

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

**Date: 31 January 2017**

**Subject: 2016/17 Guiseley and Rawdon Traffic Regulation Order Objection Report**

**Capital Scheme Number : 32568**

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Guiseley & Rawdon	<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. Following approval of a report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) in July 2016, amendments to the Leeds City Council Traffic Regulation Consolidation Order (No.25) 2014, the Guiseley and Rawdon ward Order, were advertised and attracted a total of two objections.
3. This report seeks approval of the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) to consider and over-rule the reported objections associated to the proposed waiting restrictions detailed in Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.25) Order 2014 Guiseley and Rawdon Ward Consolidation Order No.5 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 objections to Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.25) Order 2014 Guiseley and Rawdon Ward Consolidation Order No.5 Order 2016;
- iii) request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.25) Order 2014 Guiseley and Rawdon Ward Consolidation Order No.5 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 objections received against the proposed Traffic Regulation order that forms a package of work to improve road safety through the introduction of waiting restrictions on various streets within the Guiseley and Rawdon ward 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 objections received and seeks approval to implement and seal the waiting restrictions as per the advertised Order.

## **2 Background information**

- 2.1 Following the receipt of complaints and queries via Ward Members, members of the public and officer observations, a scheme was collated to introduce a number of waiting restriction measures within the Guiseley and Rawdon ward with the intention of improving accessibility and visibility at key points, thus improving road safety and providing a turnover of parking.
- 2.2 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) approved this package of measures as part of the wider Traffic Management Capital scheme report, presented July 2016, and gave authority to advertise a Traffic Regulation Order to subsequently introduce those measures.
- 2.3 The Traffic Regulation Order was subsequently advertised between 19 August 2016 and 19 September 2016. As a result of the advertisement period, a total of two objections were received. Following the request of a member of the public to provide extend a proposed restriction, this was agreed and that element re-advertised between the dates of 30 September and 24 October 2016.

## **3 Main issues**

- 3.1 This report refers to a Traffic Regulation Order scheme that seeks to implement lengths of 'No waiting at any time' and two time limited waiting bays on various streets across the ward, the full details are also provided on drawings TM-15-2595-TRO-1.1 to TM-15-2595-TRO1.5.
- 3.2 Appendix A, the objection summary table, details the objectors concerns and Highways' response.

## **4 Corporate Considerations**

### **4.1 Consultation and Engagement**

- 4.1.1 Ward Members: Ward Members were consulted by email on 3 June 2016. A written indication of support was received from one Ward Member 11 July 2016. A verbal indication of support was received from the remaining two Ward Members date 11 July 2016
- 4.1.2 Emergency Services and West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA): The Emergency Services and WYCA were consulted by email on 3 June 2016. No adverse comments were received to the proposals.

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

- 4.2.1 An Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration screening form was completed for the proposed scheme, which found that the proposals would ensure that vehicular access is maintained along narrower stretches of highway, around junction radii and points of access to private property, where existing concentrated parking is causing issues.
- 4.2.2 The same restrictions will also improve pedestrian accessibility, particularly carers with children and those pedestrians with pushchairs and/or wheelchairs. The restrictions will create lengths of highway free from parked vehicles, allowing increased visibility for all.
- 4.2.3 The time-limited waiting provision will ensure a turn-over of parking close to commercial properties and sheltered housing, allowing a localised parking provision for these facilities.
- 4.2.4 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 impact 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.

### **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.

#### 4.4 Resources and value for money

4.4.1 The full scheme is estimated at £7,000 comprising:

Construction	£4,000
TRO	£1,000
Staff fees	£2,000

4.4.2 The scheme is funded by the Traffic Management Capital budget and its completion is anticipated within the 2016/17 financial year.

#### 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 Over-ruling the received objections detailed in Appendix A, in accordance with the recommendations will allow this scheme to progress.

5.2 Provision of these measures will improve safety at key points on various roads within the Guiseley and Rawdon ward, particularly accessibility and visibility around junctions and also protecting access to private property where required.

### 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 objections to Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.25) Order 2014 Guiseley and Rawdon Ward Consolidation Order No.5 Order 2016;
- iii) request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.25) Order 2014 Guiseley and Rawdon Ward Consolidation Order No.5 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 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 A**

### **SUMMARY OF OBJECTION TO GUISELEY AND RAWDON PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER**

#### **Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.25) Order 2014 Guiseley and Rawdon Ward Consolidation Order No.5 Order 2016**

<b>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION</b>	<b>HIGHWAYS RESPONSE</b>
<p><b>Objection No.1 &amp; Objection No.2</b></p> <p><i>This objection focuses on the Park Road element of the wider scheme.</i></p> <p>The objectors state that the proposed measures will have no beneficial impact to the residents as the parking that takes place is often less than the 2 hour period specified, often being people visiting local shops or offices.</p> <p>The objectors state that when the lay-by was created many years ago, it was done to provide parking for this row of properties, but is now being abused by non-residents.</p> <p>The objectors state that their preference would be a resident permit parking scheme with no limited waiting element for non-residents.</p>	<p>The original request detailed long stay non-residential parking causing difficult for residents to park. The proposed restriction was devised in response to that original query.</p> <p>Continued observations of the location have shown that space is always available for vehicles to park within this lay-by area, whether they are residents or otherwise. This availability supports the observations that the proposed measures are appropriate.</p> <p>This lay-by is owned and maintained by Leeds City Council and thus falls into the definition of it being 'public highway'. Public highway is there for any person to use as required. There is a clear need for this area to be utilised by other members of the public in this busy town centre, shown through the regular turnover of parking. The Council does not implement resident only permit parking unless there is a complete denial of parking to residents over the course of the working day.</p> <p>It is for these reasons that the Council intends to proceed with the measures as proposed.</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.

<b>Directorate: Development</b>	<b>Service area: Traffic Management</b>
<b>Lead person: Jonathan Waters</b>	<b>Contact number: 37 87492</b>

<b>1. Title: 2016 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: Traffic Regulation Order</b>		

<b>2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening</b>
The screening focuses on a report to the Highways and Transportation Board requesting authority to implement a traffic regulation order in the Guiseley and Rawdon ward, specifically overruling objections received during the public advertisement period.

<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**.

<p><b>4. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration</b></p>
<p>If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.</p> <p>Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration?</b> (<b>think about</b> the scope of the proposal, who is likely to be affected, equality related information, gaps in information and plans to address, consultation and engagement activities (taken place or planned) with those likely to be affected)</li> </ul> <p>Consultation on the proposals has taken place with the following stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Councillors</li> <li>• Emergency Services (Police, West Yorkshire Fire and Ambulances Services)</li> <li>• Metro</li> <li>• Local Residents</li> </ul> <p>Support for the scheme has been received from Local Councillors with no objections raised from other statutory consultees. Two objections have been received by residents, as detailed in the summary table in Appendix A.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Key findings</b></li> </ul> <p>(<b>think about</b> any potential positive and negative impact on different equality characteristics, potential to promote strong and positive relationships between groups, potential to bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other, perception that the proposal could benefit one group at the expense of another)</p> <p>Positive Impacts of the Scheme Features:</p> <p>7.1.1 The proposals will ensure that vehicular access is maintained along narrower stretches of highway, around junction radii and points of access to private</p>



property, where existing concentrated parking is causing issues.

7.1.2 The same restrictions will also improve pedestrian accessibility, particularly carers with children and those pedestrians with pushchairs and/or wheelchairs. The restrictions will create lengths of highway free from parked vehicles, allowing increased visibility for all.

7.1.3 The time-limited waiting provision will ensure a turn-over of parking close to commercial properties and sheltered housing, allowing a localised parking provision for these facilities.

Negative Impacts of the Scheme Features:

7.1.4 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 impact on the accessibility for road users and/or pedestrians at a separate location.

- **Actions**

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

8 Any such issues that arise following the negative impact can be considered as part of a new scheme, moving forward.

**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

<b>Name</b>	<b>Job title</b>	<b>Date</b>
Nick Hunt	Traffic Engineering Manager	23/1/2016

## **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>	23 January 2016
<b>Date sent to Equality Team</b>	
<b>Date published</b> (To be completed by the Equality Team)	

