safe and continued operation of the Tamar Bridge.</p>
7	<p>Financial implications and risks:</p> <p>TBTF is funded on a 'user pays' basis, where the tolls are used for both operational and maintenance requirements. There are limited impacts on the Council MTFP regarding funding,</p>

	other than financing Member and Officer involvement.			
8	Is the decision a Key Decision? (please contact Democratic Support for further advice)	Yes	No	Per the Constitution, a key decision is one which:
			X	in the case of capital projects and contract awards, results in a new commitment to spend and/or save in excess of £3million in total
			X	in the case of revenue projects when the decision involves entering into new commitments and/or making new savings in excess of £1million
			X	is significant in terms of its effect on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards in the area of the local authority.
	If yes, date of publication of the notice in the Forward Plan of Key Decisions	N/A		
9	Please specify how this decision is linked to the Council's corporate plan/Plymouth Plan and/or the policy framework and/or the revenue/capital budget:	As a regional centre, Plymouth plays a major role economically, culturally and industrially, providing a focus for the innovation, technology and for the quality of life that it offer. The Tamar Bridge crossing is a vital strategic and local link that plays a key role in the City's ambitions to become a world class City.		
10	Please specify any direct environmental implications of the decision (carbon impact)	Swift removal of vehicles will result in less carbon emissions.		
Urgent decisions				
11	Is the decision urgent and to be implemented immediately in the interests of the Council or the public?	Yes	X	(If yes, please contact Democratic Support (democraticsupport@plymouth.gov.uk) for advice)
		No		(If no, go to section 13a)
12a	Reason for urgency: Light Recovery Vehicles are required to ensure the safe and continued operation of the Tamar Bridge.			
12b	Scrutiny Chair Signature:	Councillor Terri Beer (Lord Mayor) by email	Date	25/08/21

	Scrutiny Committee name:	Brexit, Infrastructure and Legislative Change Overview and Scrutiny Committee (The Lord Mayor signed in the absence of the Scrutiny Chair as per the constitution)		
	Print Name:	Councillor Terri Beer (The Lord Mayor)		
Consultation				
I3a	Are any other Cabinet members' portfolios affected by the decision?	Yes		
		No	X	(If no go to section I4)
I3b	Which other Cabinet member's portfolio is affected by the decision?			
I3c	Date Cabinet member consulted			
I4	Has any Cabinet member declared a conflict of interest in relation to the decision?	Yes		If yes, please discuss with the Monitoring Officer
		No	X	
I5	Which Corporate Management Team member has been consulted?	Name	Anthony Payne	
		Job title	Strategic Director for Place	
		Date consulted	25/08/21	
Sign-off				
I6	Sign off codes from the relevant departments consulted:	Democratic Support (mandatory)	DS43 21/22	
		Finance (mandatory)	djn.21.22.93	
		Legal (mandatory)	lt/37200/240821	
		Human Resources (if applicable)		
		Corporate property (if applicable)		
		Procurement (if applicable)		
Appendices				
I7	Ref.	Title of appendix		
	A	Briefing report for publication		

	B	Equalities Impact Assessment						
Confidential/exempt information								
18a	Do you need to include any confidential/exempt information?	Yes		If yes, prepare a second, confidential ('Part II') briefing report and indicate why it is not for publication by virtue of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 by ticking the relevant box in 18b below. (Keep as much information as possible in the briefing report that will be in the public domain)				
		No	X					
		Exemption Paragraph Number						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18b	Confidential/exempt briefing report title:							
Background Papers								
19	Please list all unpublished, background papers relevant to the decision in the table below. Background papers are <u>unpublished</u> works, relied on to a material extent in preparing the report, which disclose facts or matters on which the report or an important part of the work is based. If some/all of the information is confidential, you must indicate why it is not for publication by virtue of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 by ticking the relevant box.							
Title of background paper(s)		Exemption Paragraph Number						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cabinet Member Signature								
20	I agree the decision and confirm that it is not contrary to the Council's policy and budget framework, Corporate Plan or Budget. In taking this decision I have given due regard to the Council's duty to promote equality of opportunity, eliminate unlawful discrimination and promote good relations between people who share protected characteristics under the Equalities Act and those who do not. For further details please see the EIA attached.							
Signature				Date of decision		25/08/21		
Print Name		Councillor Jonathan Drear						

1.0 Introduction

1.1 The Tamar Bridge and Torpoint Ferries crossings are a 'joint undertaking' of Plymouth City Council and Cornwall Council, operating under statute since 1953.

1.2 The crossings are operated on a 'user pays' basis, with the tolls covering operational and maintenance costs, (hence no cost to the Council for this procurement) delivering public crossings at the Bridge and Ferry 24/7 365.

1.3 Stranded vehicles can cause severe delays to access and egress of Tamar Bridge and Saltash Tunnel, with very few opportunities for other vehicles to pass safely. Safety for travelling vehicles is a risk, as is the safety of the occupants in the vehicle.

1.4 The safety of Bridge operations require that vehicles breakdowns on the Bridge and in the tunnel are dealt with at the earliest opportunity for safety reasons.

1.5 The most effective way to maintain safety is by means of a specialist contracted service, 24/7 365 to provide light vehicle recovery, providing swift removal of vehicles, reducing risk of personal injury and journey delays.

1.6 The procurement of specialist services and materials are a regular occurrence, as would be expected, as the Bridge provides a unique link on the Devon / Cornwall border, with the A38 forming part of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) nationally.

2.0 Improving resilience and efficiency in procurement and Contract Award

2.1 Currently the process to procure and award a contract is the responsibility of both Councils, however the policy and process of both Councils differ, giving rise to anomalies and additional administration regarding timing, procurement decisions, application and contract award. Work is being undertaken to simplify the procurement and contract award process in respect of the Tamar Bridge and Torpoint Ferry.

This page is intentionally left blank

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Highways - Tamar Bridge Vehicle and User Safety



STAGE 1: WHAT IS BEING ASSESSED AND BY WHOM?

What is being assessed - including a brief description of aims and objectives?	Executive decision to approve the procurement of Light Recovery Vehicles and delegate contract award to Service Director for Street Services. The estimated total contract value anticipated to be in the region of £1.2 to £1.3 M and the contract is intended to be in place for a period of 6 years.
Author	Philip Robinson
Department and service	Service Director - Street Services
Date of assessment	29/06/2021

STAGE 2: EVIDENCE AND IMPACT

Protected characteristics (Equality Act)	Evidence and information (eg data and feedback)	Any adverse impact See guidance on how to make judgement	Actions	Timescale and who is responsible
Age	None	None	N/A	N/A
Disability	None	None	N/A	N/A
Faith/religion or belief	None	None	N/A	N/A
Gender - including marriage, pregnancy and maternity	None	None	N/A	N/A
Gender reassignment	None	None	N/A	N/A

Race	None	None	N/A	N/A
Sexual orientation - including civil partnership	None	None	N/A	N/A

STAGE 3: ARE THERE ANY IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FOLLOWING? IF SO, PLEASE RECORD ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN

Local priorities	Implications	Timescale and who is responsible
Reduce the inequality gap, particularly in health between communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Tamar Bridge link plays a vital role in strategic and community connectivity, education, commerce and leisure, as well as major health and emergency services. Maintaining the safe crossing through the procurement of a Light Vehicle Recovery service, will help ensure the Tamar Bridge is available 24/7 365. 	6 months David List
Good relations between different communities (community cohesion)	No adverse impact on community cohesion is anticipated.	6 months David List
Human rights Please refer to guidance	<p>This service recognises Article 14 of Human Rights Act – The right to receive Equal Treatment and prohibits discrimination including sex, race, religion and economic and social status in conjunction with the Equalities Act which includes age and disability.</p> <p>All staff and service users will be treated fairly and that their human rights will be respected.</p> <p>No adverse impact on human rights has been identified.</p>	6 months David List
Principles of fairness Please refer to guidance	<p>The Tamar Bridge is used daily by a significant number of the travelling public for commuting, business, social, health and leisure activities and is fundamental to the economic, social and environmental wellbeing of local communities, and as an integral part of the SRN.</p> <p>Objective and transparent evaluation criteria are embedded in the decision making for where interventions on the Bridge are required.</p>	6 months David List

STAGE 4: PUBLICATION

Responsible Officer	Philip Robinson	Date	29/06/21
Director, Service Director or Head of Service			

This page is intentionally left blank

EXECUTIVE DECISION

made by a Cabinet Member



REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY BY AN INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER

Executive Decision Reference Number – ESS01 21/22

Decision				
1	Title of decision: Preventing Plastic Pollution – Waste Sculpture			
2	Decision maker (Cabinet member name and portfolio title): Councillor Mrs Maddi Bridgeman, Cabinet Member for Environment and Street Scene			
3	Report author and contact details: Christopher Suckling, Natural Infrastructure Officer – 01752304335 christopher.suckling@plymouth.gov.uk			
4	Decision to be taken: Permission to design and produce temporary waste sculpture as part of EU funded Preventing Plastic Pollution Project.			
5	Reasons for decision: Funding has been awarded by the EU Preventing Plastic Pollution Project and needs to be spent before the end of the project (March 2023).			
6	Alternative options considered and rejected: (<i>Option 1</i>) No sculpture – rejected because we would lose the funding from the EU Preventing Plastic Pollution Project. <i>(Option 2)</i> Reallocate funding – rejected because we would lose the funding from the EU Preventing Plastic Pollution Project as it is a condition of the grant.			
7	Financial implications: £10,000 allocated to this project within the EU funded Preventing Plastic Pollution Project.			
8	Is the decision a Key Decision? (please contact Democratic Support for further advice)	Yes	No	Per the Constitution, a key decision is one which:
			X	in the case of capital projects and contract awards, results in a new commitment to spend and/or save in excess of £3million in total
			X	in the case of revenue projects when the decision involves entering into new commitments and/or making new savings in excess of £1 million
			X	is significant in terms of its effect on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards in the area of the local authority.

	If yes, date of publication of the notice in the <u>Forward Plan of Key Decisions</u>	
9	Please specify how this decision is linked to the Council's corporate plan/Plymouth Plan and/or the policy framework and/or the revenue/capital budget:	This links to the Council Corporate Plan as we strive to deliver a "greener City". This temporary sculpture will help raise awareness of plastic pollution. It is supported by the Britain's Ocean City: Plastics Taskforce and fully funded by EU Preventing Plastic Pollution Project; if we do not spend the money on this temporary sculpture we will lose the funding (it cannot be reallocated).
10	Please specify any direct environmental implications of the decision (carbon impact)	All materials will be waste plastic and recycled as part of this sculpture. It will then be recycled again at the end of the project.


Urgent decisions

11	Is the decision urgent and to be implemented immediately in the interests of the Council or the public?	Yes		(If yes, please contact Democratic Support (democraticsupport@plymouth.gov.uk) for advice)
		No	X	(If no, go to section 13a)
12a	Reason for urgency:			
12b	Scrutiny Chair Signature:		Date	
	Scrutiny Committee name:			
	Print Name:			

Consultation

13a	Are any other Cabinet members' portfolios affected by the decision?	Yes		
		No	X	(If no go to section 14)
13b	Which other Cabinet member's portfolio is affected by the decision?			
13c	Date Cabinet member consulted			
14	Has any Cabinet member declared a conflict of interest in relation to the decision?	Yes		If yes, please discuss with the Monitoring Officer
		No	X	
15	Which Corporate Management	Name	Anthony Payne	

	Team member has been consulted?	Job title	Strategic Director for Place					
		Date consulted	17/08/21					
Sign-off								
16	Sign off codes from the relevant departments consulted:	Democratic Support (mandatory)	DS11 21/22					
		Finance (mandatory)	djn.21.22.30					
		Legal (mandatory)	lt/36888/160621					
		Human Resources (if applicable)						
		Corporate property (if applicable)						
		Procurement (if applicable)						
Appendices								
17	Ref.	Title of appendix						
	A	Cabinet Briefing Note – waste sculpture						
	B	Equalities Impact Assessment						
Confidential/exempt information								
18a	Do you need to include any confidential/exempt information?	Yes		If yes, prepare a second, confidential ('Part II') briefing report and indicate why it is not for publication by virtue of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 by ticking the relevant box in 18b below. (Keep as much information as possible in the briefing report that will be in the public domain)				
		No	X					
		Exemption Paragraph Number						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18b	Confidential/exempt briefing report title:							
Background Papers								
19	<p>Please list all unpublished, background papers relevant to the decision in the table below.</p> <p>Background papers are <u>unpublished</u> works, relied on to a material extent in preparing the report, which disclose facts or matters on which the report or an important part of the work is based. If some/all of the information is confidential, you must indicate why it is not for publication by virtue of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 by ticking the relevant box.</p>							

Title of background paper(s)		Exemption Paragraph Number						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cabinet Member Signature								
20	I agree the decision and confirm that it is not contrary to the Council's policy and budget framework, Corporate Plan or Budget. In taking this decision I have given due regard to the Council's duty to promote equality of opportunity, eliminate unlawful discrimination and promote good relations between people who share protected characteristics under the Equalities Act and those who do not. For further details please see the EIA attached.							
Signature				Date of decision		24.8.21		
Print Name	Cllr Mrs Maddi Bridgeman							

Preventing Plastic Pollutions Project

Briefing Note –Waste Sculpture

June 2021

**A. Introduction**

Building on work already carried out by Britain's Ocean City: Plastics Task Force, Plymouth City Council (PCC) has secured external funding to deliver specific elements of a complimentary project - *Preventing Plastic Pollution* (see Background below), which will, in turn, deliver citywide initiatives that will reduce the amount of plastic entering the marine environment.

Work specified within this tender will be carried out within the Tamar Catchment Area with a focus on the city of Plymouth (see Background below).

We are seeking to appoint external artists to help deliver this work.

B. Background

Working in partnership with 18 organisations from across France and England, *Preventing Plastic Pollution* seeks to understand and reduce the impacts of plastic pollution in the marine environment. By looking at the catchment from source to sea, the project will identify and target hotspots for plastic, embed behaviour change in local communities and businesses, and implement effective solutions and alternatives.

Preventing Plastic Pollution is a €14million funded EU INTERREG VA France (Channel) England Programme project co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund that will work across seven pilot sites: Brest Harbour, Bay of Douarnenez, Bay of Veys, Poole Harbour, and the Medway, Tamar, and Great Ouse estuaries.

The information gathered from research in these areas will allow the cross-Channel partnerships to tackle some of the four million tonnes of plastic waste that enter the sea via rivers every year.

Aims and Results of the project:

Project objectives:

Preventing Plastic Pollution will improve the quality of Transitional Waters across the France (Channel) England area (SO 3.2) by:

- Developing a scalable and transferable mapping tool to provide quantifiable evidence of sources and quantities of plastic pollution in catchments.
- Developing an effective portfolio of innovative interventions to reduce plastic waste in or entering catchments.
- Transforming the behaviour of target groups and demonstrating best practice.

Expected project results:

Overall, *Preventing Plastic Pollution* will improve water quality with

- a) A 10 % improvement in good ecological status (Water Framework Directive Descriptor 10) in transitional waters.
- b) A reduction in the harm caused by plastic pollution in rivers and the sea equivalent to €38.8M-€126M (150 km river/coast cleared, 200 t plastic removed).
- c) A plastic-free charter implemented by 650 businesses & 50 supply chains modified.
- d) Projected uptake to include+10 more catchments 2 yrs. post project, and 100 catchments after 5 years.

Partners involved in the Tamar Catchment Area are:

- Plymouth City Council
- Environment Agency
- Westcountry Rivers Trust
- University of Plymouth

The aims of the project directly align with the Britain's Ocean City: Plastics Task Force. This group includes partners from a range of public, private and voluntary sector organisations, who have joined to maximise impact through collaborative working. The Task Force has produced the Plymouth's Plan for Plastics, detailing the broader commitment of Plymouth as a city to reducing single use plastics. The *Preventing Plastic Pollution Project* will directly deliver many of the targets set out within the Plymouth's Plan for Plastics.

The *Preventing Plastic Pollution Project* is due to end in March 2023.

C. Brief

We are looking for an external artist to lead on developing, creating and installing one waste sculptures for the *Preventing Plastic Pollution Project*. This work will need to be carried out with a target installation date being the end of August 2021 latest.

All activities will need to be monitored, evaluated and reported on, within an agreed format.

Waste Sculptures

The *Preventing Plastic Pollution Project* has awarded the City of Plymouth funding to develop, design, manufacture and install one waste sculpture. This sculpture will be made from recycled plastic collected within the local area.

To achieve this, it is expected that the external artists will:

1. Develop a work plan to outline the timescale and scope of the project. This will need to be agreed with PCC.
2. Work with PCC to consult members of the public for opinions and recommendations to support the location, development and design of the waste sculpture, including what will happen to it in the long-term.
3. Complete a full design for the waste sculpture based on the findings of the public engagement. This will need to be signed off by PCC before any further work can begin.

4. Source the plastic waste to construct the waste sculpture from within the local area. This could be via litter picks/beach cleans, waste collection facilities, engagement with business etc.
5. Construction of the waste sculpture. We would encourage the external artists to work with members of the public to do this.
6. Work with PCC to arrange and install the waste sculpture in a key location in Plymouth.
7. Work with PCC to consider the long-term residency of the sculpture. After the period of the project (March 2023), PCC will be donating the sculpture. We are keen that the artists' work with us to find a home for them.

Specifications for the sculpture:

- It will be large and eye-catching – we are hoping the sculpture will be emotive and start conversations within the City.
- Robust and sustainable – it will be outside and therefore will be strong enough to combat the elements for at least three years.
- Marine-focused – the sculpture will raise awareness of plastic pollution specifically within the marine environment.
- Innovative – we are hoping that the sculpture will be different to what people have seen before. Will they be collectors of waste?
- Health and Safety – the artists will conduct a health and safety assessment to ensure the sculpture is safe for members of the public.
- SailGP – is coming to Plymouth on 15th-17th July. We would like the sculpture to be on show at this event in some form (whether this include consultation, collection of materials, construction, community engagement etc.).

D. Budget

A maximum of £10,000 has been secured for this work. The funding is part of the *Preventing Plastic Pollution Project*, EU INTERREG VA France (Channel) England Programme. It is up to the external experts/consortium to detail how much of this money they will require to deliver the outputs, and how they will divide the money within Submission Task 3.

Appendices

Please view links below:

www.plymouth.gov.uk/plastics

www.preventingplasticpollution.com/

www.channelmanche.com/en/projects/approved-projects/preventing-plastic-pollution/

This page is intentionally left blank