

Report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation)

Date: 01 August 2016

Subject: Waterloo Road Development – Traffic Regulation Order Objection Report

Capital Scheme Number: 16721

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Pudsey	<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 2015-20 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. This report proposes a scheme that will contribute to this objective and improve road safety which is also a priority within the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan.
2. A development on Waterloo Road, Pudsey, has agreed to fund improvements to the highway that will address road safety concerns in the nearby area and around Waterloo School. These measures include the upgrade of an existing pedestrian crossing, the introduction of parking restrictions and the introduction of a 20mph speed limit. The developer is fully funding the £45,000 works and staff costs.
3. This report seeks approval of the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) to consider and over-rule the reported objection associated to the proposed waiting restrictions detailed in Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.19) Order 2015 Pudsey Ward Consolidation Order No.2 Order 2016.

Recommendations

4. The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:
 - i) note the contents of this report;

- ii) consider and over-rule the objection to Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.19) Order 2015 Pudsey Ward Consolidation Order No.2 Order 2016;
- iii) request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.19) Order 2015 Pudsey Ward Consolidation Order No.2 Order 2016; and
- iv) request the City Solicitor to write to the objectors informing them of the Chief Officer's (Highways and Transportation) decision.

1 Purpose of this report

- 1.1 This report details the objection received against the proposed Traffic Regulation order that forms a package of work to improve road safety around Waterloo Primary School, and requests the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) considers these objections and the recommendations.
- 1.2 The purpose of the report is to obtain authority to over-rule the objection received and seeks approval to implement and seal the waiting restrictions as per the advertised Order.

2 Background information

- 2.1 A planning approval was granted in February 2012 for the construction of 81 dwellings on a site on Waterloo Road, Pudsey. As part of this approval the developer was required to fund the upgrade of the existing Zebra crossing on Waterloo Road, parking restrictions and the introduction of a 20mph speed limit.
- 2.2 On the 17th March the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) approved this package of measures and gave authority to advertise a Traffic Regulation Order that would formalise the parking experienced at Waterloo Primary School.
- 2.3 To date, the 20mph speed limit has been introduced and the existing zebra crossing has been upgraded. The only remaining element of the scheme is the introduction of the proposed Traffic Regulation Order.

From the 7th May 2016 to the 6th June 2016 Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.19) Order 2015 Pudsey Ward Consolidation Order No.2 Order 2016 was advertised, see attached plan and a copy of the notice for further information. One objection and one letter of support was received during this period.

3 Main issues

- 3.1 This report refers a Traffic Regulation Order that forms part of a package of work that is being fully funded by a developer. Below is a summary of the specific restrictions that are being promoted by this order, the full details are also provided on the attached drawing TM-28-1927-TRO-02c:

- Introduction of 'no stopping' on the existing school entrance markings to operate Monday – Friday, 8am – 5pm; and

- 'No waiting at any time' protect locations around the school, such as junctions, that experience indiscriminate parking.

3.2 Please see the attached objection summary table detailing the objectors concerns and Highways' response.

4 Corporate Considerations

4.1 Consultation and Engagement

Ward Members: A meeting was held on site with two of the three Pudsey ward members on 24 October 2013. A meeting was held with the remaining ward member on 28 November 2013. All Members support the proposals.

Pudsey Councillors were made aware of the specific restrictions via email dated 19 May 2015. This email was sent in response to a complaint they received about the parking. Following this correspondence a site meeting was arranged with Members to better understand the issues and confirm the scheme details.

On the 29th June 2015, Members were sent a consultation for the proposed Traffic Regulation Order. In response to this Officers were asked to delay the progress of the scheme so that certain enforceable issues could be resolved.

On the 1st October 2015, Members were again consulted via email. One response was received confirming their support for the scheme.

On the 12th January 2016, Pudsey Councillors were made aware of the feedback from the public consultation and the changes that were generated as part of this process.

4.1.1 Emergency Services and West Yorkshire Combined Authority: Further consultation with the emergency services and Metro was undertaken on 16 December 2013. No adverse comments were received.

4.1.2 Residents & School: Consultation with directly affected properties took place via letter dated 25.11.15. A total of 11 responses were received, the majority of which supported the proposal. From this process there was a change to the extent of the restrictions being introduced on Victoria Gardens – resident of this street were made aware of the changes via letter dated 15.02.16.

4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

4.2.1 An EDCI screening document has been prepared (Appendix 1) which shows that a full impact assessment is not required for this scheme. The main findings of the screening process are summarised below.

4.2.2 The positive impacts are associated to improved road safety for all. The restrictions are located at key points on the highway and will improve accessibility and visibility for vulnerable road users such as children, parents with pushchairs and the infirm.

4.2.3 The negative impact is that parking opportunity will be reduced for blue badge holders; however, the scheme will improve pedestrian safety and accessibility around the school.

4.3 Council policies and City Priorities

4.3.1 The Best Council Plan 2015-20 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.

4.3.2 The proposal contributes to the policies in the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 2011-26 as follows:

Transport Assets: P2. Maintain to a suitable and sufficient standard.

Travel Choices: P10. Promote the benefits of active travel.

Connectivity: P18. Improve safety and security

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

4.3.4 Environmental Policy: The reduction in speed limit to 20mph will not have any significant impact on carbon emissions and air quality should remain similar to existing levels, however, there may be reduced levels of traffic noise.

4.4 Resources and value for money

4.4.1 The full scheme is estimated at £45,000 comprising:

Construction	£35,000
TRO	£3,000
Staff fees	£7,000

4.4.2 All costs are to be fully funded by the developer.

4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

4.5.1 The scheme is not eligible for Call In.

4.6 Risk Management

4.6.1 There are no risks, other than those normally encountered when working on the adopted highway, associated with the scheme.

5 Conclusions

- 5.1 Provision of these measures will improve safety around Waterloo School and the surrounding residential area. The measures are considered an appropriate alternative for the discharge of the condition on the planning approval.

6 Recommendations

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

- i) note the contents of this report;
- ii) consider and over-rule the objection to Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.19) Order 2015 Pudsey Ward Consolidation Order No.2 Order 2016;
- iii) request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.19) Order 2015 Pudsey Ward Consolidation Order No.2 Order 2016; and
- iv) request the City Solicitor to write to the objectors informing them of the Chief Officer's (Highways and Transportation) decision.

7 Background documents¹

7.1 None.

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

SUMMARY OF OBJECTION TO WATERLOO DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

**Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.19) Order 2015 Pudsey Ward Consolidation Order No.2
Order 2016**

SUMMARY OF OBJECTION	HIGHWAYS RESPONSE
<p>Objection No.1</p> <p><i>This objection focuses on the junction of Uppermoor and Occupation Lane.</i></p> <p>The objector appreciates the difficulties that arise around dropping off and picking up times at the school but urges consideration as to how the proposed restrictions affect residents, particularly those that don't have off street parking. The changes will be a real issue for the residents of No. 27 & 29 Uppermoor and will prevent them from parking outside their property.</p> <p>The objector believes the restrictions will not stop the issue of the cars at school times and will just push parking further up the road towards the small side roads and the blind corner. It seems like an extreme measure to try to solve a problem that is only an issue for half an hour twice a day.</p>	<p>The restrictions being promoted aim to manage the current parking demand and protect locations of the highway that shouldn't be experiencing parking but unfortunately do, with the main focus around improving junction safety and junction visibility.</p> <p>Occupation Lane and Uppermoor will have approximately 10 metres of restrictions either side to protect visibility at the junction. In accordance with The Highway Code, this area of carriageway should not be parked on, irrespective of whether the motorist is a resident or not.</p> <p>Some parking will be displaced as a result of these restrictions. The likelihood is that motorists will park at the next available opportunity closest to their destination; the restrictions take this into account and allow parking to remain in more appropriate locations.</p> <p>Permit parking is not being considered because the scheme is introducing restrictions to prevent incosiderate parking taking place near a junction.</p>

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.

Directorate: Development	Service area: Traffic Engineering
Lead person: David O'Donoghue	Contact number: 2477559

1. Title: Access Protection Markings
Is this a: <input type="checkbox"/> Strategy / Policy <input type="checkbox"/> Service / Function <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
If other, please specify: Confirmation of current practice

2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening
The introduction of parking restrictions around Waterloo Primary School. These restrictions are a mix of 'no stopping' and 'no waiting at any time'. This proposal will protect key features on the highway including junctions to assist road safety for all around the school.

3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration All the council's strategies/policies, services/functions affect service users, employees or the wider community – city wide or more local. These will also have a greater/lesser relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration. The following questions will help you to identify how relevant your proposals are.

When considering these questions think about age, carers, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation and any other relevant characteristics (for example socio-economic status, social class, income, unemployment, residential location or family background and education or skills levels).

Questions	Yes	No
Is there an existing or likely differential impact for the different equality characteristics?	X	
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the policy or proposal?	X	
Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom?		X
Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment practices?		X
Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment Advancing equality of opportunity Fostering good relations 		X

If you have answered **no** to the questions above please complete **sections 6 and 7**

If you have answered **yes** to any of the above and;

- Believe you have already considered the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 4**.
- Are not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 5**.

4. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration
<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"> 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) <p>There is potential that blue badge holders could be affected by the introduction of a 'no stopping' restriction on the school entrance markings. However, this restriction is being introduced to protect inter-visibility between pedestrians and motorists outside the school and will benefit vulnerable road users such as children.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key findings <p>(think about any potential positive and negative impact on different equality</p>

characteristics, potential to promote strong and positive relationships between groups, potential to bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other, perception that the proposal could benefit one group at the expense of another)

The positive impacts are associated to improved road safety for all. The restrictions are located at key points on the highway and will improve accessibility and visibility for vulnerable road users such as children, parent with pushchairs and infirm.

The negative impact is that parking opportunity will be reduced for blue badge holders; however, the scheme will improve pedestrian safety and accessibility around the school.

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

The positive impacts have been promoted through education. A school competition has been run involving the children in the design of signs along with road safety training.

Whilst there will be reduced parking for blue badge holders there will be some sections of highway protected with 'No waiting at any time' where they can park. These lengths were previous unrestricted and could be parked on by anybody.

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:	
Date to complete your impact assessment	
Lead person for your impact assessment (Include name and job title)	

6. Governance, ownership and approval
Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening

Name	Job title	Date

7. Publishing
This screening document will act as evidence that due regard to equality and diversity has been given. If you are not carrying out an independent impact assessment the screening document will need to be published.

Please send a copy to the Equality Team for publishing

Date screening completed	
---------------------------------	--

Date sent to Equality Team	
Date published (To be completed by the Equality Team)	