

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

**Date: 31 March 2015**

**Subject: 2015 Guiseley and Rawdon Traffic Scheme**

**Capital Scheme Number: 32263**

Are specific electoral Wards affected?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Guiseley and Rawdon		
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?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number:		
Appendix number:		

## 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. By enhancing the local residential environments through removing indiscriminate and obstructive parking, this will result in a safer and more user friendly road environment for all road users. By improving the local road environment, this will actively encourage children into more active modes of travel on journeys 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 a contribution to 'Public Health, which is embedded and effectively delivering health protection and health improvement.
- 2 This report seeks authority to advertise and implement amendments to the Guiseley and Rawdon Ward Traffic Regulation Consolidation Order (No.W25) 2014, Leeds City Council (Off-Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2010 and Leeds City Council (Speed Limit) (No.15) Order 2013 in the Guiseley and Rawdon area of Leeds, following a Section 106 Agreement between Leeds City Council and a developer that stipulates a Traffic Regulation Order be implemented in the area to address individual parking concerns. The proposals are the result of issues raised

by the Ward Members, local residents and Leeds City Councils Parking Services section and look to address those concerns.

## **Recommendations**

- 3 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:
- i) Authorise the detailed design and subsequent implementation of a scheme in the Guiseley and Rawdon Ward, as shown on drawings TMW-15-1-1972\_01b and TMW-15-1-1972\_01b (2) to introduce a series of waiting restrictions on roads within the Guiseley and Rawdon area, a limited waiting provision within Springfield Road public car park (Guiseley) and a 20mph speed limit on Victoria Road, Guiseley, as an extension of the existing 20mph zone in the area, at a cost of £10,000;
  - ii) Inject £10,000 into the Capital Programme funded from a Section 106 private developer receipt;
  - iii) Give authority to incur expenditure of £6,000 works and legal advertisement costs and £4,000 staff fee costs fully funded from a Section 106 private developer receipt;
  - iv) Instruct the City Solicitor to:
    - a) Advertise amendments to the Guiseley and Rawdon Ward Traffic Regulation Consolidation Order (No.W25) 2014, Leeds City Council (Off-Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2010 and Leeds City Council (Speed Limit) (No.15) Order 2013 to include the full length of Victoria Road, as described in section 3.2; and
    - b) Should no valid objections be received, make and seal the various Amendment Orders as advertised.

## **1 Purpose of this report**

- 1.1 This report seeks authority to advertise and implement a Traffic Regulation Order, a Parking Places Order and an amendment to an existing Speed Limit Order in the Guiseley and Rawdon area of Leeds, following a Section 106 Agreement between Leeds City Council and a developer that stipulates a Traffic Regulation Order be implemented in the area to address individual parking concerns. The proposals are the result of issues raised by the Ward Members, local residents and Leeds City Councils Parking Services section and look to address those concerns.

## **2 Background information**

- 2.1 Leeds City Council entered an agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to undertake the implementation of a series of highway works in the area that are implementable by the means of a Traffic Regulation Order.

- 2.2 However prior to the development commencing on site and funding becoming available a series of restriction were introduced to formalise parking along Springfield Road, adjacent to the development to alleviate residents and ward member concerns. These costs were initially incurred by Leeds City Council.

The Section 106 Agreement stipulates that the Council will implement a Traffic Regulation Order in the vicinity of the development in the interest of road safety. However due to the fact that this work was accelerated to appease local concerns, this S106 contribution is now assigned to make minor amendments to an area wide TRO.

- 2.3 Over the past twelve months the Council has been in receipt of complaints and queries regarding a variety of parking issues within the Guiseley and Rawdon area and those which, following investigation, it is considered require action have been included within this scheme and described in section 3.
- 2.4 A report was presented to the Chief Officer Highways and Transportation dated 30 September 2014 regarding a proposed series of highway safety improvements for the A65 Otley Road, Oxford Road and Victoria Road junction in Guiseley. Following the consultation undertaken as part of that scheme, a number of requests were received to reduce the speed limit to 20mph.

### **3 Main issues**

- 3.1.1 Over a period of 12 months, Leeds City Council has collated a list of issues that it deems require remedial action in the form of waiting restrictions.
- 3.1.2 The issues are centred around areas where the free flow of traffic is restricted due to parked vehicles, accessibility issues caused by parked vehicles and highway safety concerns that would benefit from the introduction of parking restrictions. These are detailed in section 3.2.

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

- 3.2.1 The proposals contain eleven areas of concern and these will be listed below with their relevant proposals.
- 3.2.1.1 **A65 Otley Road, Back Lane, Ings Lane, Guiseley:** To remediate the issues found on this section of A65 Otley Road that are the result of parked vehicles preventing the free flow of traffic and preventing safe accessibility to Guiseley Cricket Club, sections of 'No waiting at any time' and 'No waiting Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm' are proposed to be implemented. The junctions of Back Lane and Ings Lane with A65 Otley Road are also proposed to be covered by lengths of 'No waiting at any time' to ensure vehicles can use the junction safely. To mitigate displacement of parked vehicles, improvements to signage directing traffic to the currently underused, free long-stay car park on Ings Crescent will be provided.
- 3.2.1.2 **The Cavendish's/ Victoria Road, Guiseley:** Following complaint from residents in the area regarding commuter parking affecting their ability to

park and also concerns over visibility at the junction of Victoria Road with Cavendish Road, it is proposed to implement lengths of on-street parking 'Monday to Saturday 8am-6pm, 2 hours, no return within 2 hours except for residents' and 'No waiting at any time' on sections of Cavendish Road and Victoria Road; implement lengths of 'No waiting at any time' to protect the junctions of Cavendish Road with Back Lane, Cavendish Drive and Carrington Terrace, Victoria Road with Back Cavendish Road, Back Park Road and Park Road with Carrington Terrace. It is also proposed to implement a 'Residents Only Permit Zone' on Back Carr Terrace, Back Cavendish Road, Back Park Road, Carrington Terrace and Cavendish Drive. Following consultation undertaken as part of a previously approved road safety scheme for the A65 Otley Road/ Oxford Road/ Victoria Road junction, a number of queries were received with regards to the possibility of reducing the speed limit on Victoria Road from 30mph to 20mph. As the recently introduced 'Back Lane' 20mph zone abuts Victoria Road and through evidence collected via a speed and volume survey, it is proposed to reduce the speed limit to 20mph for the reasons outlined in paragraph 4.3.2 below.

#### 3.2.1.3

**Springfield Road Car Park, Guiseley: Springfield Road Car Park, Guiseley:** Parking Services have requested that, as part of this wider scheme, a Parking Places Order be implemented on Springfield Road Car Park to ensure that all day commuter parking is prevented and encouraged to use the recently constructed free long stay car park on Netherfield Road. The restriction will also make sure that the car park is accessible for residents and visitors to Guiseley can make use of the facility to access local amenities. It is proposed to implement a general 'Monday to Saturday, 8am to 6pm, 3 hours no return within 3 hours' restriction, with a small section, numbering six spaces, be made out for 'Monday to Saturday, 8am to 6pm, 30 minutes no return within 3 hours'.

#### 3.2.1.4

**St. Oswald's Terrace/ The Green, Guiseley:** Following complaint from residents regarding all day parking, church related parking and school related parking affecting their ability to park in the vicinity of their properties, it is proposed to implement a length of '8am-6pm 2 hours, no return within 2 hours, except for permit holders' to alleviate this issue whilst still providing short term parking provision. The restriction shall be valid for all seven days, due to complaint over long stay parking associated with the nearby church. The implementation of a 2 hour provision for non-residents is seen as a mitigating factor to still allow provision for the Church and those requiring a longer period of waiting will be accommodated by other provision in the nearby area.

#### 3.2.1.5

**Main Street, Hawksworth:** Following complaints from residents over problems with accessibility to driveways and to Dean Lane as a result of school related traffic and particularly due to events and extra-curricular activities at Hawksworth Primary School causing this issue to extend outside the usual morning and afternoon periods, it is proposed to implement two lengths of 'No waiting at any time' to ensure accessibility.

- 3.2.1.6 **Queen Street and Salisbury Street, Rawdon:** Following complaint of non-resident parking from nearby businesses on these narrow streets, where many residents have no off-street parking provision, it is proposed to introduce 'Residents Only Permit Parking Monday to Friday 8am to 5pm'.
- 3.2.1.7 **Micklefield Road, Rawdon:** Following complaints received by the Council with regards to parking encompassing the entire north section of Micklefield Road and thus reducing both visibility of oncoming vehicles and their ability to pass one another, it is proposed to implement lengths of 'No waiting at any time' to create visibility at junctions and also a passing place for vehicles. It is believed that the small amount of displaced traffic can be accommodated by on-street provision on Micklefield Lane.
- 3.2.1.8 **Canada Road/ Larkfield Road, Rawdon:** Following a query received from a local Ward Member, specifically concerning parking on the southbound lane of Canada Road/ Larkfield Road causing vehicles to use the opposing lane on the approach to a blind crest, it is proposed to implement a length of 'No waiting at any time' to ensure that southbound vehicles can use their lane as appropriate.
- 3.2.1.9 **A65 New Road Side/ Low Fold, Rawdon:** Following complaint from residents of Low Fold it is proposed to implement a length of 'No waiting at any time' to ensure that the access from A65 New Road Side to Low Fold is maintained and that visibility at the junction is improved.
- 3.2.1.10 **Westfield Estate, Yeadon:** Following complaint from residents regarding school related parking, it is proposed to implement lengths of 'No waiting at any time' to cover the junctions of Old Whack House Lane with West Lea Crescent, Westfield Grove and an unnamed road between numbers 12 and 14 Westfield Avenue and to protect the accesses of 58 and 60 Westfield Avenue, the accesses of which emerge onto Old Whack House Lane. It is also proposed to adjust the existing school keep clear markings to within the regulatory lengths and formalise these with a 'No Stopping on entrance markings' restriction, initially proposed to be enacted Monday to Friday, 8am to 5pm, subject to consultation with the schools in question. Where the amendment of these markings leaves space, a 'No waiting at any time' restriction shall be implemented.
- 3.2.1.11 **A65 Otley Road, Guiseley:** Outside the access to property number 120, following complaint from the resident that on-street parking associated with local amenities regularly prevents access to and from the property, it is proposed to provide a length of 'No waiting at any time' to ensure access is maintained.
- 3.2.1.12 **Bradford Road – Guiseley:-** Introduction of some form of waiting restriction subject to consultation to restriction parking outside and in the vicinity of Farnells to ensure access and the free flow of traffic is maintained.

- 3.2.2 All of the above issues and their relevant proposals described in paragraphs 3.2.1.1 to 3.2.1.11 have been carefully considered as, where possible, to cause minimal displacement of parking that would adversely affect other areas.

## **4 Corporate Considerations**

### **4.1 Consultation and Engagement**

- 4.1.1 A meeting was held between officers and Ward Members, date 12 December 2014 to present the proposals. Subsequently and following clarification of various points all Ward members has confirm their support for the proposals.
- 4.1.2 The Emergency Services and the West Yorkshire Combined Authority were consulted via email date 20 January. An indication of no objection was received from all the concerned parties.
- 4.1.3 As part of the formal public advertisement process, a notice will be placed in the Yorkshire Post newspaper and notices detailing the proposals will be installed on lighting columns in the affected area.

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

- 4.3.1 An Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration screening has been undertaken and identified that a full impact assessment is not required. An Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Impact Assessment has been previously carried out for the implementation of 20mph speed limits and zones, the impacts of which are included within this report.

#### **4.3.2 Positive Impacts:**

- The scheme introduces parking restrictions which eliminate parking at potentially hazardous locations in the Guiseley and Rawdon area and those areas around junctions where accessibility and visibility is currently reduced. This ensures that road users can proceed in a safe manner, which is to the benefit of themselves, other road users and also pedestrians in the vicinity, particularly at junctions.
- Crossing points are always available for pedestrians where the desire to cross exists and where suitable provision has been specifically provided. This provides a safer environment for all pedestrians, especially parents with young children, people with mobility issues and the infirm.

Making 20mph the normal speed limit on Victoria Road would:

- Complement the recently introduced 'Back Lane' 20mph zone in Guiseley and enhances the benefits brought by that speed limit, as detailed in the report presented to highways board date 28 June 2013.
- Provide safer passage whilst crossing the road to all pedestrians, provide greater independence for children travelling to school whilst dramatically increasing the chances of survival if hit by a car to 97%.

- Make Victoria Road more pleasant to walk and cycle which will encourage a more healthy lifestyle, whilst reducing pollution and noise for the local community.

#### 4.3.3 Negative Impact

- A consequence of the implementation of parking restrictions is that parking will displace to new locations, which cannot be determined until the restrictions have been implemented. This may have a negative effect on the accessibility for road users and/or pedestrians at a separate location. Any such issues that arise following this displacement can be considered as part of a new scheme, moving forward. Furthermore, parking that currently takes place on The Green outside St. Oswalds Terrace associated with the church, may be impacted by the implementation of a resident permit parking scheme. An attempt to mitigate this has been undertaken by the implementation of a 2 hour exemption for non-residents to park. Furthermore, it is also noted that there is further acceptable parking provision in the area, such as Church Street.
- There is a potential that there may be a small increase in journey times for road users, along with the perceived increase in congestion due to slower vehicle movements. It is considered, however, that the increase in safety for both road users and pedestrians as a result of lower speeds will mitigate against the small increase in journey times.

#### 4.4 Council Policies and City Priorities

4.4.1 The proposals contained in the report have no implications for the council constitution.

4.4.2 Local Transport Plan 3: **Strategic Approaches:**  
**Connectivity:** P18. Improve safety and security  
 P22. Develop networks and facilities to encourage cycling and walking.

#### 4.5 Resources and Value for Money

4.5.1 The estimated cost of the scheme at present is £10,000, broken down as approximately £4,000 staff fee costs and £6,000 works costs and legal advertisement costs. This is to be funded by a private developer who has paid £10,000 to Leeds City Council via a Section 106 agreement for the introduction of the Traffic Regulation Orders and in the event of there being a sum of money not expended upon completion of the scheme, then this will be returned to the private developer, as stipulated within the Section 106 agreement.

#### 4.5.2 Capital Funding and Cashflow :

<b>Funding Approval :</b>	<b>Capital Section Reference Number :-</b>						
<b>Previous total Authority to Spend on this scheme</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>TO MARCH</b>	<b>FORECAST</b>				
	<b>£000's</b>	<b>2014 £000's</b>	<b>2014/15 £000's</b>	<b>2015/16 £000's</b>	<b>2016/17 £000's</b>	<b>2017/18 £000's</b>	<b>2018 on £000's</b>
LAND (1)	0.0						
CONSTRUCTION (3)	0.0						
FURN & EQPT (5)	0.0						
DESIGN FEES (6)	0.0						
OTHER COSTS (7)	0.0						
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Authority to Spend required for this Approval</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>TO MARCH</b>	<b>FORECAST</b>				
	<b>£000's</b>	<b>2014 £000's</b>	<b>2014/15 £000's</b>	<b>2015/16 £000's</b>	<b>2016/17 £000's</b>	<b>2017/18 £000's</b>	<b>2018 on £000's</b>
LAND (1)	0.0						
CONSTRUCTION (3)	6.0			6.0			
FURN & EQPT (5)	0.0						
DESIGN FEES (6)	4.0		2.0	2.0			
OTHER COSTS (7)	0.0						
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Total overall Funding (As per latest Capital Programme)</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>TO MARCH</b>	<b>FORECAST</b>				
	<b>£000's</b>	<b>2014 £000's</b>	<b>2014/15 £000's</b>	<b>2015/16 £000's</b>	<b>2016/17 £000's</b>	<b>2017/18 £000's</b>	<b>2018 on £000's</b>
Section 106 / 278	10.0		2.0	8.0			
Total Funding	10.0	0.0	2.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Balance / Shortfall =</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

#### 4.6 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

- 4.6.1 There are no specific legal implications included within this report, nor is any information contained within the report to be deemed confidential. The scheme is expected to be complete within the 2015/2016 financial year.

#### 4.7 Risk Management

- 4.7.1 There are no risk issues, over and above those expected when working in the public highway, generated by the proposals contained within this report. The implementation of the scheme will mitigate any potential risk caused by overspill parking caused by the new development onto immediate areas of the public highway.

### 5 Conclusions

- 5.1 It considered appropriate to introduce amendments to both the Guiseley and Rawdon Ward Traffic Regulation Consolidation Order (No.W25) 2014 on various roads within the Guiseley and Rawdon ward; and also Leeds City Council (Off-



Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2010 to incorporate Springfield Car Park. These amendments will provide accessibility, visibility benefits as well as aiding the turnover of traffic in certain areas which will be to the benefit of commercial premises within the area of those restrictions. It is also considered appropriate to introduce an amendment to Leeds City Council (Speed Limit) (No.15) Order 2013, to incorporate Victoria Road, which will benefit the residents and also the pedestrians on Victoria Road through a reduction in speed.

## **6 Recommendations**

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

- i) Authorise the detailed design and subsequent implementation of a scheme in the Guiseley and Rawdon Ward, as shown on drawing TMW-15-1-1972\_01b and TMW-15-1-1972\_01b (2), to introduce a series of waiting restrictions on roads within the Guiseley and Rawdon area and Springfield Car Park and also a 20mph speed limit on Victoria Road, as an extension of the existing 20mph zone in the area, at a cost of £10,000;
- ii) Inject £10,000 into the Capital Programme funded from a Section 106 private developer receipt;
- iii) Give authority to incur expenditure of £6,000 works and legal advertisement costs and £4,000 staff fee costs fully funded from a Section 106 private developer receipt;
- iv) Instruct the City Solicitor to :
  - a) Advertise amendments to the Guiseley and Rawdon Ward Traffic Regulation Consolidation Order (No.W25) 2014, Leeds City Council (Off-Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2010 and Leeds City Council (Speed Limit) (No.15) Order 2013; and
  - b) Should no valid objections be received, make and seal the Amendment Orders as advertised.

## **7 Background Documents**

7.1 Initial consultation letter to Ward Members;

7.2 Initial consultation letter to Emergency Services and Combined Authority

## 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: Traffic Management</b>
<b>Lead person: Jonathan Waters</b>	<b>Contact number: 39 50654</b>

<b>1. Title: 2015 GUISELEY AND RAWDON TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER</b>		
Is this a:		
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy / Policy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Service / Function</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other</b>
<b>If other, please specify</b>		

<b>2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening</b>
This screening report focuses on a report presented at highways board, which seeks authority to advertise and implement a Traffic Regulation Order and an amendment to an existing Speed Limit Order in the Guiseley and Rawdon area of Leeds.

<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.  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).		
<b>Questions</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
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**

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 on the proposals has taken place with the following stakeholders:

- Local Councillors
- Emergency Services (Police, West Yorkshire Fire and Ambulances Services)
- Metro
- Local Residents where affected.

Formal advertisement in the form of an advert in the Yorkshire Post, along with notices posted on lighting columns in the area will take place prior to scheme implementation. Any objections received will be considered prior to taking the scheme forward and where not withdrawn following dialogue with the objector(s), will be presented to the Chief Officer Highways and Transportation at highways board, for his consideration.

• **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:

- The scheme introduces parking restrictions which eliminate parking at potentially hazardous locations in the Guiseley and Rawdon area and those areas around junctions where accessibility and visibility is currently reduced. This ensures that road users can proceed in a safe manner, which is to the benefit of themselves, other road users and also pedestrians in the vicinity, particularly at junctions.
- Crossing points are always available for pedestrians where the desire to cross exists and where suitable provision has been specifically provided. This provides a safer environment for all pedestrians, especially parents with young children, people with mobility issues and the infirm.

Making 20mph the normal speed limit on Victoria Road would:

- Complement the recently introduced 'Back Lane' 20mph zone in Guiseley and enhances the benefits brought by that speed limit, as detailed in the report presented to highways board date 28 June 2013.
- Provide safer passage whilst crossing the road to all pedestrians, provide greater independence for children travelling to school whilst dramatically increasing the chances of survival if hit by a car to 97%.
- Make Victoria Road more pleasant to walk and cycle which will encourage a more healthy lifestyle, whilst reducing pollution and noise for the local community.

#### Negative Impact

- A consequence of the implementation of parking restrictions is that parking will displace to new locations, which cannot be determined until the restrictions have been implemented. This may have a negative effect on the accessibility for road users and/or pedestrians at a separate location. Any such issues that arise following this displacement can be considered as part of a new scheme, moving forward. Furthermore, parking that currently takes place on The Green outside St. Oswalds Terrace associated with the church, may be impacted by the implementation of a resident permit parking scheme. An attempt to mitigate this has been undertaken by the implementation of a 2 hour exemption for non-residents to park. Furthermore, it is also noted that there is further acceptable parking provision in the area, such as Church Street.
- There is a potential that there may be a small increase in journey times for road users is expected, along with the perceived increase in congestion due to slower vehicle movements. It should also be considered that the increase in safety for both road users and pedestrians as a result of lower speeds will mitigate against the small increase in journey times.

- **Actions**

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

The Traffic Regulation Order, Parking Place Order and Speed Limit Order shall be monitored post-implementation for their effectiveness and also their impact on parents, carers, those with mobility issues, the infirm and also those who frequent the Church on The Green. Should any overriding issues become apparent, then these can be investigated and mitigated and a later date.

**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

<b>6. Governance, ownership and approval</b>		
Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening		
<b>Name</b>	<b>Job title</b>	<b>Date</b>
Nick Hunt	Principal Engineer	3/2/15

<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.	
Please send a copy to the Equality Team for publishing	
<b>Date screening completed</b>	3/2/15
<b>Date sent to Equality Team</b>	
<b>Date published</b> (To be completed by the Equality Team)	