

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

**Date: 26 April 2016**

**Subject: A642 Wakefield Road, Swillington – Road Safety Measures**

**Capital Scheme Number: 32339**

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Garforth & Swillington	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number: Appendix number:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**Summary of main issues**

- 1 The Best Council Plan 2013-17 outlines how Leeds City will achieve its ambition to become the Best City in the UK and Leeds City Council the best authority. According to the Best Council Plan, the success of the Best Council objective: will be partly measured through reduced numbers of people killed or seriously injured on the city's roads. By enhancing the local residential environments by reducing vehicle speeds will provide a safer and friendlier road environment for all users.
- 2 This report seeks approval to undertake the detailed design and implementation of road safety measures to reduce the number and severity of accidents on A642 Wakefield Road, this due to high speeds, poorly judged overtaking resulting in loss of control and accidents due to unclear signage.
- 3 The length of A642 from just north of Garforth roundabout to Bullerthorpe Lane has, in the period March 2009-March 2016 had 45 accidents of which there have been 4 fatal motorcycle collisions, 1 fatal pedal cycle collision, 2 motorcycle serious collisions and 4 serious car collisions. The remaining accidents were classed as slight.

## Recommendations

- 3 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:
- i) authorise the detailed design and implementation of a road safety scheme to introduce a buffer 60-40-30 mph speed limit, review and make improvements to existing road markings, signage and junction improvements on A642 Wakefield Road, Swillington, as shown on drawing TM-00-2078-12-01;
  - ii) Give authority to incur expenditure of £45,000, which comprises of £30,000 works costs, £14,000 staff fees and £1,000 legal fees, all to be funded from the LTP Transport Policy Capital Programme;

Request the City Solicitor to:

- a) Amend the existing Speed Limit Order for A642, to introduce a buffer 60-40-30 mph speed limit on A642 Wakefield Road, Swillington, as shown on drawing TM-00-2078-12-01 and if no valid objections are received, to make, seal and implement the Order as advertised.

### 1 Purpose of this report

- 1.1 To seek approval to undertake the detailed design and implementation of a road safety scheme to introduce a buffer 60-40-30 mph speed limit, review and make improvements to existing road markings, signage and junction improvements on A642 Wakefield Road from Garforth roundabout to Bullerthorpe Lane.
- 1.2 To seek approval to incur costs of £45,000 for the design, implementation and inclusive of advertising costs, on the drawing number outlined in recommendations.

### 2 Background information

- 2.1 The A642 Wakefield Road from Garforth roundabout to Bullerthorpe Lane is a busy single carriageway road which changes from rural, urbanised as it passes through the village of Swillington and back to rural. The rural section is subject to a 60mph speed limit and changes to 30mph through Swillington. There are a number of working farms along the route and a major business. There is a double white line system in place to discourage overtaking on various sections along Wakefield Road.
- 2.2 The length of A642 from just north of Garforth roundabout to Bullerthorpe Lane has, in the period March 2009-March 2016 had 45 accidents of which there have been 4 fatal motorcycle collisions, 1 fatal pedal cycle collision, 2 motorcycle serious collisions and 4 serious car collisions. The remaining accidents were classed as slight.
- 2.3 Accident analysis shows that the fatalities occurred due to combination of high speed, poorly judged overtaking and loss of control with the injury severity

exacerbated by collision with street furniture. The majority of the accidents which have occurred have been at junctions with misjudging speeds and a failure to give way; in particular there is an accident pattern at the junction with Whitehouse Lane with A642, where overgrown vegetation (trees) create poor visibility for drivers exiting Whitehouse Lane onto the A642.

### **3 Main issues**

The proposed measures are designed to reduce the accident and severity of injury to drivers/passengers of vehicles on A642 Wakefield Road by introducing a buffer speed limit on approach to Swillington village, improving existing road markings, replacing and reviewing the location of existing signs and improving sight lines by cutting back vegetation at the A642/Whitehouse Lane junction.

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

3.2 To implement a series of measures to improve the accident record along A642 Wakefield Road as shown on drawing number TM-00-2078-12-01.

- Introduce a buffer 60-40-30mph speed limit change to make drivers more aware of their speed when entering the village. It is felt that at present the drastic change in the speed limit from 60mph to 30mph does not have the desired effect of slowing drivers down sufficiently when entering the village.
- The road markings will be reviewed and improvements made where deemed necessary.
- Existing warning signs to be made more conspicuous to highlight the presence of junctions with a review to their location and to be erected on yellow backing boards where required.
- Double white line system to be assessed and extended to discourage overtaking at various locations.
- Whitehouse junction - vegetation to be cut back and smaller trees to be removed to improve visibility when exiting the junction.

3.3 The objective of this proposal is to improve the local environment, for all road users, by the introduction of a buffer speed limit and making improvements to road markings and signing and junction improvements, thus reducing vehicular speeds, accidents and severity.

#### **3.7 Programme**

It is anticipated that the proposal will be implemented within the 2016/ 2017 financial year.

### **4 Corporate Considerations**

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

4.1.1 Ward Members: Ward Members were consulted by email on the 19 February 2016. Ward members were supportive of the proposals.

- 4.1.2 Emergency Services and WYCA were consulted by letter and email on the 19 February 2016. No objections were received to the proposals. The police are fully supportive of the proposals.
- 4.1.3 The general public will be consulted on the Speed Limit Order via notices on street lighting columns during the public advertisement phase, along with an advert in the Yorkshire Post newspaper.

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

- 4.2.1 A screening document has been prepared and an independent impact assessment is not required for the approvals requested.
- Positive: A buffer speed limit will slow driver speeds thus providing a safer environment for all road users. Improvements to existing road markings and signs will make drivers more aware of the surroundings and junction improvements will improve conditions.
  - Negative: Slight reduction in air quality and a small increase in journey times due to lower speeds, however this is offset by the potential reduction in accidents.

## **4.3 Council policies and the Best Council Plan**

- 4.3.1 The proposal contributes to the policies in the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 2011-26 as follows:
- 4.3.2 Proposal 18 – Improve safety and security, seeking to minimise transport casualties
- 4.3.3 Safety Audit: full safety audits will be carried out on this proposal and any recommendations received will be given full consideration and responded to.

## **4.4 Resources and Value for Money**

- 4.4.1 The estimated costs are £45,000, which comprises of £30,000 works costs, and £14,000 staff fees and £1,000 legal fees, all to be funded from the LTP Transport Policy Capital Programme.

## Capital Funding and Cash Flow

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						
<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>
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)	30.0			30.0			
FURN & EQPT (5)	0.0						
DESIGN FEES (6)	14.0		7.0	7.0			
OTHER COSTS (7)	1.0			1.0			
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>45.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>38.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
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
Transport Policy LTP Grant	45.0		7.0	38.0			
Total Funding	45.0	0.0	7.0	38.0	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>

**Parent Scheme Number:** 99609  
**Title:** LTP Transport Policy Capital Programme

4.5.1 There should be no additional revenue costs as a result of this capital scheme.

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

4.6.1 The scheme is in the Annual Programme and subject to resolving any objections received it is anticipated to be completed within the 2016/2017 financial year.

### 4.7 Risk Management

4.7.1 There are no issues, over and above those expected when working in the public highway, generated by the proposals contained within this report.

## 5.0 Conclusions

5.1 A combination of speed limit reduction, junction improvements and improvements to existing road markings and signs will have a positive impact in the area as it will improve the local environment, especially for all road uses.

## **6.0 Recommendations**

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

- i) Authorise the detailed design and implementation of a road safety scheme to introduce a buffer 60-40-30 mph speed limit, review and make improvements to existing road markings, signage and junction improvements on A642 Wakefield Road, Swillington, as shown on drawing TM-00-2078-12-01;
- ii) Give authority to incur expenditure of £45,000, which comprises of £30,000 works costs, £14,000 staff fees and £1,000 legal fees, all to be funded from the LTP Transport Policy Capital Programme.

Request the City Solicitor to:

- a) Amend the existing Speed Limit Order for A642, to introduce a buffer 60-40-30 mph speed limit on A642 Wakefield Road, Swillington, as shown on drawing TM-00-2078-12-01 and if no valid objections are received, to make, seal and implement the Order as advertised.

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

7.1 None.

---

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

## Appendix 1

### Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Screening

As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

A **screening** process can help judge relevance and provides a record of both the **process** and **decision**. Screening should be a short, sharp exercise that determines relevance for all new and revised strategies, policies, services and functions. Completed at the earliest opportunity it will help to determine:

- the relevance of proposals and decisions to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.
- whether or not equality, diversity, cohesion and integration is being/has already been considered, and
- whether or not it is necessary to carry out an impact assessment.

<b>Directorate: City Development</b>	<b>Service area: Highways &amp; Transportation</b>
<b>Lead person: Bobby Virdi</b>	<b>Contact number: 0113 2475297</b>

<b>1. Title: A642 Wakefield Road – Road Safety Measures</b>		
Is this a:		
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy / Policy</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Service / Function</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other</b>
<b>If other, please specify</b>		

<b>2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening</b>
<p>The screening focuses on a report to the Highways and Transportation Board requesting authority to undertake the detailed design, advertisement and implementation of Road Safety Measures along A642 Wakefield Road.</p> <p><b>Main Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speed reduction and improvements to road markings and existing signing along A642 Wakefield Road.</li> </ul>

- It is considered that these measures will assist in slowing driver speeds in the vicinity of the village, thus creating a safer environment for all road users.

### 3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

All the council's strategies/policies, services/functions affect service users, employees or the wider community – city wide or more local. These will also have a greater/lesser relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

The following questions will help you to identify how relevant your proposals are.

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

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

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

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

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

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

If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.

Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).

- **How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration?** (**think about** the scope of the proposal, who is likely to be affected, equality related



information, gaps in information and plans to address, consultation and engagement activities (taken place or planned) with those likely to be affected)

Consultation on the proposals was undertaken with Ward Members, the emergency services and West Yorkshire Combined Authority.

• **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:

- Proposed speed limit reduction and improvements to road markings and signing will make drivers more aware of their surroundings and will slow driver speeds thus providing a safer environment for all road users.

Negative Impacts:

- Slight reduction in air quality and a small increase in journey times due to lower speeds, however this is offset by the potential reduction in accidents.

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

**N/A**

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

Date to scope and plan your impact assessment:	N/A
Date to complete your impact assessment	N/A
Lead person for your impact assessment (Include name and job title)	N/A

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

Name	Job title	Date
Andy Merckel	Senior Traffic Engineer	15/03/2016

**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

<b>Date screening completed</b>	04/04/2016
<b>Date sent to Equality Team</b>	15/03/2016
<b>Date published</b> (To be completed by the Equality Team)	