

Report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation)

Date: 22 July 2014

Subject: Boston Spa & Collingham – Proposed Waiting Restrictions – Objection report

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Harewood & Wetherby	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number: Appendix number:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Summary of main issues

- 1 A report was submitted to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) on 18th February 2014 and subsequently approved to introduce No waiting At Any Time (NWAAT) restrictions on Bridge Road, Boston Spa and School Lane, Collingham.
- 2 Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation)(Waiting Restriction)(N°W11)Order 2014 was advertised on site between 21st March 2014 and 21st April 2014 and a single objection was received.

Recommendations

- 3 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:
 - i) consider the objections to Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation)(Waiting Restriction)(N°W11)Order 2014 in the Boston Spa and Collingham area (as shown on the attached drawing TME/33.1/161.1), relating to the introduction of NWAAT restrictions on Bridge Road, Boston Spa & School Lane, Collingham;
 - ii) overrule the objection and give authority to implement the scheme as advertised; and
 - iii) instruct the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation)(Waiting Restriction) Order N°W11 2014 as advertised and inform the objector accordingly of the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation's) decision.

1 Purpose of this report

- 1.2 The purpose of this report is to consider the objection raised against the proposed NWAAT restrictions on Bridge Road, Boston Spa & School Lane, Collingham following the advertising of the Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation)(Waiting Restriction) Order N°W11 2014 between 21st March & 21st April 2014.

2 Background information

- 2.1 The purpose of the original report was to seek approval to implement a scheme that will alleviate some of the key issues surrounding the issues identified across the Wetherby and Harewood wards, to which LCC are looking to introduce measures to address these concerns.
- 2.2 The issues/locations identified are ;
- **Bridge Road, Boston Spa:**
Concerns have been raised by residents in Boston Spa with regards to parked vehicles on Bridge Road, and how it affects the give and take system in place over the bridge; where it can cause problems if vehicles are parked causing the road to be too narrow to allow the free movement of traffic.
 - **School Lane, Collingham:**
Requests have been received to restrict parking at certain locations on School Lane to address inconsiderate parking in the area. This will include restrictions over the frontage of the Church View Surgery in Collingham, where parking has caused access issues for emergency vehicles and vehicles accessing and exiting the surgery, and restrictions close to the junction of School Lane and the A58 where inconsiderate and obstructive parking associated with the adjacent shops takes place.
- 2.3 In order to improve the safety on Bridge Road Boston Spa, it is proposed that No Waiting At Any Time (NWAAT) are introduced on the south western side of the bridge to cover the widened area of road and removing the parking that has proved problematic.
- 2.4 NWAAT restrictions will be introduced on the frontage of the Church View Surgery to prevent the access problems that generated the request and further restrictions will be introduced at the junction of School Lane and the A58 to address the indiscriminate parking problems associated with the nearby shops
- 2.5 A report was submitted to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) on the 18th February 2014 and subsequently approved to introduce No Waiting At Any Time (NWAAT) restrictions on Bridge Road, Boston Spa & School Lane, Collingham and to advertise the draft waiting restriction order.
- 2.6 The draft waiting restriction order on Bridge Road, Boston Spa & School Lane, Collingham – Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation)(Waiting Restriction)(N°W11)Order 2014 was advertised between 21st March and 21st April 2014, with a single objection being received.

2.7 The proposals to introduce NWAAT restrictions are shown on the attached drawing n° TME/33.1/161.1

3 Main issues

3.1 A single representation has been received via email from Boston Spa Parish Council. The grounds for the objections are set out below and are also detailed in the attached schedule together with Highways Services comments, they refer solely to the restrictions in Boston Spa and not Collingham;

- The problem identified in the City Council's report is virtually non-existent and it seems the Order is being proposed to overcome a single residents occasional problem driving his/her own vehicle
- No such problem has ever been identified or no such complaint has ever been made to the Parish Council
- We are not aware of a bus ever having to be reversed up Bridge Road and indeed it is extremely rare that a car has had to do that. When they have it is probably because they have continued to drive down Bridge Road past Bridge Close when the road has not been clear
- There is already space for vehicles to pull in where the access to Bridge Cottage and to the Thornhill flats mean that vehicles do not park
- Most if not all problems on Bridge Road are caused by inconsiderate and/or incompetent drivers and double yellow lines will not stop such driving behaviour
- Most problems with traffic are caused half way up at the top of the hill, not at the bridge
- The area at the bridge is also important for visitors and fishermen and double yellow lines will mean that even out of rush hour there will be no parking and that is just a nonsensical sledge hammer solution to a tiny peanut of a problem
- The Parish Council was not consulted before the draft Order was made.

4 Corporate Considerations

4.1 Consultation and Engagement

4.1.2 Ward Members were consulted on 27 June 2013 and were asked for a response regarding the proposals. Following this the Ward Members responded in favour of the proposed scheme.

4.1.3 The Member of Parliament for the area and the Collingham Parish Council were consulted on the proposals on the 09 and 13 August 2013 respectively and expressed their support for the proposals.

4.1.4 Ward Members and the MP were contacted again following the objection received, advising of the intention to recommend the objection be over ruled and requesting any final amendments before proceeding; to which no adverse comments were received.

4.1.5 Public notices were placed on site on 20 March 2013 in the vicinity of the aforementioned proposed restrictions, providing members of the public with an opportunity to make any objections or representations to the proposals. A notice

was also advertised in the local press. Following this we received several queries of the extents of the proposals and support for the scheme.

4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

- 4.2.1 An Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration screening has been carried out on the proposals (Appendix 1) and has determined that an impact assessment is not required for the proposals requested.
- 4.2.2 The introduction of NWAAT restrictions on School Lane, Collingham outside the Church View Surgery will remove parking that is currently making accessing the doctor's surgery difficult. The knock on effect of this, is that it will free up sight lines for vehicles accessing/egressing the surgery car park whilst also increasing the amount of space they have to manoeuvre in, this will particularly be useful for any emergency vehicles accessing the site, and will improve safety for any pedestrians (particularly the disabled, elderly and other dependants accessing the surgery) in the area who will not have to negotiate parked vehicles along this access

4.3 Council policies and City Priorities

- 4.3.1 Environmental Policy; the proposals contained within this report are in accordance with aims 6 and 7 of the Policy in that the proposals will aid to "reduce the impact of traffic in the city by changes to the road system" and "develop a safe, healthy local environment which provides the best quality of life for Leeds residents.
- 4.3.2 LTP Policies; The proposals contained in this report are in accordance with Plan Objective: Delivering Accessibility. The proposals also follow Core Strategy Approaches A1 and A2 in that the scheme will improve physical accessibility and improve the highway for pedestrians.

4.4 Resources and value for money

- 4.4.1 There are no additional costs associated with this report. Funding for the scheme was approved in the previous Design & Costs report on 18th February 2014.

4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

- 4.5.2 The scheme is in the Annual Programme and subject to resolving any objections received it is anticipated to be completed within the 2014 financial year.
- 4.5.3 Not eligible for call in

4.6 Risk Management

- 4.6.1 If no action was taken then injury accidents at this location are likely to remain at their current levels.

5 Conclusions

- 5.1 The parking that takes place on Bridge Road is proving a danger to road users as it takes up space on the road to allow the free flow of two way traffic exiting the

single file bridge. With the introduction of traffic restrictions this problem will be mitigated, reducing overall congestion in the area.

- 5.2 Removing parking outside the access to the Church View Surgery will improve the sight lines for road users accessing and egressing the surgery itself, thus removing any danger associated with the reduced visibility.
- 5.3 Restricting parking in and around the junctions of the A58 with School Lane will improve overall access in the area for all residents and users of the retail establishments, whilst removing any hazards associated with unregulated parking near junctions for pedestrians.

6 Recommendations

- 6.1 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:
 - i) consider the objections to Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation)(Waiting Restriction)(N^oW11)Order 2014 in the Boston Spa and Collingham area (as shown on the attached drawing TME/33.1/161.1), relating to the introduction of NWAAT restrictions on Bridge Road, Boston Spa & School Lane, Collingham;
 - ii) overule the objection and give authority to implement the scheme as advertised; and
 - iii) instruct the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation)(Waiting Restriction) Order N^oW11 2014 as advertised and inform the objectors accordingly of the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation's) decision.

7 Background documents¹

- 7.1 None.

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

List of Objectors to Boston Spa & Collingham – Proposed Waiting Restrictions – Objection

Details of Objection	Officers Response
<p>The problem identified in the City Council's report is virtually non-existent and it seems the Order is being proposed to overcome a single residents occasional problem driving his/her own vehicle</p>	<p>The problem identified to the council was initially reported by a local resident who was concerned with the traffic problems and congestion they witnessed from their home, however since consulting on this issue/advertising this order, other residents have come forward to discuss the scheme acknowledging the problem and putting forward their concerns which we resolved and/or showing support for the proposals as they stand.</p>
<p>No such problem has ever been identified or no such complaint has ever been made to the Parish Council</p>	<p>Although these complaints have not been raised by residents/the bus companies with the Parish Council, they did however contact the Leeds City Council's Highways & Transportation department to address their concerns, given we are the highways authority for the district and should any action be necessary (as is the case here)we would be duty bound to undertake works to address the issue.</p>
<p>We are not aware of a bus ever having to be reversed up Bridge Road and indeed it is extremely rare that a car has had to do that. When they have it is probably because they have continued to drive down Bridge Road past Bridge Close when the road has not been clear</p>	<p>The bus companies when consulted responded in favour of these proposals as they too acknowledged the problems faced here and welcomed any parking restrictions to alleviate the congestion on Bridge Road.</p>
<p>There is already space for vehicles to pull in where the access to Bridge Cottage and to the Thornhill flats mean that vehicles do not park</p>	<p>With parking occurring up to the narrowing of the bridge leaving a small space directly over the accesses to Bridge Cottage, it is only sufficient for a small number of vehicles and not an idea solution to the situation, if more vehicles are crossing the bridge than this space allows, then the</p>

	problem as described continues.
Most if not all problems on Bridge Road are caused by inconsiderate and/or incompetent drivers and double yellow lines will not stop such driving behaviour	As you describe issues faced on Bridge Road can be as a direct result of careless/inconsiderate motorists, however that does not mean the council should not act to aid the situation where it can, if removing a small amount of parking may improve the congestion for all motorists even those who are inconsiderate, then this is action that would surely be beneficial.
Most problems with traffic are caused half way up at the top of the hill, not at the bridge	Problems arise near the brow of the hill due to the areas topography and the location of accesses to nearby Bridge Close and the Public Car Park, issues at this location are further compounded by traffic slowing in approach to the bridge due to the issues described. Unfortunately there is little that can be done to address issues surrounding the curvature of the hill and its impact on sight lines from nearby junctions.
The area at the bridge is also important for visitors and fishermen and double yellow lines will mean that even out of rush hour there will be no parking and that is just a nonsensical sledge hammer solution to a tiny peanut of a problem	Outside of rush hour this section of Bridge Road is still intended to be used for traffic to return to two way traffic flows, allowing parking on this length at any time of day essential extends the single file length for motorists, the proposed restriction is only intended to cover a small section of Bridge Road directly adjacent to the bridge, which constitutes approximately space for 2 parked vehicles. With this restriction in place, there still remains over 200m of unrestricted kerb space on Bridge Road capable of accommodating a large number of vehicles, as such I feel that the displacement of two vehicles will have no impact on fisherman and visitors to the bridge, as there is more than sufficient alternate parking on Bridge Road for them.
The Parish Council was not consulted before the draft Order was made.	It would appear that there has been a slight error in relation to the content of the report and the specific reference to the Parish Council should have read , 'and the Collingham Parish Council'. The sentence in the report referred to "The Member of Parliament for the area Alec Shelbrooke and the Parish council were consulted on the proposals on the 9th and 13th

August respectively, and expressed their support for the proposals". This refers to consultation with the Collingham area parish councils with regards to the school lane restrictions and which they were involved developing and which are to be introduced as part of this scheme.

It is worth explaining that funding for the Collingham scheme had been identified and we now as a cost saving exercise and working in a more proactively manner try where possible to link onto the back of identified funded schemes other small scale request for assistance, particularly when the requests are for similar Traffic Regulation Orders. The cost of facilitating simple yellow lines is relatively cheap, but the costs associated with the promotion and advertisement of the legal orders can be expensive and therefore the combinations of similar request in wards or areas can and have saved the authority a significant amount of expenditure to date.

The request for some assistance in Boston Spa came directly from a resident who was having issues with parking occurring right up to the bridge narrowing outside his home, which prevented him exiting his driveway safely. This also caused issues detailed in the report (vehicles including buses having to reverse up Bridge Rd towards Boston Spa main street, due to vehicles blocking the intended waiting area).

It would appear for such a minor request the Engineer has inadvertently not consulted Boston Spa or Thorp Arch Parish council on the prospect of introducing a section of NWAAT on Bridge Road, Boston Spa outside this residents property as he has assumed they would welcome the wishes of the resident and the improvement on traffic flows on Bridge Road. I have reminded all Traffic Engineers to consult with Parish Councils and apologise for this oversight and any confusion it may have caused.