

# Report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation)

## Date: 05 August 2013

## Subject: Oldfield Road/ Highfield Avenue, Wortley - Proposed Zebra Crossing

## Capital Scheme Number: 32136 / 000 / 000

| Are specific electoral Wards affected?   | Yes   | 🗌 No |
|--|-------|------|
| If relevant, name of Ward: Farnley & Wortley   |       |      |
| Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?  | 🗌 Yes | No   |
| Is the decision eligible for Call-In?  | 🗌 Yes | No   |
| Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?<br>If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number:<br>Appendix number: | 🗌 Yes | No   |
| FF   |       |      |

#### Summary of main issues

1 This report seeks approval to incur expenditure and undertake the detailed design and implementation of a zebra crossing at the location of Oldfield Lane near to its junction with Highfield Avenue, Wortley.

#### Recommendations

- 2 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:
  - i) note the contents of this report;
  - ii) approve the design and implementation of a scheme to introduce a zebra crossing at the location of Oldfield Lane / Highfield as indicated on the attached drawing TME-12-03-1973-01;
  - iii) give authority to incur expenditure of £19,000 comprising £12,000 works costs and £7,000 staff costs, funded from the LTP Transport Policy Capital Programme; and
  - iv) give authority to display a Notice on site under the provisions of Section 23 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 in order to inform the public of the proposed zebra crossing.

## **1.0** Purpose of this report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek approval for the detailed design and implementation of a scheme to introduce a zebra crossing facility at the location of Oldfield Lane/ Highfield Avenue, Wortley.

## 2.0 Background information

- 2.1 The council received a request for a formal crossing facility at the location of Oldfield Lane/ Highfield Avenue where, currently, there is a refuge island with informal crossing points.
- 2.2 This location is a busy high street with only one existing informal crossing facility which does not meet the demand for pedestrians using the shops, bus stop and other local facilities on both of the road. The presence of on street parking, and the high level of demand for parking spaces, increases the difficulty of crossing.
- 2.3 Following a pedestrian crossing survey, the results were included in the Pedestrian Crossing Review 2014. The associated report approved on 18 March 2014 recommended introducing a zebra crossing at this location

## 3.0 Main issues

- 3.1 It is proposed that a zebra crossing be provided at Oldfield Lane. A zebra crossing in this location will serve to provide a safer means of crossing the road and will benefit to the wider community including parents with children going to/from the shops.
- 3.1.2 The proposals are shown on the attached drawing TME-12-03-1973-01.

## 3.2 Programme

3.2.1 It is envisaged that the works will be carried out within the 2014/2015 financial year.

## 4.0 Corporate Considerations

- 4.1 Consultation and Engagement
- 1.1.1 Ward Members: Farnley & Wortley Ward Members were consulted by email on the 25 March 2014. Replies have been received by all of them who are all fully supportive of the proposal.
- 4.1.2 Emergency Services and Metro (WYPTE): The Emergency Services and Metro were consulted by email on the 25 March 2014. The Police had no objections. The other emergency services and metro had no objections
- 4.1.3 Internal Consultation: Colleagues in Highways and Transportation have been consulted as part of the design process.
- 4.1.4 A Stage 1/2 Safety Audit has been requested and recommendations will be considered and incorporated into the proposals where appropriate.

## 4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

- 4.2.1 An Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Screening has been undertaken and the process determined that an Impact Assessment was not required. The screening is attached as Appendix 1. The Pedestrian Crossing Review was also referred to as part of the equality process.
- 4.2.2 The crossing will provide a safe crossing point enabling all pedestrians to safely cross a busy road which will be of particular benefit for people with mobility issue; the elderly; carers supporting wheelchairs or pushchairs and parents with young children.
- 4.2.3 The crossing will include tactile paving and dropped kerbs which will alert people who are visually impaired, that they are approaching a road crossing point.

#### 4.3 Council policies and City Priorities

- 4.3.1 Environmental Policy: The proposals contained in this report are in accordance with aims of the Councils Environmental Policy.
- 4.3.2 Local Transport Plan (LTP): The proposal contained in this report are in accordance with the objectives of the policies in the West Local Transport Plan 2011-26.
- 4.3.3 Community Safety: The proposals contained in this report have no implications under Section 17 of Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

#### 4.4 **Resources and value for money**

- **4.4.1 Full scheme estimate:** The total estimated cost of the scheme is £19,000 comprising of £12,000 works costs, and £7,000 staff fees, funded from LTP Transport Policy Capital Programme
- 4.4.2 Capital Funding and Cash Flow:

| Funding Approval :                    | Capital S | ection Referen | ce Numbe | r :-    |         |         |         |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|----------------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Previous total Authority              | TOTAL     | TO MARCH       | FORECAST |         |         |         |         |
| to Spend on this scheme               |           | 2013           | 2013/14  | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017 on |
|                                       | £000's    | £000's         | £000's   | £000's  | £000's  | £000's  | £000's  |
| LAND (1)                              | 0.0       |                |          |         |         |         |         |
| CONSTRUCTION (3)                      | 0.0       |                |          |         |         |         |         |
| FURN & EQPT (5)                       | 0.0       |                |          |         |         |         |         |
| DESIGN FEES (6)                       | 0.0       |                |          |         |         |         |         |
| OTHER COSTS (7)                       | 0.0       |                |          |         |         |         |         |
| TOTALS                                | 0.0       | 0.0            | 0.0      | 0.0     | 0.0     | 0.0     | 0.0     |
| Authority to Spend                    | TOTAL     | TO MARCH       |          | F       | ORECAST |         |         |
| required for this Approval            | 10142     | 2013           | 2013/14  | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017 on |
|                                       | £000's    |                | £000's   | £000's  | £000's  | £000's  | £000's  |
| LAND (1)                              | 0.0       |                |          |         |         |         |         |
| CONSTRUCTION (3)                      | 12.0      |                |          | 12.0    |         |         |         |
| FURN & EQPT (5)                       | 0.0       |                |          |         |         |         |         |
| DESIGN FEES (6)                       | 7.0       |                |          | 7.0     |         |         |         |
| OTHER COSTS (7)                       | 0.0       |                |          |         |         |         |         |
| TOTALS                                | 19.0      | 0.0            |          | 19.0    | 0.0     | 0.0     | 0.0     |
|                                       |           |                |          |         |         | _       |         |
| Total overall Funding                 | TOTAL     | TO MARCH       |          |         | ORECAST |         |         |
| (As per latest Capital                |           | 2013           | 2013/14  | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017 on |
| Programme)                            | £000's    | £000's         | £000's   | £000's  | £000's  | £000's  | £000's  |
| LCC Supported Borrowing               | 0.0       |                |          |         |         |         |         |
| Revenue Contribution                  | 0.0       |                |          |         |         |         |         |
| Capital Receipt                       | 0.0       |                |          |         |         |         |         |
| Insurance Receipt                     | 0.0       |                |          |         |         |         |         |
| Lottery                               | 0.0       |                |          |         |         |         |         |
| Gifts / Bequests / Trusts             | 0.0       |                |          |         |         |         |         |
| European Grant                        | 0.0       |                |          |         |         |         |         |
| Health Authority                      | 0.0       |                |          |         |         |         |         |
| School Fundraising                    | 0.0       |                |          |         |         |         |         |
| Private Sector                        | 0.0       |                |          |         |         |         |         |
| Section 106 / 278                     | 0.0       |                |          |         |         |         |         |
| Government Grant - LTP /TSG           | 19.0      |                |          | 19.0    |         |         |         |
| SCE(C)                                | 0.0       |                |          |         |         |         |         |
| SCE(R)                                | 0.0       |                |          |         |         |         |         |
| Departmental USB                      | 0.0       |                |          |         |         |         |         |
| Corporate USB                         | 0.0       |                |          |         |         |         |         |
| Any Other Income ( Specify)           | 0.0       |                |          |         |         |         |         |
| Total Funding                         | 19.0      | 0.0            | 0.0      | 19.0    | 0.0     | 0.0     | 0.0     |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 10.0      | 0.0            | 0.0      |         | 0.0     | 0.0     | 0.0     |
| Balance / Shortfall =                 |           |                | 0.0      |         |         |         |         |

#### Parent Scheme Number: 99609

Title: LTP Transport Policy Capital Programme

# 4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

4.5.1 Due to the low cost involved the scheme is not eligible for call in.

# 4.6 Risk Management

4.6.1 There are no risk issues, over and above those expected when working in the public highway, generated by the proposals contained in this report.

## 5.0 Conclusions

5.1 The provision of a zebra crossing on Oldfield Lane/ Highfield Avenue will provide a safer means of crossing the road. A zebra crossing in this location will reduce the likelihood of danger to both pedestrians and traffic using the road and improve the amenities of the area

#### 6.0 Recommendations

- 6.1 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:
  - i) note the contents of this report;
  - ii) approve the design and implementation of a scheme to introduce a zebra crossing at the location of Oldfield Lane / Highfield as indicated on the attached drawing TME-12-03-1973-01;
  - iii) give authority to incur expenditure of £19,000 comprising £12,000 works costs and £7,000 staff costs, funded from the LTP Transport Policy Capital Programme; and
  - iv) give authority to display a Notice on site under the provisions of Section 23 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 in order to inform the public of the proposed zebra crossing.

#### 7.0 Background documents <sup>1</sup>

7.1 None.

<sup>1</sup>The background documents listed in this section are available for download from the Council's website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.

# **Appendix 1** Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Screening



As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

A **screening** process can help judge relevance and provides a record of both the **process** and **decision**. Screening should be a short, sharp exercise that determines relevance for all new and revised strategies, policies, services and functions. Completed at the earliest opportunity it will help to determine:

- the relevance of proposals and decisions to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.
- whether or not equality, diversity, cohesion and integration is being/has already been considered, and
- whether or not it is necessary to carry out an impact assessment.

| Directorate: : Highways Services | Service area: Traffic Management |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Lead person: Peter Walwyn        | Contact number: 0113 2475620     |

| 1. Title: Oldfield Lane/ Hig | ghfield Avenue – Zebra Crossi | ng    |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------|
| Is this a:                   |                               |       |
| Strategy / Policy            | Service / Function            | Other |
| If other, please specify     |                               |       |

## 2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening

The focus for this screening is the report seeking approval to introduce a zebra crossing on Oldfield Lane/ Highfield Avenue, Farnley & Wortley ward.

## 3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

All the council's strategies/policies, services/functions affect service users, employees or the wider community – city wide or more local. These will also have a greater/lesser relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

The following questions will help you to identify how relevant your proposals are.

When considering these questions think about age, carers, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation and any other relevant characteristics (for example socio-economic status, social class, income, unemployment, residential location or family background and education or skills levels).

| Questions  | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----|
| Is there an existing or likely differential impact for the different       |     |    |
| equality characteristics?  |     |    |
| Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the              |     |    |
| policy or proposal?  |     |    |
| Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or               |     |    |
| procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by             |     |    |
| whom?  |     |    |
| Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment                      |     |    |
| practices?   |     |    |
| Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on                     |     |    |
| <ul> <li>Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and</li> </ul> |     |    |
| harassment   |     |    |
| <ul> <li>Advancing equality of opportunity</li> </ul>                      |     |    |
| <ul> <li>Fostering good relations</li> </ul>                               |     |    |

If you have answered no to the questions above please complete sections 6 and 7

If you have answered **yes** to any of the above and;

- Believe you have already considered the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 4.**
- Are not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 5.**

If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.

Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).

• How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration? (think about the scope of the proposal, who is likely to be affected, equality related information, gaps in information and plans to address, consultation and engagement activities (taken place or planned) with those likely to be affected)

Consultation has taken place with Ward Members, the emergency services and metro and no objections have been received.

If approval is given a Notice will be posted on site notifying the public of the Councils intention to provide a zebra pedestrian crossing.

A road safety audit has been carried out on the proposed scheme and comments provided have been taken into consideration. Further safety audits will be carried out as the scheme progresses.

# • Key findings

(think about any potential positive and negative impact on different equality characteristics, potential to promote strong and positive relationships between groups, potential to bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other, perception that the proposal could benefit one group at the expense of another)

Positive Impacts:

Local residents will be positively helped by the scheme as the proposed crossing will provide a safer means of crossing a busy road. The crossing will have a positive impact on all pedestrians and will be especially beneficial to children, mobility impaired people, the elderly and carers supporting wheelchairs or pushchairs.

Negative:

## Actions

(think about how you will promote positive impact and remove/ reduce negative impact)

**5.** If you are **not** already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you **will need to carry out an impact assessment**.

| Date to scope and plan your impact assessment: | N/A |
|--|-----|
| Date to complete your impact assessment        | N/A |

| Lead person for your impact assessment | N/A |
|--|-----|
| (Include name and job title)           |     |

| <b>6. Governance, ownership and approval</b><br>Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening |                            |                |  |
|--|----------------------------|----------------|--|
| Name   | Job title                  | Date           |  |
| Nicholas Hunt  | Principle Traffic Engineer | 26 / 06 / 2014 |  |

#### 7. Publishing

This screening document will act as evidence that due regard to equality and diversity has been given. If you are not carrying out an independent impact assessment the screening document will need to be published.

If this screening relates to a **Key Delegated Decision**, **Executive Board**, **full Council** or a **Significant Operational Decision** a copy should be emailed to Corporate Governance and will be published along with the relevant report.

A copy of **all other** screening's should be sent to <u>equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk</u>. For record keeping purposes it will be kept on file (but not published).

| Date screening completed  | 26 / 06 / 2014 |
|---|----------------|
| If relates to a Key Decision - date sent to<br>Corporate Governance         |                |
| Any other decision – date sent to Equality Team (equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk) |                |