

**Report to Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation)**

**Date: 25<sup>th</sup> November 2014**

**Subject: A647/B6154 Thornbury Barracks Junction Pinch Point Scheme -**

**Associated Traffic Regulation Order**

**Capital Scheme Number: 16952 / 000 / 000**

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Calverley & Farsley / Pudsey	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input 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 Authority to implement the 'Thornbury Barracks Junction Pinch Point Scheme' was obtained from Executive Board on the 5<sup>th</sup> of March 2014.
- 2 Works commenced on site July 2014. The works include signalling the roundabout and constructing central running lanes through its middle. Drawing EP/716952/TRO/7 shows the extent of these works. The anticipated completion date is March 2015.
- 3 In order to facilitate the efficient and safe use of the new junction, and adjacent City Connect cycle Superhighway, a Traffic Regulation order (TRO) is required. This is within the limit of proposed physical works of this proposed junction improvement only the other sections of the project being covered by a separate report
- 4 The purpose of this report is to request authority to advertise the necessary Traffic Regulation Order, and if no valid objections are received, seal and implement the TRO.

**Recommendations**

- 5 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:

- i) note the contents of this report; approve the TRO proposals, including those for the City Connect cycle superhighway within the boundary of the Thornbury Barracks Pinch Point scheme; and
- iii) give authority to the City Solicitor to advertise a draft Traffic Regulation Order for the various waiting and loading restrictions as shown on drawing EP/716952/TRO/7 and subject to no valid objections being received, to make, seal and implement the Order as advertised.

## **1 Purpose of this report**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to request authority to advertise the necessary Traffic Regulation Order, and if no valid objections are received, seal and implement the TRO.

## **2 Background information**

### **Scheme Background**

- 2.1 The scheme is located on the A647 (at the junction with the B6154), which is the principal highway link between Leeds and Bradford. The junction currently suffers significant congestion causing poor journey times and reliability.
- 2.2 The Thornbury Barracks Junction Pinch Point Scheme has been designed to address these problems and authority to implement the scheme was given by the Executive Board on the 5<sup>th</sup> of March 2014.
- 2.3 In August 2013 the former West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority (Metro), in partnership with Leeds City Council and Bradford Metropolitan District Council, were awarded £18.1m from the Department for Transport's Cycle City Ambition Grant fund. This was matched with over £10m of local funds to deliver the CityConnect project. This includes a programme of cycle route provision and initiatives to promote and support cycling as a means to commute to work and for leisure. One of the main components of the project is the cycle superhighway between Leeds and Bradford.
- 2.4 The cycle superhighway comprises a 2m wide cycle track physically segregated from the carriageway and the adjacent footway with kerbs. The cycle track is accommodated in the existing highway by reducing the width of the carriageway and/or widening the highway into adjacent council owned land.
- 2.5 A Traffic Regulation Order was advertised in June 2014 to support the design of the City Connect project. The Order included a No Parking Or Loading on Cycle Track or Footway restriction which was designed to address a key concern, namely that the cycle track will be obstructed by vehicles mounting the track to park. Footway parking is prevalent in many parts of the city, with vehicles parked either partially or fully on the footway, and clearly this would have a serious impact on the aim of the cycle superhighway to have an unobstructed route for cyclists. It was considered that introducing this restriction would allow the route to be kept unobstructed and allow civil enforcement of any transgressions.

- 2.6 As the cycle superhighway scheme developed into the advertising period it became apparent that these proposals overlapped with those contained in the adjacent Thornbury Barracks pinch point project where it is necessary to ensure that the proposed improvements operate as designed to improve the flow of traffic through the junction
- 2.7 For transparency of process and avoid confusion between the two projects it has therefore been decided to omit from the City Connect project TRO those parts of the TRO proposals which fall within the boundary of the Thornbury Barracks pinch point scheme, and to re-advertise these proposals as part of the proposed Thornbury Barracks TRO. This will allow all the responses mments received relating to the area within the Thornbury Barracks scheme boundary to be considered together thus permitting common mitigating options appropriate to both schemes to be developed.
- 2.8 For clarity , it's is proposed to advertise the necessary TRO's for both parking restriction in the carriageway, and for the CityConnect project together and at the same time, within the physical limits of this project only.

### **3 Main issues**

#### **Scheme Proposals - General**

- 3.1 The extent of the proposed waiting and loading restrictions are shown on drawing no. EP/716952/TRO/7.

PARAGRAPH 3.2 FROM THE ORIGINAL REPORT IS STILL NEEDED

#### **Works Programme**

- 3.3 It is anticipated that the TRO will be implemented in the current financial year.

### **4 Corporate Considerations**

#### **4.1 Consultation and Engagement**

- 4.1.1 The West Yorkshire Combined Authority has been consulted and the location of waiting and loading restrictions and detail of bus stop clearways have been discussed and agreed with them.
- 4.1.2 All Emergency Services and affected Ward Members have been consulted as part of the wider 'City Connect' Cycle project.
- 4.1.3 The Police responded with no adverse comments but expressed the view that future enforcement was to be carried out by Parking Enforcement Officers. Fire and Ambulance services were consulted, however there has been no response and it is assumed that they do not have any adverse comments.
- 4.1.4 Ward Members for Calverley & Farsley and Pudsey have been consulted and they are generally in favour of the overall scheme. However they have expressed their desire that the waiting/loading restrictions are developed with fronting

properties so that reasonable mitigation measures can be developed to lessen the impact.

- 4.1.5 Internal consultation with the Urban Traffic Control and the Road Casualty Reduction Team have been carried out in order to design the extent and nature of the proposed restrictions.
- 4.1.6 In April 2014 approval was granted for the advertisement of the CityConnect cycle superhighway Order proposals. This was done by street notice combined with a simultaneous letter delivery to all affected frontagers. This letter contained a plan detailing the CityConnect TRO which included the 'Prohibition of Parking and Loading on Footway and Cycle Track' restriction.
- 4.1.7 Since this advertisement a more comprehensive restriction to ensure the effective operation of the improved junction is proposed for Bradford Road as part of the Thornbury Barracks pinch point scheme. For transparency the original 'Prohibition of Parking and Loading on Footway and Cycle Track' restriction has been combined into this Order to allow a full and comprehensive understanding of the proposed footway and carriageway restrictions to be available to the general public and affected frontagers.
- 4.1.8 Sixty 'fronting' properties directly affected by the proposed TRO have had a 'face to face' visit by an Officer to discuss how they would be affected individually. Six written objections to the consultation proposals were received, 5 of which were as a response to consultation for this project. A further objection was picked up from previous consultation for the City Connect project Each objection related to the loss of on-street parking outside their property. Objectors have been individually contacted with the following outcomes:
- 4.1.9 Four objections were received relating to 3 adjacent properties, immediately adjacent to the junction. These properties are affected by loading and waiting restriction at all times. Property owners have been contacted and as a result, mitigating measures have been agreed in principal with the property owners and tenants. These objections have subsequently been withdrawn on the condition the mitigation measure are carried out.
- 4.1.10 A further property, affected by waiting and loading restriction at 'peak times' only has been contacted. The extent of restrictions outside this property has been marginally amended to the satisfaction of this objector and this objection has subsequently been withdrawn to parking restrictions on the highway. Objection remains to proposed parking restrictions resulting from the CityConnect cycle superhighway
- 4.1.11 A final objection, picked up from previous consultations regarding the City Connect project remains unresolved. Attempts to contact the objector have been unsuccessful. Efforts will continue, to contact and resolve this objection. This objection will be passed to those relating to the Cycle City Superhighway beyond the limits of this TRO advertisement.

## 4.2 **Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration**

- 4.2.1 An Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration screening document has been prepared for the project and is in Appendix A. An independent impact assessment is not required for the approvals requested. The screening process identified the following impacts on the equality characteristics:

Positive Impacts:

- The waiting and loading restrictions will protect the junction and its approaches from parked vehicles to enable the safe and efficient use of the junction when operational.
- There would be a visual improvement with less parked cars on the highway.
- Visibility would be clear of parked cars for pedestrians manoeuvring around the junction
- Reduce the risk of accidents as a result of poor visibility due to parked cars

Negative Impacts:

- There will be a loss of on-street parking due to no waiting and no loading at all times in the immediate vicinity of the junction, and at peak times along the approach and leaving lengths of all four arms.

Overall, the scheme provides a design that has balanced local needs with due regard to the needs of vulnerable road users and disability groups.

### **4.3 Council policies and City Priorities**

- 4.3.1 The Thornbury Barracks junction improvements fit within the Best Council plan objective of improving roads. Reduction of congestion and improving connectivity between Leeds and Bradford fits with Best Council plan strategic aims to promote sustainable and inclusive economic growth by improving the economic wellbeing of local people and businesses.
- 4.3.2 The scheme supports the objectives of the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 2011-26. The proposals fit within the connectivity theme ‘to deliver an integrated, reliable transport system that enables people and goods to move around efficiently and safely’ and supports the proposal ‘to define and develop a core, high quality, financially sustainable network of transport services that will provide attractive alternatives to car travel’.
- 4.3.3 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.

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

- 4.4.1 **Full Scheme Estimate:** The A647/B6154 Thornbury Barracks Junction Pinch Point Scheme estimated to cost £3,433,000 is already approved by the Executive

Board on the 5<sup>th</sup> March 2014 . There are no additional monies required to process the TRO.

4.4.2 **Revenue Implications:** There are no revenue implications re this scheme.

#### **4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In**

4.5.1 The decisions taken in respect of this report are not eligible for call in.

#### **4.6 Risk Management**

4.6.1 Failure to secure the necessary TRO will jeopardise the safe and efficient operation of the junction improvement.

### **5 Conclusions**

5.1 The proposals contained within this report provide a single unified proposal for addressing the TRO requirements of both the City Connect project and the Thornbury Barracks Pinch Point scheme to address the need to effectively manage the movement of traffic on through the junction and on the proposed cycle superhighway.

5.2 The report seeks authority to formally advertise a TRO to enable the safe and efficient use of the junction improvement and if no valid objections are received, seal and implement the TRO.

### **6 Recommendations**

The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:

- i) note the contents of this report;
- ii) approve the TRO proposals, including those for the City Connect cycle superhighway within the boundary of the Thornbury Barracks Pinch Point scheme; and
- iii) give authority to the City Solicitor to advertise a draft Traffic Regulation Order for the various waiting and loading restrictions as shown on drawing EP/716952/TRO/7 and subject to no valid objections being received, to make, seal and implement the Order as advertised.

### **7 Background documents<sup>1</sup>**

7.1 None.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

## 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.

<b>Directorate: City Development</b>	<b>Service area: Projects</b>
<b>Lead person: Kate Lee</b>	<b>Contact number: 24 76167</b>

<b>1. Title: Design &amp; Cost Report for Thornbury Barracks Junction Pinch Point Scheme</b>		
Is this a:		
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy / Policy</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Service / Function</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other</b>
<b>If other, please specify</b>		

<b>2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The screening focuses on the report to the Executive Board, seeking authority to advertise, make, implement and seal a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO).</li> </ul> <p>The TRO is required and associated with works that includes signalling the Thornbury Barrack's roundabout and constructing central running lanes through it's middle.</p> <p>The scheme proposals include the introduction of parking/loading restrictions.</p>

### 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?	X	
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the policy or proposal?	X	
Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom?		X
Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment practices?		X
Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment</li> <li>• Advancing equality of opportunity</li> <li>• Fostering good relations</li> </ul>		X

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**.

### 4. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

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 been carried out with:

- West Yorkshire Combined Authority (formally Metro)
- First Group (the main bus operator along the route)
- LCC Officers ( including the casualty reduction team, cycling team and access officer)
- Emergency services
- Calverely & Farsley and Pudsey Ward Members

Public consultation was a 'face to face' visit by an Officer to the 60 fronting properties directly affected by the TRO to discuss how they would be affect individually.

- **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)

The highway works for the scheme, and their impact on equality characteristics, are as follows:

**Positive Impacts:**

- The waiting and loading restrictions will protect the junction and its approaches from parked vehicles to enable the safe and efficient use of the junction when operational.
- There would be a visual improvement with less parked cars on the highway.
- Visibility would be clear of parked cars for pedestrians manoeuvring around the junction
- Reduce the risk of accidents as a result of poor visibility due to parked cars

**Negative Impacts:**

- There will be a loss of on-street parking due to no waiting and no loading at all times in the immediate vicinity of the junction, and at peak times along the approach and leaving lengths of all four arms.

Overall, the scheme provides a design that has balanced local needs with due regard to the needs of vulnerable road users and disability groups.

- **Actions**

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

Negative impact can be reduced by carrying out 'accommodation works' within property curtilage to increase off-street parking.

**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 (Include name and job title)	N/A

#### **6. Governance, ownership and approval**

Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening

<b>Name</b>	<b>Job title</b>	<b>Date</b>
Sabby Khaira	Principal Engineer	October 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 [equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk](mailto:equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk). For record keeping purposes it will be kept on file (but not published).

<b>Date screening completed</b>	8 <sup>th</sup> October 2014
If relates to a Key Decision - <b>date sent to Corporate Governance</b>	
Any other decision – <b>date sent to Equality Team (equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk)</b>	