

Report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation)

Date: 7th July 2015

Subject: Design & Cost Report for Traffic Management Capital Programme 2015/16

Capital Scheme Number : 16762 / 000 / 000

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> No

Summary of main issues

1. One of the key objectives of the Best Council Plan is to ‘promote sustainable and inclusive economic growth’ through delivering key infrastructure projects. The projects within this report address several key concerns relating primarily to address local traffic issues including parking and the provision of a safer environment for the general public and will contribute towards the Council’s goal to reduce the numbers of people killed or seriously injured on the city’s roads.
2. This report is aimed at supporting the Council’s Best Council objective ‘becoming an efficient and enterprising council’, in that this report continues the change in our approach to report and deliver schemes within the Traffic Management Capital Programme.
3. The aim of this report is to adopt and approved last year’s initiative in the way schemes funded from the Traffic Management Capital Budget are reviewed and authorised by the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation). This approach enables authorisation of the annual programme in one holistic report, which is a more cost effective and economical way to deliver the programme and will minimise unnecessary delays in the process.
4. The purpose of the report is to agree a programme of works to deliver 13 schemes through the Traffic Capital Budget during the 2015-16 financial year as prioritised in appendix A and one reserve scheme currently unfunded but to be developed as a

contingency from the Traffic Management Capital Budget, to ensure full year spend is achieved.

5. This report seeks approval to agree and authorise the preparation and delivery of a programme of works to be funded from the Traffic Management Capital Budget for minor local traffic management improvement schemes from the 2015-6 financial year, through an improved and more efficient process.

Recommendations

6. The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:
 - i) review and approve the prioritised list of Traffic Management Capital projects to the sum of £235,000 as identified in Appendix A for the 2015/16 capital year allocation;
 - ii) approve the design, consultation and subject to the making of any necessary Traffic Regulation Orders the implementation of the approved programme of works as detailed in Appendix A;
 - iii) give authority and to request the City Solicitor to advertise any draft Traffic Regulation Orders as listed in Appendix A (Speed Limit Order, Movement Order, Waiting Restriction Order or Experimental Order) and advertise and display on site Notices pursuant to Section 90C of the Highways Act 1980 (traffic calming measures/features); Section 23 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (establishment of pedestrian crossings) and Section 63 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 (establishment of Hackney carriage stands) as required to address/ resolve the problems identified for each scheme and if no valid objections are received, to make, seal and implement the Orders and associated proposals as advertised;
 - iv) to receive such other further reports as may be needed to address any objections received to advertised Orders and Notices or any other matters arising from the detailed scheme proposals; and
 - v) give authority to incur expenditure of £235,000 inclusive of any legal fees, staff fees and works costs which will be funded entirely from the Traffic Management Capital Programme and to commence the detailed design, consultation and implementation of the schemes described in Appendix A.

1 Purpose of this report

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to seek approval for the annual programme of Traffic Management Capital Schemes and authorise the detailed development, consultation, preparation and delivery of these scheme subject to the satisfactory completion of any necessary Orders and statutory processes.

2 Background information

- 2.1 The Council's annual Capital Programme includes an allocation of funds for Traffic Management schemes. This annual programme is utilised to fund small scale minor traffic engineering works and Traffic Regulation Orders generally in local communities to address road safety, parking and related traffic issues.

2.2 Traffic management schemes follow a feasibility, consultation and legal process, the length of which is difficult to determine but can often be in excess 12 months. The current pattern of funding enables the council to accommodate uncertainties over timing of spend while still delivering schemes of local importance in a planned and prioritised manner.

2.3 The Traffic Management capital budget is complementary to an operational revenue budget for 2015-16 of £99,890 for implementation of minor works including signing, lining and TRO's corrections to ensure all parking restrictions are enforceable.

2.4 Traffic Management Capital budget 2014-15 year end and 2015/16 budget

2.4.1 The year-end out turn position is shown below. The 2014/15 'unallocated' carry over budget of £35,000 is surplus funding due to a number of reasons, such as:-

- Variance between initial estimates and current estimates / out turn costs have occurred as the scope of certain proposals has developed through design and consultation.
- Some proposals have been abandoned following feasibility or initial consultation.
- Alternative external funding may have been identified during the design year or
- Schemes have not progressed to approval within the financial year.

The 2014/15 carry over 'allocated to schemes' budget is calculated from schemes which have already been approved by the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) but have not incurred final account costs to date.

2014/15 Unspent carry over budget - "Unallocated"	£35,000
2014/15 Unspent carry over budget - "Allocated to schemes"	£40,400
2015/16 New Traffic Management Capital Budget injection	£200,000
Total budget 2015/16	£275.400

Available budget for 2015/16 new schemes prioritisation is therefore

$$(\text{£}35,000 + \text{£}200,000) = \text{£}235,000.$$

2.5 Scheme authorisation and reporting procedure.

2.5.1 As a minor schemes budget approval to Traffic Management scheme is delegated to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) who takes decisions by reference to the Highways and Transportation Board. The previous arrangements for reporting such schemes to the Highways and Transportation Board, often resulted in multiple reports for

individual schemes and is inefficient in terms of process and also the timely delivery of measures of importance to local communities. As such a review has been undertaken of the process in relation to the Council's financial regulations and constitution and this report reflects a simplified method of reporting which is designed to reduce inefficiency, whilst maintaining full consultation and compliance with the necessary statutory procedures.

2.5.2 This re-evaluation of the approval process which was trialled last year embodied by this report enabled schemes to be delivered more efficiently, reduced workload for Traffic Management, Finance and Administration Sections; helping to ensure that the committed expenditure is spent and that schemes are more reliably completed within the budgeted year.

2.5.3 Subject to the approval of this report, all schemes in the programme will be reviewed with the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) on a monthly basis at Highways and Transportation Board for consideration and approval. Where any scheme which results in objections (namely Traffic Regulation Orders/ Speed Limit Orders and Section 90C proposals) these will be reported back with recommendations to the Highways and Transportation for a formal decision by the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) as hitherto.

3 Main issues

3.1 Design Proposals and Full Scheme Description.

3.1.1 This report is seeking authority to take forward an agreed programme of Traffic Management schemes as detailed in Appendix B to this report. This section of the report therefore describes how this programme has been assembled.

3.1.2 Throughout the year, the Traffic Management Section receives a range of requests from Ward Members, local residents, the general public and businesses for action to address local traffic issues of concern. At the same time operational matters on the network become apparent which require remedial actions. All these issues are recorded and from this a list of schemes is assembled to be prioritised against the annual funding allocation. This year (2015/16) there have been a total of 80 schemes requested, where initial evaluation by Traffic Engineers has determined that remedial action is needed and supported.

3.1.3 To ensure value for money, some schemes in the same locality have been combined to save legal and advertisement costs which has resulted in the number of schemes fall from 80 sites to 65 identified schemes.

3.1.4 Each request has been assessed for their deliverability and for their general value for money in terms of being able to deliver realistic transport improvements. The schemes were also compared against the general aims of the overarching LTP transport themes in order to enable comparison to be made of the range of benefits of each scheme. (These

themes are Road Safety, Economic Growth, Sustainable Travel Choices, Congestion Issues and Equality of Accessibility).

3.1.5 **Where Schemes Originate:**

3.1.6 Schemes originate from a range of sources. Some schemes are promoted internally, e.g. in response to changes in the regulations which prescribe the detail of signage and road markings or following identification of a road safety risk. However most are initiated externally following representation from the public and business, generally backed by support from Elected Members, Parish Councils and other representative bodies.

3.1.7 The issues that the service is approached to resolve can be emotive in local communities and schemes are only progressed where the case is supported by evidence and research (parking patterns, traffic speeds, accident records etc) and has a sound, cost effective solution.

3.1.8 The Traffic Management capital budget fills the middle ground between the small traffic revenue schemes and the larger LTP budget schemes and is subject to increasing demands; this is partly due to other budgets being cut in real terms. More significant however, is the increasing public desire for solutions to localised problems associated with traffic volumes, speeds, accessibility and parking. The latter are often associated with commuter, business and shopper parking, especially around large traffic generators such as shopping centres, Universities and hospitals.

3.1.9 The outcome of supporting this report is a justifiable and evidenced scheme programme that is aimed at meeting the local communities expectation in relation to:-

- Supporting road safety
- Supporting business
- Encouraging community cohesion
- Enhancing quality of life for residents
- Supporting all highway users
- Making best use of the highway network

3.1.10 There are always many more issues identified than the allocated budget can support and so a points scoring system is used to rank the schemes in terms of their local benefits and effectiveness. This approach ensures that the localism agenda is embedded within the process and that schemes are developed in

accordance with local transport issues and priorities. The basic scoring categories cover the schemes impact in terms of:-

- Accident history and severity.
- The change in level of service to road users including pedestrians cyclists, public transport users and HGV impact; and
- Environmental impact.

3.1.11 Initial cost estimates have been prepared for those requests and a recommended prioritised list of schemes has been developed to enable schemes to be moved forward through design and consultation to implementation. Due to the limited funding available not all scheme requests are able to be supported at this time.

3.1.12 The prioritisation assessment has identified that 13 schemes and one reserve scheme can be delivered against the current £235,000 allocation for the 2015/16 budget year.

3.1.13 A copy of the prioritisation criteria and scoring system is attached as Appendix C.

3.2 Programme – Subject to approval being granted, it is proposed to design and consult on the schemes, advertise any related draft Traffic Regulation Orders and associated Notices and implement the works within the 2015/16 financial year.

4 Corporate Considerations

4.1 Consultation and Engagement

4.1.1 The majority of the schemes in the proposed programme have originated from local communities either from Ward Member, local residents or businesses. At this stage therefore the detail and prioritisation has been assembled with input from the relevant officers from the highway and transportation service disciplines, but as the works programme develops, consultation on individual projects will be carried out as appropriate.

4.1.2 Subject to approval of the programme each individual scheme will be subject to full consultation with Ward Members, local residents and businesses as appropriate prior to final detailed scheme being progressed. This will include any relevant statutory process, such as for Traffic Regulation Orders, where any objections received will be formally reported to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) for consideration. The Executive Member for Development has been consulted on the prioritisation methodology and proposed programme detailed herein and has approved this methodology... Ward Members are aware of the outcomes relating to proposals in their wards and the approved proposals have been published on the Council's website. The progress of the overall programme and each individual scheme will be monitored by the Chief Officer (Highways

and Transportation) and Heads of Service via a regular presentation/ update on a monthly basis at the either the Highways and Transportation Board and/or the Transtat meeting. This process covers scheme design, consultation, statutory process and project delivery.

4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

4.2.1 An Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Screening has been completed and indicated that an EIA was not required. Generalised positive and negative impacts have been identified but each individual scheme on the programme will require a specific EDCI screen and any issues will be presented to the members of the Highways and Transportation Board for consideration and approval.

- The installation of safety schemes including; traffic signals, pedestrian crossing facilities, speed limit changes and traffic calming schemes by the service has a positive effect on local communities, different age groups and the mobility impaired.
- Parking restrictions improve quality of life in streets of terraced properties, assist disabled parking, support access to businesses and reliability of public transport operations.

4.2.2 Negative Impacts

- Requests for schemes continue throughout the year however the service will be unable to deliver identified schemes within a reasonable timescale due to the budget restriction. This will have an adverse effect on the perception of the service and the council generally.

The negative impacts will be reduced/removed by:-

4.2.3 The introduction of this one year approval reporting process will ensure schemes can be delivered in a more efficient way and that better monitoring throughout the year can be undertaken to ensure schemes are delivered within the financial year.

4.2.4 A screening document will be prepared and an independent impact assessment will be completed for each project during the detailed design process as required. The screening document and/or the independent impact assessment once approved by the service will be sent to the Equality Team to be approved and publishing.

4.3 Council policies and City Priorities

4.3.1 Local Transport Plan: The proposals contained in this report are in accordance with Local Transport Plan 3 – Strategic Approaches:-

Travel Choice Connectivity	P10	Promote the benefits of active travel
	P18	Improve safety and security

P22 Develop networks and facilities to encourage cycling and walking.

4.3.2 Disability / Mobility: The schemes will provide a positive improvement to local residents by removing indiscriminate and obstructive parking which create road safety concerns. The schemes will also provide a safer environment for the general public.

4.4 Resources and value for money

4.4.1 Full scheme estimate

4.4.2 The cost to promote the 13 prioritised schemes from the Traffic Management Capital Budget 2015/16 is £235,000, which is split into the following categories:-

Works	£186,000
Staff Fees	£ 46,500
Legal Fees	£ 2,500

The £235,000 is fully funded from the Traffic Management Capital Programme, being £200,000 new budget in 2015/16 and £35,000 unused budget from 2014/15

4.4.3 Capital Funding and Cash Flow.

Complete the embedded table below:-

Funding Approval :	Capital Section Reference Number :-						
Previous total Authority to Spend on this scheme	TOTAL £000's	TO MARCH 2015 £000's	FORECAST				
			2015/16 £000's	2016/17 £000's	2017/18 £000's	2018/19 £000's	2019 on £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 required for this Approval	TOTAL £000's	TO MARCH 2015 £000's	FORECAST				
			2015/16 £000's	2016/17 £000's	2017/18 £000's	2018/19 £000's	2019 on £000's
LAND (1)	0.0						
CONSTRUCTION (3)	186.0		186.0				
FURN & EQPT (5)	0.0						
DESIGN FEES (6)	46.5		46.5				
OTHER COSTS (7)	2.5		2.5				
TOTALS	235.0	0.0	235.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total overall Funding (As per latest Capital Programme)	TOTAL £000's	TO MARCH 2015 £000's	FORECAST				
			2015/16 £000's	2016/17 £000's	2017/18 £000's	2018/19 £000's	2019 on £000's
LCC Supported Borrowing	235.0		235.0				
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	0.0						
SCE (C)	0.0						
SCE (R)	0.0						
Departmental USB	0.0						
Corporate USB	0.0						
Any Other Income (Specify)	0.0						
Total Funding	235.0	0.0	235.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Balance / Shortfall =	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Parent Scheme Number : 16762 / 000 / 000

Title : Traffic Management Capital Programme 2015/16

4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

4.5.1 A variety of Road Traffic Regulation Orders and Notices will be required to be promoted and advertised using the powers contained within the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984 together with other related statutory Notices using powers contained in the Highways Act 1980 and the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 .

4.6 Risk Management

4.6.1 This report is aimed to develop a new system for the approval and monitoring of Traffic Management Scheme to reduce the risk of not delivering the Traffic management Budget within the approved Financial Year.

4.6.2 Due to the nature of the schemes delivered via the Traffic Management budget, there is always the risk objections are received which can delay introduction, whilst resolution discussions are undertaken. Streamlining the process enables these expected delays to be monitored and programmed more efficiently.

5 Conclusions

- 5.1 The proposed Traffic Management Capital programme for 2015-16 consists of 13 priority schemes to the value of £235,000 designed to address key issues of local importance within local communities which have been selected on a prioritised basis from requests and issues identified during the previous 2014-15 financial year. The programme has been developed to maximise the best possible outcomes for road safety, businesses and communities from the allocated budget.
- 5.2 Approval to the development and delivery of the overall programme as detailed in this report will enable schemes to be delivered in a timely and efficient manner and will produce positive outcomes for road safety, businesses and communities. As with all schemes having a regulatory component all Orders will be consulted on a developed within the required statutory guidelines and process and where objections are received these will be formally considered by the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation).

6 Recommendations

- 6.1 The Chief Officer (Highways & Transportation) is requested to:
- i) review and approve the prioritised list of Traffic Management Capital projects to the sum of £235,000 as identified in Appendix A for the 2015/16 capital year allocation;
 - ii) approve the design, consultation and subject to the making of any necessary Traffic Regulation Orders the implementation of the approved programme of works as detailed in Appendix A;
 - iii) give authority and to request the City Solicitor to advertise any draft Traffic Regulation Orders as listed in Appendix A (Speed Limit Order, Movement Order, Waiting Restriction Order or Experimental Order) and advertise and display on site Notices pursuant to Section 90C of the Highways Act 1980 (traffic calming measures/features); Section 23 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (establishment of pedestrian crossings) and Section 63 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 (establishment of Hackney carriage stands) as required to address/ resolve the problems identified for each scheme and if no valid

objections are received, to make, seal and implement the Orders and associated proposals as advertised;

- iv) to receive such other further reports as may be needed to address any objections received to advertised Orders and Notices or any other matters arising from the detailed scheme proposals; and
- v) give authority to incur expenditure of £235,000 inclusive of any legal fees, staff fees and works costs which will be funded entirely from the Traffic Management Capital Programme and to commence the detailed design, consultation and implementation of the schemes described in Appendix A.

7 Background documents¹

6.1 Appendix A – Traffic Management Proposed Programme 2015-16

6.2 Appendix B - Traffic Management Scheme Works Description

¹ 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 A

Appendix A 2015/16 Wish list Priority sites 6th July 2015							
No	Location	Description of works	Requested By:-	Ward	Traffic Office	Estimated Costs	Comments
1	Lane End Place	Footway provision - Pedestrian (school) connectivity	various	Beeston & Holbeck	NBH	£25,000	match funding contribution
2	Merrion Place	Speed humps	Internal	City & Hunslet	NBH	£10,000	match funding contribution
3	Vicar Lane/ New Market Street	Measures to reduce Bus/ Pedestrian Conflict	WYCA	City & Hunslet	BV	£25,000	Partnership scheme with WYCA/ LCC/ First
4	Talbot Road / Lidgett Place	junction redesign	Member of the public	Roundhay	RAC	£35,000	LTP Match funding
5	Garnet Rd, Oakley Grove and surrounding streets	Change existing permit parking to facilitate short stay limited waiting during the day.	Businesses	Beeston & Holbeck	DOD	£5,000	District improvement scheme
6	Call Lane	footway widening and cycle provision	Police	City & Hunslet	NBH	£35,000	
7	Meanwood Road/ Cambridge Road	junction narrowing	Safety Audit	Hyde Park & Woodhouse	JB	£20,000	
8	Ellerby Road	TRO	Ward Member	Richmond Hill and Burmantofts	NH	£6,000	
9	A61 Harrogate Road/ King Lane	Island removal	SSEC	Chapel Allerton	NBH	£10,000	
10	Harewood Road - Collingham	islands and lining scheme	Ward Councillors	Harewood	CP	£20,000	
11	Morley Area TRO	Yellow Box marking provision	Member of the public	Morley	MD	£1,200	
12	Queensway	Removal and replacement of chicane	ward member	Otley & Yeadon	NBH	£15,000	match funding contribution
13	Chartist Way	splitter island improvement & Pedestrian refuge	Member of the public	Morley south	CW	£20,000	£235,000 - Cut off line
14	Beechwood Avenue	junction narrowing	Ward Councillors	Headingley	NBH	£18,000	reserve scheme

Appendix B

Site 1 Lane End Place – Footway linkage provision – Ward Beeston and Holbeck

The Issue:-

Elected ward members have over the last few years requested the provision of a 'missing' section of footway to link Holbeck Moor Road to the City and Holbeck Children's Centre and St Luke's Primary School. It has not been possible to facilitate these measures previously due to limit resources and therefore LTP match funding has been identified to provide the footway linkage at a total combined cost of £40,000. This is therefore Traffic management contribution towards the scheme.

What we propose:-

We seek authority for expenditure of £25,000 comprising of £20,000 works, £5,000 staff to design, build and supervise.

Recommendations:-

- Give authority to incur funding expenditure of £25,000 comprising of £16,000 works and £4,000 staff to design, build and supervise the provision of a new section of footway.

Site 2 Merrion Place – Traffic Calming provision – Ward City and Hunslet

The Issue:-

As part of a City Centre initiative Merrion Street was closed to through traffic between New Briggate and Vicar Lane to enhance the customer experience along this route. This partial pedestrianisation area has enables street café culture to be established, which has been hugely successful within the City Centre.

As part of the ongoing evaluation of the scheme as required as part of the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order it has been found the some traffic have transferred onto the minor narrow back route of Merrion Place at inappropriate speeds. To address this concern relating to inappropriate speed and to encourage vehicles to keep on the City Centre loop road to access Vicar Lane, it is proposed to introduce up to two traffic calming feature on Merrion Place.

What we propose:-

We seek authority for expenditure of £10,000 comprising of £7,000 works, £2,000 staff and £1,000 legal costs, to promote design, consult, advertise and implement up to two full width speed humps on Merrion Place:-

Recommendations:-

- Give authority to incur match funding expenditure of £10,000 comprising of £7,000 works, £2,000 staff and £1,000 legal costs (total scheme costs £35,000) to promote a scheme to introduce up to two full width speed humps.
- Give authority for the City Solicitor to advertise a 90c notice for the introduction of the vertical traffic calming measures and if no valid objections are received, to implement the proposals as advertised.

Site 3 Vicar Lane/ New Market Street - crossing upgrade. – Ward City and Hunslet

The issue:-

It has been identified that there is an ongoing injury accident problem at this location between buses and pedestrian and a series of interventions are now felt needed to reduce the number and severity of these accidents.

What we propose:-

We seek authority for expenditure of £25,000, comprising of £20,000 works and £5,000 staff fees to introduce a raised speed table at this junction to reduce vehicles speeds (particularly buses), to minimize the likelihood of further pedestrian/vehicle conflict incidents. It is also proposed as part of these works to upgrade the signing of the bus gate order, which requires alterations to the kerblines to ensure an enhanced bus gate sign can be located without obscuring pedestrian's visibility for approaching vehicles. It is also felt beneficial for the audible 'Caution Two Way Traffic' speakers to be reintroduced at this junction for offer further warning of the potential conflict point.

Recommendations:-

- Give authority to incur expenditure of £25,000, comprising of £20,000 works and £5,000 staff fees to amend the kerblines to ensure better and legally compliant signing of the bus gate order, the introduction of a speed table to assist the safe passage of pedestrian and the reintroduction of to this 'Caution two way traffic ahead' speakers' at the pedestrian crossing point.

Give authority for the City Solicitor to advertise a 90c notice for the introduction of the vertical traffic calming measures and if no valid objections are received, to implement the proposals as advertised

Site 4 Talbot Road/ Lidgett Place. – Ward Roundhay

The issue:-

This junction is particularly wide and is where five individual roads meet. The open aspect encourages inappropriate speeds and makes it difficult for pedestrian to cross. This intersection is used by a significant number of children who attend the local schools (Allerton Grange Secondary School, Talbot Primary School and Gledhow Primary School). Recent years has seen the severity of injury accident at this location increase, which resulted in recent years where a serious and fatal road collision was recorded. It has not been possible to facilitate these measures previously due to limit resource availability, however given the potential injury accident savings and the school agenda LTP match funding has been identified to provide this road safety scheme. This is therefore our contribution towards the scheme.

What we propose:-

To rationalize the layout to a more conventional approach which will provide a more formal road layout, remove driver uncertainty, reduced actual vehicular speeds and enable safer passage across the junction for pedestrian, particularly school children and the elderly. A speed table may also be incorporated into the design, subject to speed survey results.

Recommendations:-

- Give authority to incur expenditure of £35,000 match funding with LTP contribution, comprising of £30,000 works and £5,000 staff fees (total scheme cost is £70,000) to design, consult and implement a scheme to redesign the junction to reduce speed and improve pedestrian accessibility.

- Give authority for the City Solicitor to advertise a 90c notice for the introduction of the vertical traffic calming measures and if no valid objections are received, to implement the proposals as advertised

Site 5 Garnet Road, Oakley Grove area – Ward Beeston and Holbeck

The issue:-

In the past an area wide resident permit only parking scheme was introduced within the area. However in recent year's representations from the local ward members, business forum and community forum have stated that during the working day period these location are divorce from vehicles and this available public highway would be better serves to enable short stay parking to facilitate parking demands in the shopping area.

What we propose:-

To promote a Traffic Regulation Order within the area to amend the existing residents permit parking only to incorporate short stay limit waiting. Timescale to be determined as part of formal consultation but provision recommendation is for 'limited waiting 2hrs, no return within 2hrs – Monday to Saturday'.

Recommendations:-

- Give authority to incur expenditure of £5,000, comprising of £2,500 works, £1,500 staff and £1,000 legal costs to promote a Traffic Regulation Order.
- Request the City Solicitor to advertise a draft Traffic Regulation Order to enable better use of the adopted highway to better serve the wider community's needs, through the inclusion of 'limited waiting' provision of the existing resident permit parking areas and if no valid objections are received, to make, seal and implement the Order as advertised.

Site 6 Call Lane - Night Time economy road safety concerns. – Ward City and Hunslet

The issue:-

Concerns relating to road safety in the City Centre during the night time periods were brought to the attention of officer several years ago and a series of incremental measures have been introduced to address these concerns. The latest development was the introduction of a 'bus gate' which restricted vehicular access to buses and hackney carriage vehicles between the hours of 22:00hr and 05:30hr over the weekend periods, which is currently enforced via a static camera.

However due to the narrow pavement widths and the excessive carriageway width there appear to be an imbalance of allocated highway to what is currently offered to vehicular use and to that which is offered to the high volumes of pedestrian needs.

What we propose:-

We seek authority for expenditure of £35,000 comprising of £30,000 works, £4,500 staff and £1,000 legal costs, to promote a Traffic Regulation Order to remove the 4 bay and display bays on the western side of Call Lane and to widen the footways on both sides to in excess of 3m. This would still provide parking on the eastern side for 'loading, buses stops and hackney carriageway provision, whilst maintaining an unobstructed through route for vehicles. The narrowing of the carriageway would reduce in a reduction in vehicular speeds, whilst offering pedestrians, (particularly during the night time economy periods) a much safer and less confided appealing space. As part of the consultation it is also considered to introduce some form of vertical traffic calming feature to ensure inappropriate speeds are not observed.

Recommendations:-

- Give authority to incur expenditure of £30,000 comprising of £24,000 works, £4,500 staff and £1,500 legal costs to promote a Traffic Regulation Order.
- Request the City Solicitor to advertise a draft Traffic Regulation Order to restrict parking on the western side of Call Lane and if no valid objections are received, to make, seal and implement the Order as advertised.
- Request the City Solicitor to advertise a draft Movement Order to prohibit the right turn movement from Duncan Street into Call lane (if further investigation and feasibility justifies) and if no valid objections are received, to make, seal and implement the Order as advertised.
- Give authority for the City Solicitor to advertise a 90c notice for the introduction of the vertical traffic calming measures and if no valid objections are received, to implement the proposals as advertised

Site 7 Meanwood Road/ Cambridge Road – Ward Hyde Park and Woodhouse***The issue:-***

It has been identified by colleagues within Accident studies that there is a cluster of recorded injury accidents at this location, which could be resolved through small scale engineering intervention.

10 accidents were recorded during the 2009 to 2013 period and in more recently there were 5 accidents recorded in 2013. The pattern of collisions relate to emerging right turn conflicts with pedal and motorcycles being hit, many having occurred during evening peak period. A further 3 accidents have occurred in 2014, with all 3 fitting this pattern.

What we propose:-

We seek authority for expenditure of £20,000, comprising of £16,000 works and £4,000 staff to design and implement a scheme which narrows the junction mouth, provides a central junction island to assist pedestrian passage and the introduction of an enhanced dedicated cycle lane along this route.

Recommendations:-

- Give authority to incur expenditure of £20,000, comprising of £16,000 works and £4,000 staff to design, consult and implement a scheme which narrows the excessively wide junction mouth, enhances pedestrian accessibility provision, whilst addressing the primary injury accident collision pattern, through the introduction of an advisory cycle lane.

Site 8 Ellerby Road – TRO – Ward Burmantofts and Richmond Hill***The issue:-***

Elected ward members have over the last few years requested traffic management intervention in the form of Traffic Regulations Orders to remove indiscriminate and obstructive parking at several locations within the ward. It is not financially viable to promote a separate Traffic Regulation Order for such small scale works, namely junction protections with 'No Waiting At Any Time' restrictions on an individual basis. It is also proposed in the interest of a cost saving opportunity to advertise and implement on site some disabled parking bays along Harehills Lane near the shopping areas.

We have therefore packaged these numerous requests into one area based scheme to promote a Traffic Regulation Order, which enables a holistic approach to be taken and ensure value for money.

What we propose:-

We seek authority for expenditure of £6,000, comprising of £3,000 works, £2,000 staff and £1,000 legal costs, to promote a Traffic Regulation Order on the following primary streets within the Burmantofts and Richmond Hill ward:-

Ellerby Road, Accommodation Road, Nippet Lane, Upper Accommodation Road and Harehills Lane; and any other roads identified during the consultation exercise which engineers feel are justified.

Recommendations:-

- Give authority to incur expenditure of £6,000, comprising of £3,000 works, £2,000 staff and £1,000 legal costs to promote a Traffic Regulation Order.
- Request the City Solicitor to advertise a draft Traffic Regulation Order to remove indiscriminate and obstructive parking and if no valid objections are received, to make, seal and implement the Order as advertised.

Site 9 A61 Harrogate Road/ King Lane island removal. Ward – Chapel Allerton

The issue:-

A request has been via SSEC and depot in relation to the location and need for a splitter island at the above junction. This island is constantly hit/ overrun by vehicles which often results in the street furniture being managed and it is now considered a maintenance financial drain. The site has required maintenance intervention/ site visits in excess of 30 times within the last 18 month period. The island does not offer any pedestrian assistance and it is considered that this should be removed and replaced with thermoplastic screed.

What we propose:-

It is therefore proposed to remove the physical island and replace it with a painted feature which offers a guide to motorist, enables swept paths to be undertaken with the need to damage the street asset.

Recommendations:-

- Give authority to incur expenditure of £10,000 comprising of £8000 works and £2,000 staff fees to consult and remove the island which is now considered a financial drain and is unnecessary.

Site 10 Harewood Road - Collingham. – Ward Harewood

The issue:-

Concerns have been raised about the pedestrian accessibility in crossing Harewood Road within Collingham. A request has therefore been made to consider the introduction of lining amendments and carefully located pedestrian refuge islands to create a safer road environment.

What we propose:-

We seek authority for expenditure of £20,000, comprising of £16,000 works and £4,000 staff fees to design, consult and implement a new lining scheme, complimented by the introduction of pedestrian refuge islands to reduce vehicular speeds and to assist pedestrian passage across the route within Collingham.

Recommendations:-

- Give authority to incur expenditure of £20,000, comprising of £16,000 works and £4,000 staff fees to implement a new lining scheme, complimented by the introduction of pedestrian several refuge islands to reduce vehicular speeds and to assist pedestrian passage across the route within Collingham.

Site 11 Morley Area TRO***The issue:-***

Elected ward members have over the last few years requested traffic management intervention in the form of Traffic Regulations Orders to remove indiscriminate and obstructive parking at several locations within the ward. It is not financially viable to promote a separate Traffic Regulation Order for such small scale works, namely junction protections with 'No Waiting At Any Time' restrictions on an individual basis. We have recently been given £2,000 contribution from Housing to promote a TRO and this scheme therefore packaged these numerous requests into one ward based scheme to promote a Traffic Regulation Order, which enables a holistic approach to be taken and ensure value for money.

What we propose:-

We seek authority for expenditure of £3,200, comprising of £2,000 works (Housing Contribution), £700 staff and £500 legal costs, to promote a Traffic Regulation Order on the following primary streets within the Morley ward:-

Resident only permit parking:- Baker Street

'No Waiting at any time' restriction:- Brunswick Street / Bruntcliffe Lane junction, Elmfield Road / Bridge Street junction, Great Northern Street junction, Birchfield Avenue / Street Lane junction, Hull Street, Annie Street

School Keep Clear Order :- Newlands Drive and Kingsdale Gardens.

Recommendations:-

- Give authority to incur expenditure of £3,200, comprising of £2,000 works (Housing allocation funding), £700 staff and £500 legal costs to promote a Traffic Regulation Order.
- Request the City Solicitor to advertise a draft Traffic Regulation Order to remove problematic, indiscriminate and obstructive parking and if no valid objections are received, to make, seal and implement the Order as advertised.

Site 12 Queensway – Ward Guiseley and Rawdon & Otley and Yeadon***The issue:-***

Elected ward members have over the last few years requested traffic management intervention to remove the two priority chicanes along Queensway, due to road safety concerns and congestion issues these create during certain peak traffic periods. Ward members have therefore provided a contribution to amending these features through match funding provision..

What we propose:-

We seek authority for expenditure of £15,000, comprising of £12,000 works and £3,000 staff fees (total scheme cost is £27,000) which match funds contribution from ward members to remove the existing priority

chicane system and replace them with full width speed humps, which will slow all vehicles down, will assist pedestrian passage across Queensway, without creating undue delays along the route.

Recommendations:-

- Give authority to incur expenditure of £15,000 match funded by ward member WBI contribution, comprising of £12,000 works and £3,000 staff fees to design, consult and implement a scheme to remove existing priority chicane features and replace with full width speed humps.
- Give authority for the City Solicitor to advertise a 90c notice for the introduction of the vertical traffic calming measures and if no valid objections are received to implement the proposals as advertised..

Site 13 Chartist Way – Ward Morley

The issue:-

Concerns have been made relating to the difficult pedestrians, particularly the elderly have crossing at the roundabout junction of Chartist Way and Fountain Street. There is an elderly people complex on one side and a school and retail shopping area and local bus stops on the adjacent side. Whilst the numerical criteria for a formal crossing have not been met at this location, it is felt that community severance concerns could be better addressed through the introduction of a pedestrian central island and enhancement to the existing splitter islands to assist pedestrians.

What we propose:-

We seek authority for expenditure of £20,000 comprising of £16,000 works and £4,000 staff fees to enhance the splitter island at the junction of Chartist Way and Fountain Street and the introduction of a pedestrian refuge along the midpoint of Chartist Way to improve pedestrian accessibility along this busy route and wide junction mouth.

Recommendations:-

- Give authority to incur expenditure of £20,000, comprising of £16,000 works and £4,000 staff fees to implement a scheme to provide enhanced pedestrian crossing provision on Chartist Way.

Reserve Schemes Approval

Site 14 Beechwood Avenue – Ward Headingley

The issue:-

Concerns have been raised by a Ward Member of concerns relating to pedestrians ability to crossing the extremely wide junction mouth (37m wide) of Beechwood Avenue and Ashville Road. A scheme has therefore been developed to reduce the width to provide a safer passage for pedestrian whilst ensuring motorist slow to use this junction. .

What we propose:-

We seek authority for expenditure of £18,000, comprising of £14,000 works and £4,000 staff fees to design, consult and implement a junction design to reduce vehicular speeds and to assist pedestrian passage across the junction...

Recommendations:-

- Give authority to incur expenditure of £18,000, comprising of £14,000 works and £4,000 staff fees to implement a junction design to reduce vehicular speeds and to assist pedestrian passage.