

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

**Date: 03 February 2015**

**Subject: Site 16 Coal Road/ Redhall lane/ Skelton Lane – HGV restrictions**

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s):	<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 The Best Council Plan 2013-17 outlines how Leeds City will achieve its ambition to become the Best City in the UK and Leeds City Council the best local authority. According to the Best Council Plan, the success of the Best Council objective: ensuring high quality public services will be partly measured through reduced numbers of people Killed or Seriously Injured on the city's roads. Enhancing the local residential environment by reducing vehicles speeds and removing unnecessary heavy good vehicles from this residential area will provide a safer and more user friendly road environment for all. By improving the local road environment this will actively encourage children to utilise more active modes of travel to school, contributing to the Leeds Education Challenge, which is part of the objective to build a child friendly city, delivery of the Better Lives programme and contribution to "Public Health which is embedded and effectively delivering health protection and health improvement".
- 2 There has been a long standing campaign to restrict HGV access along residential routes of Coal Road, Redhall Lane and Skelton Lane to ensure HGV's use the primary route network of the A58 and A6120, rather that the short cut through these residential routes.
- 3 In August 2014 a report was approved by the Chief Highways Officer (Design & Cost Report for Traffic Management 2014/2015) which requested approval to introduce a 7.5t HGV Restriction in Whinmoor and advertise the Traffic Regulation, Movement Restriction (No.M12) Order 2014 item 77.

- 4 The purpose of this report is to seek authority to overrule the two objections received to Traffic Regulation, Movement Restriction (No.M12) Order 2014 relating to the provision of this restriction, as advertised between 3<sup>rd</sup> October and 31<sup>st</sup> October 2014.

## **Recommendations**

- 5 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:
- i) note the contents of this report;
  - ii) consider and overrule the objections to the Traffic Regulation, Movement Restriction (No.M12) Order 2014 relating to the provision of this restriction as shown on drawing number TM/11/1/123/6; and
  - iii) request the City Solicitor to inform the objectors accordingly.

### **1 Purpose of this report**

- 1.1 To consider and overrule the objections received to Traffic Regulation, Movement Restriction (No.M12) Order 2014 relating to the provision of this restriction and proceed with the works.

### **2 Background information**

- 2.1 Through correspondence with Ward Members and members of the public and matters raised at the Whinmoor Community Forum, a number of complaints were lodged regarding the volume of heavy goods vehicles using Coal Road, Red Hall Lane and Skeltons Lane through the residential area of Whinmoor.
- 2.2 Following on from the complaints received, an investigation took place into the problems. Traffic, speed, volume and classification surveys were undertaken, which showed a total of 381 Heavy goods vehicles (HGV's) using Red Hall Lane, 314 HGV's using Coal Road and 135 HGV's using Skeltons Lane over a 24 hour period, primarily to gain access to the local industrial estate. It was deemed that the best course of action would be to discourage HGV's from using the local residential roads and to force them back onto the adjacent primary routes of the A58, A6120 and the A64 by means of introducing a Traffic Regulation Order to restrict HGV movement in the Whinmoor area.
- 2.3 In August 2014 a report was approved (Design & Cost Report for Traffic Management 2014/2015) which requested approval to advertise the Traffic Regulation, Movement Restriction (No.M12) Order 2014 item 77.
- 2.4 Objections have been received following the advertisement of the Traffic Regulation Order in October 2014, two residents have objected.

### **3 Main issues**

### **3.1 Design Proposals and Full Scheme Description.**

- 3.1.1 In order to resolve the large amount of heavy goods vehicles using the residential roads we proposed to introduce a 7.5 tonne maximum gross weight limit, Movement Restriction Order on the Whinmoor Area.
- 3.1.2 Extents of the advertised restriction are shown on drawing number TM/11/1/123/6.
- 3.1.3 The objective of the scheme is to eliminate the effect of heavy goods vehicles on the residential area of Whinmoor by restricting the movement of this class of vehicle.

## **4 Corporate Considerations**

### **4.1 Consultation and Engagement**

- 4.1.1 Ward Members; Ward Members were consulted by email in May 2014. Ward Members were in favour of the Traffic Regulation; Movement Restriction (No.M12) Order 2014.
- 4.1.2 Emergency Services and the West Yorkshire Combined Authority; The Emergency Services and West Yorkshire Combined Authority were consulted as part of the initial consultation in May 2014. No adverse comments were received.
- 4.1.3 Public; the residents who are situated in the area directly affected were consulted initially before public advertisement on 13 May 2014. Public advertisements of the Traffic Regulation; Movement Restriction (No.M12) Order 2014 were placed on site between the 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014 and 31<sup>st</sup> October 2014. Most responses which were received during the consultation period showed in principle their support for the scheme. Two residents objected to the proposals.

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

An Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Screening has been carried out on the proposals and has determined that an impact assessment is not required for the approvals requested. The screening is attached as an appendix to this report.

The screening process identified the following positive impacts:

#### Positive Impacts

- The restriction will reduce HGV's entering an area of high pedestrian activity, therefore creating a safer environment for all residents, in particular children who may not be able to see other motorists due to the size of the HGV vehicles.
- The restriction will reduce HGV's within the area and therefore reduce traffic flow, this will benefit the visually impaired by reducing visual intrusion.

- Local environment and amenities will be more accessible to the elderly, disabled, carers and residents by reducing larger vehicular movement on the residential roads.

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

4.3.1 Environmental Policy; the proposals contained in 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 The proposal contributes to the policies in the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 2011-26 as follows: P18. Improve safety and security, seeking to minimise transport casualties.

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 The total cost to implement the scheme is £21,000 which comprises of £16,000 works, £3,500 staff and £1,500 legal costs all to funded from the Traffic Management Capital Budget.

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

4.5.1 The scheme is in the Annual Programme and subject to resolving any objections received and is anticipated to be completed during the 2014/2015 financial year.

### **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 within this report.

## **5 Conclusions**

5.1 It is believed that the proposals will benefit local road safety and residents within the Whinmoor area. The residential roads will be free of Heavy Goods Vehicles assisting the free flow and safe movement of traffic on the network.

## **6 Recommendations**

6.1 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to;

- i) note the contents of this report;
- ii) consider and overrule the objections to the Traffic Regulation, Movement Restriction (No.M12) Order 2014 relating to the provision of this restriction as shown on drawing number TM/11/1/123/6; and
- iii) request the City Solicitor to inform the objectors accordingly.

## **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: Highway services</b>	<b>Service area: Traffic Management</b>
<b>Lead person: Andy Magee</b>	<b>Contact number: 0113 2477534</b>

<b>1. Title: Site 16 Coal Road/ Redhall lane/ Skelton Lane – HGV restrictions</b>
Is this a:
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy / Policy</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>/</b> <input 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>
<p>6      The screening focuses on the report seeking authority to overrule objections received to Traffic Regulation, Movement Restriction (No.M12) Order 2014 relating to the provision of this restriction and proceed with the works. There has been a long standing campaign to restrict HGV access along residential routes of Coal Road, Redhall Lane and Skelton Lane to encourage/ force HGV to use the primary route network of the A58 and A6120, rather than the short cut through these residential routes.</p>

<p><b>3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration</b>          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.</p>
--

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 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>		✓

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
<p>If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.</p> <p>Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration?</b> (<b>think about</b> 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)</li> </ul> <p>Consultation has taken place with Ward Members, the emergency services and West Yorkshire Combined Authority. No objections have been received from them. Consultation has also been carried out to all of the residents directly affected by the restriction. Most residents expressed their support for the proposals. 2 objections have been received.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Key findings</b></li> </ul>

<p>Positive Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The restriction will reduce HGV's entering an area of high pedestrian activity, therefore creating a safer environment for all residents, in particular children who may not be able to see other motorists due to the size of the HGV vehicles.</li> <li>• The restriction will reduce HGV's within the area and therefore reduce traffic flow, this will benefit the visually impaired by reducing visual intrusion.</li> <li>• Local environment and amenities will be more accessible to the elderly, disabled, carers and residents by reducing larger vehicular movement on the residential roads.</li> </ul> <p><b>(think about</b> 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)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Actions</b> <b>(think about</b> how you will promote positive impact and remove/ reduce negative impact)</li> </ul>

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

<p><b>6. Governance, ownership and approval</b> Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening</p>		
<b>Name</b>	<b>Job title</b>	<b>Date</b>
Nick Borrás	Senior Engineer	23/01/2015

<p><b>7. Publishing</b> 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.</p> <p>If this screening relates to a <b>Key Delegated Decision, Executive Board, full Council</b> or a <b>Significant Operational Decision</b> a copy should be emailed to Corporate Governance and will be published along with the relevant report.</p> <p>A copy of <b>all other</b> screenings should be sent to <a href="mailto:equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk">equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk</a>. For record keeping purposes it will be kept on file (but not published).</p>	
<b>Date screening completed</b>	
If relates to a Key Decision - <b>date sent to Corporate Governance</b>	23/01/2015
Any other decision – <b>date sent to Equality Team</b>	



**(equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk)**

## Appendix 2 – Whinmoor Area HGV Restrictions

<b>Details of Objection</b>	<b>Number of Objectors</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>
<p>The introduction of the restriction within the Whinmoor area, particularly on Red Hall Lane will increase the amount of Vehicular movement at the Red Hall Lane/A58 junction. With residents having the view that the increased vehicular traffic will have a direct impact on road safety at this junction.</p>	2	<p>The restriction will divert Heavy Goods Vehicles to the A58 Wetherby Road, this is an 'A' class road that is specifically designed to facilitate strategic movement of all classes of vehicle, which currently facilitates approximately 15,000 vehicles per day. Surveys have shown there will be an increase of 295 HGV's per day, which equates to about 13 additional movements per hour (less than 2%). The effects of this are likely to be negligible considering the overall volume of traffic. Accident records for this junction show that within the past 5 years 6 accidents have occurred 5 out of 6 are considered to be 'slight' and one having a rating of 'serious'.</p>