

Report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation)

Date: 31 January 2017

Subject: Guiseley Primary School Expansion Scheme – Traffic Regulation Order Objection Report

Capital Scheme Number: 16981 / GUI / 000

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 May 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 one objection.
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.4 Order 2016.

Recommendations

4. The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportaton) 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.25) Order 2014 Guiseley and Rawdon Ward Consolidation Order No.4 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.4 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 through the introduction of waiting restrictions on various streets within the proximity of Guiseley 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 As part of a scheme to expand the previous Guiseley Infants School into the new Guiseley Primary School, a package of highway improvement works was proposed. These works included improvements to the existing zebra crossing on Oxford Road, traffic calming features on Oxford Road and West Villa Road, an area wide 20mph zone and a series of waiting restrictions in the area.
- 2.2 The waiting restrictions in question included 'no waiting at any time' at key points on a number of roads in the area, such as junction radii and lengths of road to prevent parking that would obstruct the highway. Other measures included time limited waiting on West Villa Road and Oxford Road, as well as formalising the existing school keep clear markings to prevent stopping.
- 2.3 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) approved this package of measures as part of the wider Traffic Management Capital scheme report, presented May 2016, and gave authority to advertise a Traffic Regulation Order to subsequently introduce those measures.
- 2.4 The Traffic Regulation Order was advertised between 29 July 2016 and 30 August 2016. As a result of the advertisement period, a total of two objections were received.
- 2.5 A period of re-consultation was undertaken with a number of residents on Oxford Road, following representations from one objector on their behalf that the proposals there did not match their desires. The consultation concluded with the desire to change this proposal. Following approval from the Chief Officer Highways and Transportation, this change was subsequently re-advertised

between 4 August and 30 August 2016. The objection relating to this element was subsequently withdrawn.

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' on various streets in the vicinity of Guiseley Primary School, 'No stopping on entrance markings 8am – 5pm Monday to Friday' and '1 hour no return within 1 hour Monday to Friday 8am – 6pm' on West Villa Road and also '2 hours no return within 2 hours, Monday to Friday 8am – 6pm' and '4 hours no return within 2 hours, Monday to Friday 8am – 6pm' on Oxford Road. The full details are also provided on drawings TM-15-2406-TRO-1.1 to TM-15-2406-TRO1.2.
- 3.2 The proposals for West Villa Road were first detailed within the planning application for the school expansion. Where previously the road was seen to cater for all-day commuter parking, this caused school-related traffic to build up in an undesirable manner, with parking on junctions and bends. The measures as proposed would displace the all-day parking to other locations, providing a turnover of parking availability in the vicinity of the school, whilst still restricting parking in the areas of highest concern, such as junction radii and on narrow sections of highway where parking can only take place on one side of the carriageway. These measures should better regulate parking in this area, particularly at school opening and closing times, improving highway safety and accessibility.
- 3.3 Appendix A, the objection summary table, details the objection received to the proposals as mentioned in paragraph 3.1 and the subsequent response provided by Leeds City Council Highways to that objection.

4 Corporate Considerations

4.1 Consultation and Engagement

- 4.1.1 Ward Members were consulted on the highway proposals by email date 25 February 2016. An additional proposal was requested by a Ward Member as a result of that consultation, which was subsequently included within the proposals. Support was given to the final proposals by all three Ward Members.
- 4.1.2 Emergency Services and West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA): The Emergency Services and WYCA were consulted by email on 25 February 2016. No adverse comments were received to the proposals from the Emergency Services and WYCA confirmed support for the proposals via email date 23 March 2016.
- 4.1.3 As detailed in paragraph 2.4, the formal public advertisement period for the measures was undertaken between 29 July 2016 and 30 August 2016. As detailed in paragraph 2.5, an amendment to the proposals for Oxford Road was made and advertised concurrent to the wider Traffic Regulation Order.

4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

4.2.1 An Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration screening form was completed as part of the initial report approved by the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) in July 2016 and is attached as Appendix B.

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:

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

Connectivity: P18. Improve safety and security

P22. Develop networks and facilities to encourage cycling and walking.

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 estimated cost to implement the wider scheme is £56,400, specifically £46,000 works costs, £1,000 legal costs and £9,400 staff fees, all to be funded from the Children's Services Capital Programme.

4.4.2 It is anticipated this scheme will be completed within the 2016/17 financial year, upon approval of this report.

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 objection detailed in Appendix A, in accordance with the recommendations will allow the scheme to progress.

5.2 Provision of these measures will improve safety at key points on various roads within the vicinity of Guiseley Primary School, particularly accessibility and

visibility around junctions and the school frontage, whilst providing a turnover of parking in key locations that currently see all day parking.

6 Recommendations

6. 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.25) Order 2014 Guiseley and Rawdon Ward Consolidation Order No.4 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.4 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.

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.4 Order 2016

SUMMARY OF OBJECTION	HIGHWAYS RESPONSE
<p>Objection No.1</p> <p>The objector states that much if not all of the long stay parking which takes place on West Villa Road is commuter parking by users of the nearby train station and the proposed limited waiting on West Villa Road will simply encourage those long stay parkers to relocate further in to the nearby residential streets.</p> <p>The objector states that parking associated with the school essentially takes place between the hours of 0830 and 0915 and then again between the hours of 1430 and 1530, including visitors to the school during the day. The objector feels that the proposed limited waiting will relocate the long stay parkers and so school users will have better opportunities to park and therefore this will not encourage walking to and from the school.</p> <p>The objector states their belief that the potential for relocation has already been recognised by the fact that steps have been proposed to protect some of the junctions within the residential area.</p> <p>The objector feels that the "potential for up to 18 vehicles to relocate in to the residential area", and that it has been observed that the residential area is "generally devoid of parking during the working day" is inaccurate.</p> <p>The objector feels that the proposals deal solely with the concerns of the school not the community at large and does nothing to deal with the cause of other parking problems such as commuter parking.</p>	<p>Leeds City Council takes on board the concerns raised with regards the 1 hour limited waiting bays. Previous consideration had been given to the potential displacement and taken observations of the surrounding areas to determine what level of impact is expected.</p> <p>The parking that takes place at present, from officer observations, is either related to school staff or train station commuters. When the location has been visited on an evening or a weekend, this section of West Villa Road appears to be quieter than through the day. Observations elsewhere in the area, show these other roads to be very quiet and devoid of any parking in a lot of circumstances.</p> <p>The 1 hour bay on West Villa Road will displace approximately 18 vehicles, if we were to assume that all vehicles currently parking will be displaced. Leeds City Council is comfortable that 18 vehicles can be accommodated in the local area without unduly impacting on residents, particularly if the majority of this parking takes place throughout the working day.</p> <p>Whilst non-residential parking in areas such as this is often viewed negatively by local residents, it should be accepted that there is a demand for people to park in the Guiseley area and if this can be done in a safe manner that doesn't unduly impact on accessibility for residents, then the Council has to take a pragmatic stance</p>

APPENDIX B

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: Highways Services	Service area: Traffic Management
Lead person: Jonathan Waters	Contact number: 0113 3950654

1. Title: Guiseley Primary School Expansion Scheme – Associated Highway Works

Is this a:

Strategy / Policy

Service / Function

Other

Traffic Regulation Order, Speed Limit Order, highway alignment alterations

2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening

The screening focuses on a report to the Highways and Transportation Board, requesting the authority to implement a series of highway improvement measures associated with the Guiseley Primary School expansion scheme. These include improvements to an existing zebra crossing, implementation of vertical traffic calming features, implementation of parking restrictions, a new 20mph zone and other highway alignment alterations.

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. Also those areas that impact on or relate to equality: tackling poverty and improving health and well-being.

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

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 has taken place with Ward Members, the Emergency Services and West Yorkshire Combined Authority. Support was received from the Ward Members and WYCA, West Yorks Fire and Rescue raised no objections. Consultation will take place

either directly with affected parties or via a series of public advertisement notices, advertisement in the Yorkshire Post newspaper and a Section 90c Notice. All comments received from the consultation will be duly considered prior to scheme implementation.

- **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:

- i) Provide safer passage whilst crossing the road to all pedestrians, especially those with mobility issues, disabled people, parents supporting pushchairs and young and old people;
- ii) Improved visibility for drivers of the zebra crossing and pedestrians waiting at the crossing, thus improving safety all round;
- iii) By providing a series of speed plateaus, drivers will be encouraged to adhere to the lowered speed limit. Furthermore, driver behaviour at the formal zebra crossing should be improved through the implementation of the plateau;
- iv) By providing a humped zebra crossing, the crossing itself is therefore at the height of the footway. This better enables those parents/ carers with pushchairs to cross, as well as those pedestrians using wheelchairs and those with limited mobility; and
- v) By removing undesirable parking in the vicinity of bends and crossing points, visibility for pedestrians wishing to cross and drivers approaching the waiting pedestrians is enhanced, thus improving crossing safety.

Negative impacts:

- vi) The removal of unrestricted parking in the vicinity of the school and on Oxford Road will move parent parking and commuter parking to other locations, potentially causing other areas of concern through parking practices. This is mitigated with regards parent parking through the introduction of a pick-up/ drop-off car park within the school grounds. It is felt that the number of all-day commuters along Oxford Road should be comfortably accommodated within the nearby residential areas, though this will be monitored over time.

20mph zone

A full Equality, Diversion/ Cohesion and Integration impact assessment has previously been carried out for 20mph schools schemes.

Positive impacts: Making 20mph the normal speed limit would:

- Provide safer passage whilst crossing the road to all pedestrians, especially those with mobility issues, disabled people, parents supporting pushchairs and young and

old people

- Greater independence and choice for children travelling to school
- Dramatically increases survival if hit by a car to 97%, particularly important for children and older people where the chances of survival if hit at 30mph are only 50%.
- Make it more pleasant to walk or cycle, encouraging a more healthy lifestyle
- Reduce pollution and noise.
- Improve quality of life for the local community

Negative Impact: Making 20mph the normal speed limit would:

- Slight reduction in air quality 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)

Comments received from members of the public towards the proposals will be duly considered in the design process. Should there be a comment raised that we feel requires accommodation within the scheme and is safe and reasonable to do so, then it shall be done.

Post-scheme implementation monitoring of the site will be carried out. Should there be a need for further works to alleviate post-implementation issues then this will be duly considered at the time.

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
Nick Hunt	Principal Engineer	
Date screening completed		21/04/2016

7. Publishing

Though **all** key decisions are required to give due regard to equality the council **only** publishes those related to **Executive Board, Full Council, Key Delegated Decisions** or a **Significant Operational Decision**.

A copy of this equality screening should be attached as an appendix to the decision making report:

- Governance Services will publish those relating to Executive Board and Full Council.
- The appropriate directorate will publish those relating to Delegated Decisions and Significant Operational Decisions.
- A copy of all other equality screenings that are not to be published should be sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk for record.

Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached screening was sent:

For Executive Board or Full Council – sent to Governance Services	Date sent:
For Delegated Decisions or Significant Operational Decisions – sent to appropriate Directorate	Date sent:
All other decisions – sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk	Date sent: