

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

**Date: 14 March 2017**

**Subject: 2016/17 20mph schemes – Holt Park, Adel and Wharfedale Ward - Objection Report**

**Capital Scheme Number : 32603**

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Adel and Wharfedale	<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 October 2016 and as part of the ongoing 20mph schemes programme, a Speed Limit Order and Section 90C Notice were advertised in Holt Park and attracted a total of eleven objections, of which eight are still standing.
3. This report seeks approval of the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) to consider and over-rule the reported objections associated to the proposed 20mph zone detailed in Leeds City Council (Speed Limit) (No.1) Order 2017 Holt Park and the associated Section 90C for traffic calming measures.

## **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 (Speed Limit) (No.1) Order 2017 20mph Zone Holt Park, Adel and Wharfedale and associated Section 90C notice for traffic calming measures;
  - iii) request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Speed Limit) (No.1) Order 2017 20mph Zone Holt Park, Adel and Wharfedale; 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 Speed Limit Order and Section 90C Notice that forms a package of work to implement a 20mph zone and associated Traffic Calming in the Holt Park area of the Adel and Wharfedale ward and requests the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) to consider 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 Speed Limit Order as per the advertised Order.

### **2 Background information**

- 2.1 As part of the Government's approach to speed management, the Department for Transport (Dft) provides guidance on 20mph schemes and setting local speed limits. The guidance encourages local authorities to consider the appropriate use of 20mph speed limits and 20mph zones and highlights how a flexible approach to the use of 20mph speed limits can be taken, particularly where pedestrian and cyclist movements are high, such as around schools, shops, markets, playgrounds and other areas which are not part of any major through route.
- 2.2 The objective of the 20mph schemes programme is to enhance the local environment by reducing vehicular speeds to create a safer road environment for all, but with a particular emphasis on children. By introducing 20mph zones in the vicinity of schools and their surrounding residential areas, this may also encourage children to engage in walking and cycling to school.
- 2.3 The 20mph schemes programme is now a well-established element of Leeds City Councils programme of road casualty reduction and sustainable travel schemes.
- 2.4 DfT figures indicate that 20mph speed limit schemes where there are safety issues give good rates of return and typically pay for themselves within two years. There is now a greater need to deal with area based schemes, as the worst individual locations have been tackled previously.

- 2.5 The accident history within the Holt Park area in the period 2009-2014, as used to formulate the priority matrix, shows sixteen injury collisions with these being recorded as 'slight', but with three pedestrian and two child pedestrian injuries. There have been two further injury accidents within the proposed zone extents in the period 2014 to date.
- 2.6 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) approved a package of measures detail in a report presented 11 October 2016 and gave authority to advertise a Speed Limit Order and associated Section 90C Notice to subsequently introduce those measures.
- 2.7 The Speed Limit Order and Section 90C Notice were subsequently advertised between 9 December 2016 and 9 January 2017. It was brought to the attention of Officers that a proposed element of the Section 90C Notice had been missed off the initial advert. This was separately advertised between 6 January 2017 and 28 January 2017. As a result of the advertisement period, a total of eleven objections were received. Three objections were subsequently withdrawn, leaving eight outstanding objections, detailed in the summary of objections at the end of this report.

### **3 Main issues**

- 3.1 This report refers to a Speed Limit Order and associated Section 90C that seeks to implement a 20mph zone and associated traffic calming measures on various streets across the ward, the full details of which are provided on drawings TM-1-2579-SL01-2017.
- 3.2 The report also refers to the formal objections received to the proposals from members of the public. Please see the attached objection summary table detailing 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. An indication of support was received from one Ward Member 5 June 2016. A second Ward Member offered their support to the proposals on 14 July 2016. No objection was received from the third Ward Member.
- 4.1.2 Emergency Services and West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA): The Emergency Services and WYCA were consulted by letter and email on 26 May 2016. The Police replied 2 June and offered no objection and a comment stating they supported the implementation of the traffic calming features so that the scheme is ultimately self-enforcing. A response was received from WYCA on 2 June offering support to the proposals. A response was received from the West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service on 6 June 2016, stating they had no objection to the proposals.

4.1.3 Direct consultation of the proposals was undertaken by a Ward Member with the residents in the Holt Park area, via letter, the resultant comments of which were passed to officers for information.

4.1.4 The formal public advertisement of the scheme was undertaken between 9 December 2016 and 9 January 2017. Following the accidental omission of an element of work from the Section 90C Notice, this individual element was advertised from 6 January 2017 to 28 January 2017.

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

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

4.2.2 Positive Impact: 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 chances of survival if hit by a car to 97%
- 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

4.2.3 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.

## **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 By providing a safer road environment where needed and justified, the ongoing 20mph zone programme is helping to achieve Leeds' ambition to become the Best City by reducing the number of pedestrians killed or seriously injured on the city's roads, by fostering links between the communities and local facilities, especially where the highway forms a considerable barrier, and by enabling more sustainable travel choices for local journeys, including for new developments within the city.

4.3.3 Environmental Policy: The reduction in speed limit to 20mph will not have any significant impact on carbon emissions, air pollutants should remain similar to that of 30mph.

- 4.3.4 Local Transport Plan 3: **Strategic Approaches:**  
**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.
- 4.3.5 Transport Policy Approval: The design instruction for this scheme was received in April 2015 and the proposed scheme is approved in principle by Transport Policy.

#### **4.4 Resources and value for money**

- 4.4.1 The estimated total cost to implement this scheme is £51,750 which comprises of £41,850 works costs, £8,900 staff fees and £1,000 legal fees all to be funded from the LTP Transport Policy Capital Programme.
- 4.4.2 The scheme is funded by the Traffic Management Capital budget commencing in the 2016/17 financial year with completion anticipated within the 2017/18 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 If no action was taken then access to the schools for pedestrians and cyclists will not improve and the potential of injury to pedestrians and cyclists will not be addressed.

### **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 this 20mph scheme will contribute to the Councils ambition by improving the safety and quality of life of Leeds residents by enabling safe pedestrian and cycling journeys in local communities. It will also provide a safer environment around the school and residential areas thus encouraging more sustainable travel behaviours for all users.

### **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 (Speed Limit (No.1) Order 2017 Holt Park 20mph zone, Adel and Wharfedale associated Section 90C notice for traffic calming measures;

- iii) request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Speed Limit) (No.1) Order 2017 Holt Park 20mph Zone, Adel and Wharfedale; 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 HOLT PARK 20MPH ZONE AND ASSOCIATED TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES**

#### **Leeds City Council (Speed Limit) (No.1) Order 2017 Holt Park 20mph zone – Adel and Wharfedale (And associated Section 90C Notice)**

<b>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION</b>	<b>HIGHWAYS RESPONSE</b>
<p><b>Objection No.1</b></p> <p>Objector claims there are no traffic related problems that could justify scheme.</p> <p>Objector claims Police concluded there is not a problem with traffic speeds.</p> <p>Objector claims notices only on site for one week and not posted on the internet so not sufficient consultation undertaken.</p> <p>Objector claims scheme is a waste of money.</p>	<p>Accident data shows a total of 18 accidents within the proposed scheme area between 2009 and 2017. Comparable schemes show an average 40% reduction in accident levels so scheme is justified through this expected reduction.</p> <p>Holt Lane/ Holt Road has over 30% of daily traffic travelling above 30mph, identified by Police as a local concern. Police have offered full support to the proposals.</p> <p>One Ward Member undertook direct consultation with residents. Notices were installed and maintained on site for one month and a notice placed in Yorkshire Post. Council has satisfied and exceeded its requirements for advertisement requirements. Accept that no internet advertisement however Council currently investing in programmes to allow this to happen shortly.</p> <p>Considering the road casualty reduction potential of the scheme, the DfT guidance LCC's targets for reducing road injuries the expenditure is appropriate and forms part of the approved annual programme.</p>
<p><b>Objection No.2</b></p> <p>Objector states that existing 30mph limit seems appropriate.</p> <p>Objector claims that drivers have to focus too much on speedometer and this reduced concentration of road surroundings and accidents may incur and that existing accidents are not speed related.</p>	<p>The proposals are the result of a desire from the Department for Transport to see residential roads reduced to 20mph. Council initiated a programme of works in 2010 to meet this desire, approved by Executive Board. Road characteristics and speeds are appropriate for a 20mph speed limit given similar, successful schemes in Leeds.</p> <p>Comparable schemes in the Leeds metropolitan area have seen total accidents (not just speed related) reduce by an average of 40% suggesting a positive impact on safety of the highway network.</p>

<p>Objector claims without necessary enforcement, existing speeders will continue to drive in same manner.</p> <p>Objector suggested alternate warning signage to encourage safer driving.</p> <p>Objector suggested the use of Speed Indicator Devices to better enforce existing speed limit.</p>	<p>20mph schemes are implemented with support of the Police and in accordance with guidance from the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO). ACPO also state that enforcement will be undertaken in line with usual enforcement duties.</p> <p>Highway authorities can only install approved signage on the highway, no such warning signs as desired are available.</p> <p>Speed Indicator Devices are not appropriate and would be prohibitively expensive, giving far less coverage for the same money as the 20mph zone.</p>
<p><b>Objection No.3</b></p> <p>Objector claims small minority of traffic that exceeds speed limit and that the proposed 20mph zone penalises those who drive within the current limit.</p> <p>Objector claims a reduced speed limit does not guarantee those who exceed current limit will abide by new limit.</p> <p>Objector claims speed bumps are a dangerous theoretical solution. Claims vehicles speed up between bumps and brake at them, potentially damaging to vehicles and dangerous to cyclists and emergency services.</p> <p>Objector claims proposals could be a waste of money.</p>	<p>See objection no.2 for detail on scheme purpose.</p> <p>See objection no.2 for detail on enforcement.</p> <p>Traffic calming features proposed to bring speeds in line with ACPO-required 24mph mean speed on Holtdale Approach and Farrar Lane. Also aim to reduce the 30% of daily traffic travelling above 35mph on Holt Lane/ Road. LCC believes current speed levels more dangerous than potential impact of traffic calming. Comparable schemes show 40% reduction in accidents on average, proving there can be significant safety benefits from these schemes.</p> <p>Independent investigations into claims of traffic calming damaging vehicles have shown no such damage occurs when vehicles traverse features in an appropriate manner. Regular spacing of traffic calming features in line with the Department for Transport's Local Transport Note 1/07 prevents acceleration between humps.</p> <p>Considering accident reduction potential and in keeping with DfT and LCC desire to reduce speed limits, expenditure is appropriate and forms part of the annual programme.</p> <p>See objection no.1 for detail on waste of money claim.</p>



<p><b>Objection No.4</b></p> <p>Objector queries where desired 24mph mean speed is derived from.</p> <p>Objector claims there is no problem with speeding on Holt Lane/ Road when mean speed currently under posted 30mph speed limit; therefore traffic calming not necessary.</p> <p>Objector queries rationale for traffic calming on Farrar Lane, as road not heavily pedestrianized, no recorded injury accidents and no perceived issues and if mean speed below current speed limit, then no issue.</p> <p>Objector claims no proper consultation has been undertaken, nor any notification of the scheme.</p> <p>Objector claims traffic calming may increase speeds as accelerating causes weight to shift to rear of vehicle thus decreasing compression on suspension over features, reducing damage.</p>	<p>Wider scheme intention result of desire from Department for Transport to reduce residential roads to 20mph, backed by LCC Executive Board. Associated of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) subsequently set 24mph mean speed as the absolute maximum for a 20mph road, to ensure 'self-enforcing' (using Police-standard 10%+2mph for enforcement).</p> <p>It is acknowledged some roads do not suit 20mph, such as Holt Lane/ Road, which has a distributor character and above 5000 vehicles a day. However, over 30% of daily traffic travels above 35mph which is too high. Police support traffic calming measures to control speeds.</p> <p>In line with DfT guidance, Farrar Lane is to become 20mph as it has a more residential-feel than other 'distributor' roads. Also in line with ACPO guidance, existing mean speeds are higher than required 24mph so traffic calming features are required to reduce speeds accordingly.</p> <p>See objection no.1 for detail on consultation.</p> <p>See objection no.3 for detail on traffic calming.</p>
<p><b>Objection No.5</b></p> <p>Objector claims '2010 DETR document 'Tomorrow's Roads: Safer for Everyone' states local authorities should not just use safety benefits to justify schemes, taking into account other aspects.</p> <p>Objector claims speed cushions are associated with increased emissions and particulates, contributing to early mortality. Refers to table 1.1 of DfT Local Transport Note 1/07. Claims people of poor health and the elderly are disadvantaged by the proposals.</p> <p>Claims that speed cushions in Leeds are of differing widths. If implemented at 1.5m wide, allows vehicles to straddle sufficiently, but if 1.7m wide this will lead to deterioration of air quality through braking and accelerating.</p>	<p>Document in question is 2000 Department for Environment, Transport and The Regions and is written to guide local authorities, not stipulate. As the local highway authority, the primary objective is improve road safety and this is the aim of this scheme.</p> <p>Council aware of draft NICE guidance on air pollution. That document makes reference to 'Smooth Driving and Speed Reduction' which seeks to provide advice on best practice for traffic calming. Council takes advice on board, along with own experiences and the overall aims of the scheme and the wider desired safety improvements.</p> <p>Standard design of traffic calming in Leeds has been tailored to provide best fit between speed reduction and suitability for vehicles, based on national practice as exemplified in the DfT regulations, advice and guidelines. The cushions are to be implemented to form a route where traffic</p>

	<p>can assume one speed and not need to brake and then acceleration repeatedly. Regular spacing of traffic calming features in line with the Department for Transport's Local Transport Note 1/07 prevents acceleration between humps.</p>
<p><b>Objection No.6</b></p> <p>Objector believes scheme is an inappropriate use of money.</p> <p>Objector believes there are no major traffic issues and a change of speed limit will not impact upon those driving above existing 30mph speed limit.</p> <p>Objector claims that there is a low accident rate in the area.</p>	<p>See objection no.1 for detail on purpose of scheme and inappropriate use (waste of) money claims.</p> <p>See objection no.2 for detail on Police support and ACPO guidance.</p> <p>See objection no.1 for detail on accidents.</p>
<p><b>Objection No.7</b></p> <p>Objector queried how many road traffic accidents had occurred in a given time in the proposed area and how many could have been positively avoided by the introduction of the proposed measures.</p> <p>Objector claims that the monies associated with this scheme would be better spent on highway maintenance in the area.</p>	<p>See objection no.1 for detail on accidents and accident reduction.</p> <p>See objection no.1 for detail on purpose of scheme and inappropriate use of funding..</p>
<p><b>Objection No.8</b></p> <p>Objector claims the proposals are unnecessary, unjustified and no accidents have been caused as a result of speed.</p> <p>Objector claims the proposals are costly, the monies could be better spent elsewhere.</p> <p>Objector claims traffic calming measures cause damage to vehicles.</p> <p>Objector claims traffic calming features are damaging to the environment.</p>	<p>See objection no.1 for detail on accident reduction and the wider purpose of the scheme.</p> <p>See objection no.1 for detail on cost and the claim of inappropriate use of funding.</p> <p>See objection no.3 for detail on damage to vehicles.</p> <p>See objection no.5 for detail on the claims of environmental damage as a result of traffic calming features.</p>

# Appendix B

## Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Impact Assessment



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. In all appropriate instances we will need to carry out an equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment.

This form:

- can be used to prompt discussion when carrying out your impact assessment
- should be completed either during the assessment process or following completion of the assessment
- should include a brief explanation where a section is not applicable

<b>Directorate:</b> City Development	<b>Service area:</b> Highways and Transportation
<b>Lead person:</b> Mary Levitt-Hughes	<b>Contact number:</b> 0113 2477515
<b>Date of the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment:</b> 17 April 2012	

<b>1. Title:</b> 20mph Speed Reduction Schemes Around Schools
Is this a:
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other</b>
Is this:
<input type="checkbox"/> New/ proposed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already exists and is being reviewed <input type="checkbox"/> Is changing
(Please tick one of the above)

### 2. Members of the assessment team:

Name	Organisation	Role on assessment team
Mary Levitt-Hughes	Principal Project Officer, Technical Support	Equality Lead
Lisa Powell	Performance & Improvement Manager	Equality Support
Gurdip Bahi	Transport Policy	Transport Planner
Philippe Nirmalendran	Traffic Management	Traffic Engineer
Gary Pritchard	Traffic Management	Traffic Engineer
Kasia Szczerbinska-Speakman	Strategy and Policy	Access and Mobility Officer
Peter Morris	Highways Design & Construction	Trainee Engineer

Sean Hewitt	Highways Design & Construction	Group Engineer
Christopher Way	Traffic Management	Traffic Engineer

### 3. Summary of strategy, policy, service or function that was assessed:

The approach to 20mph speed limits has been evolving inline with changes to the guidance regulation from the DfT and regularly reported to Lead Members and was considered further in 2009 by Lead Members and Leader Management Team. Subsequently a review of such measures was instigated. This review has focused on a particular interest in lower speed limits in the vicinity of schools, changes to the DfT guidance and the costs benefits of the programme.

The review of 20mph Zones and Limits has given regard to the following issues:

- Member / stakeholder views and aspirations
- increasing pressure on resources;
- the forthcoming preparation of the third Local Transport Plan;
- the need to effectively target casualty reduction;
- reducing Rates of Return of 20 Zones as presently configured;
- the future role of Home Zones; and
- the need to continue demonstrating value for money.

As a result of this review the following actions were suggested as a way forward:

- i) That the principle of utilising 20 mph speed limits as a core part of the casualty reduction strategy for local communities and neighbourhoods continues to be supported.
- ii) That the principle of incorporating schools into 20 Zones or Limits is endorsed and that where there is a record of road injuries in the vicinity such schemes may be prioritised for Local Transport funding. Elsewhere if transport funding criteria are not achieved such measures will be a matter for local discretion, community priorities and funding.
- iii) To consider a small project comprising 20 Limits in the environs of 10-20 schools, identified on the basis of road injury records, for piloting a school based approach based on sites with an identified road injury record.
- iv) Review present proposals for 20 Zones to see if the alternative 20 Limit approach could deliver equally effective schemes at a lower and more affordable cost, so that the results can be used to inform the treatment of these areas and stretch the coverage of future 20 mph programmes.

The above actions were approved by LCC Corporate Leadership Team and a pilot of 6 schemes have been completed with a further tranche being progressed. Ongoing annual programmes will be progressed inline with the approved strategy and this Equality assessment.

#### **Regulation Changes**

Recent changes to the DfT regulations that came into effect in November 2011 allow

20mph 'Schemes' to be implemented. The new guidance encourages local authorities to introduce more 20 mph speed limits and 20mph zones, and clearly highlights a more flexible approach in the use of 20 mph speed limits. In particular where pedestrian and cyclist movements are high, such as around schools, shops, markets, playgrounds and other areas which are not part of any major through route then 20 mph speed limits or 20mph zones are recommended for introduction.

These changes allow us to:

- Create larger 20mph speed limit areas without features where speeds are already low.
- Create 20mph Zones with a minimum number of features. These are now only installed where we have high speeds or an number of injury accidents. The type of feature used is left to the designer to identify based on the site conditions etc.
- Effect use of budget to install more 20mph schemes for our money.

### **20mph Zones**

20 mph Zones comprise of traffic calming features and signs and were previously considered appropriate where excessive speeds occurred and where measures were needed to keep speeds at or below 20mph. The regulations for zones required physical features at frequent intervals, even where the features were not needed for safety at all the locations within the zone, increasing the cost of zones but without necessarily bringing commensurate benefits.

### **20mph Limits**

20mph Limits were introduced by the erection of signs and road markings. These are regarded as most appropriate where speeds were already relatively low and further traffic calming features were not needed. Also, they were intended for very small areas, typically of one or two streets.

**4. Scope of the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment**  
(complete - 4a. if you are assessing a strategy, policy or plan and 4b. if you are assessing a service, function or event)

<b>4a. Strategy, policy or plan</b> (please tick the appropriate box below)	
The vision and themes, objectives or outcomes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The vision and themes, objectives or outcomes and the supporting guidance	<input type="checkbox"/>
A specific section within the strategy, policy or plan	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Please provide detail:</b>	
The ambition for Leeds City Council is that all schools across the city will have a 20 mph	

speed limits in place and this aim is supported by the Local Transport Plan's (LTP3) 2 key objectives highlighted below:

1. **Economy.** To improve connectivity to support economic activity and growth in West Yorkshire and the Leeds City Region.
2. **Low-Carbon.** To make substantial progress towards a low carbon, sustainable transport system for West Yorkshire, while recognising transport's contribution to national carbon reduction plans.
3. **Quality of Life.** To enhance the quality of life of people living in, working in and visiting West Yorkshire.

To help deliver the above objectives the following LTP3 "proposals" are applicable to the 20mph schemes:

- **Proposal 7** - *Implement a targeted programme of travel behaviour change including marketing, information, education and support activities.*
- **Proposal 9** - *Provide tailored education and training to support habitual behaviour change to more sustainable travel modes.*
- **Proposal 17** - *Develop a new model for transport planning at a community level to enhance local accessibility.*
- **Proposal 18** - *Improve safety and security, seeking to minimise transport casualties*
- **Proposal 22** - *Define, develop and manage networks and facilities to encourage cycling and walking.*

<b>4b. Service, function, event</b>	
please tick the appropriate box below	
The whole service (including service provision and employment)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A specific part of the service (including service provision or employment or a specific section of the service)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Procuring of a service (by contract or grant) (please see equality assurance in procurement)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Please provide detail:</b>	
<b>5. Fact finding – what do we already know</b>	
Make a note here of all information you will be using to carry out this assessment. This could include: previous consultation, involvement, research, results from perception surveys, equality monitoring and customer/ staff feedback.	
<b><u>Casualty Reduction</u></b>	
In terms of road casualties around schools, research over several years has shown that over 90% of injuries to children on the school journey occur beyond the vicinity of the school. Analysis of the casualty data indicates, using a five year average, shows that around 25% of all child casualties (approx 93 annually) occur during the times of a school	

journey.

### **School Assessment Process**

The primary objective of 20mph schemes has always been casualty reduction. Therefore the prioritisation of the programme has been based on the recorded injury accidents. To allow for the varying sizes of the zones the overall area of the zone or the length of road covered by the proposed zone has been used to establish the accidents per km<sup>2</sup> or per km, and ranked accordingly.

The areas are identified using main and primary roads as natural boundaries and can therefore vary in size.

Following the introduction of the school 20mph pilot. All the remaining schools and their surrounding residential areas have been included into the assessment process and have now been ranked on the number of injury accidents per km<sup>2</sup>. This has been done as an interim measure and soon we will have the information based on accidents per km.

Given that the number of casualties are reducing as more and more zones are treated it is proposed to develop this process by establishing a scoring system to factor in other benefits or element which are present in the areas such as.

- Number of schools pupils
- Community centres
- Other vulnerable users centres in the area
- Shops and high streets
- Contributions from external funding.
- Population

The current process will be used to formulate the programme for this financial year (2012/13) and the revised process will identify the programme for future financial years.

### **Design Process**

- Investigate speed surveys and accident data
- Determine possible extent of 20mph limit/zone
- Onsite investigation of existing conditions/environment
- Determine costs of draft proposals
- Initial consultation
- Report to Highways and Transportation Board for approval to advertise the necessary Traffic Regulation Order (TRO)
- Introduce scheme if no resolved objections received\*
- Monitor effects e.g. carry out further speed surveys and accident studies

Where possible the Road Safety's School Travel Team go into schools prior to scheme implementation to give a presentation to the children about the 20mph and raise awareness and promote the schemes.

### **Are there any gaps in equality and diversity information**

None

**Action required:**

Ongoing monitoring of schemes, by using speed surveys and accident statistics

**6. Wider involvement – have you involved groups of people who are most likely to be affected or interested**

Yes

No

**Please provide detail:**

The following stakeholders are consulted prior to the implementation of the 20mph schemes.

- Emergency Services
- Metro
- Ward Members
- Schools
- Local residents
- Parish Councils (if applicable)

**Action required:**

None

**7. Who may be affected by this activity?**

please tick all relevant and significant equality characteristics, stakeholders and barriers that apply to your strategy, policy, service or function

**Equality characteristics**

Age

Carers

Disability

Gender reassignment

Race

Religion or Belief

Sex (male or female)

Sexual orientation

Other

**Please specify:** Social class may be more affected as they are more likely to live near busy roads and walk or use public transport.

**Stakeholders**

Services users

Employees

Trade Unions



Partners	Members	Suppliers
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other please specify</b>	
<b>Potential barriers.</b>		
..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Built environment</b>		<b>Location of premises and services</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Information and communication</b>		<b>Customer care</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Timing</b>		<b>Stereotypes and assumptions</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Cost</b>		<b>Consultation and involvement</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>specific barriers to the strategy, policy, services or function</b>	
<b>Please specify</b>		

**8. Positive and negative impact**  
Think about what you are assessing (scope), the fact finding information, the potential positive and negative impact on equality characteristics, stakeholders and the effect of the barriers

**8a. Positive impact:**

Making 20mph the normal speed limit would:

- Dramatically increases chances of survival if [hit by a car](#) to 97%
- 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
- 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

**Action required:**  
None

**8b. Negative impact:**

- There is a slight reduction in air quality when speed limits are reduced, however, this is offset by the potential reduction in fatal accidents as a consequence of reduced speeds and safety features introduced as part of 20 mph zones/limits
- Perceived displaced traffic may increase congestion on other roads, although the

level of displacement would differ for every scheme and assessing this would be costly without necessarily bringing commensurate benefits.

- Potential noise increase, due to the reduction in vehicle speeds, although this is compensated by improving road safety for pedestrians and potentially only an issue at the beginning and end of the school day
- Journey times may be increased very slightly within the relatively small area of the scheme, however, every measure is taken to ensure that this is minimal by working closely with Metro to lessen the impact on commuters on buses.
- Speed calming features may have a slight impact on emergency services, though this is mitigated by ensuring that the appropriate features are used as part of the scheme design process
- Increases future maintenance costs, particularly for raised features e.g. speed cushions, road markings

**Action required:**

None

**9. Will this activity promote strong and positive relationships between the groups/communities identified?**

Yes

No

**Please provide detail:**

The introduction of 20mph schemes will have a beneficial affect in the localised area as it will provide a safer environment for the local community.

**Action required:**

None

**10. Does this activity bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other (e.g. in schools, neighbourhood, workplace)?**

Yes

No

**Please provide detail:**

Improves community safety and makes it more of a social event as it encourages parents and children to walk or cycle to school.

**Action required:**

None

**11. Could this activity be perceived as benefiting one group at the expense of another?**

**Yes**

**No**

**Please provide detail:**

It may be perceived that the schemes have a more positive impact on pedestrians and cyclists over motorists. However, the reduction in road casualties has a beneficial affect on all three groups.

**Action required:**

None

**12. Equality, diversity, cohesion and integration action plan**

(insert all your actions from your assessment here, set timescales, measures and identify a lead person for each action)

<b>Action</b>	<b>Timescale</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Lead person</b>
Monitoring of schemes, by using speed surveys and accident statistics	Ongoing	Accident reduction	Paul Foster

<b>13. Governance, ownership and approval</b>		
State here who has approved the actions and outcomes from the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment		
Name	Job Title	Date
Gwyn Owen	Project Manager, Transport Policy	14/05/12
Howard Claxton	Traffic Engineering Manager	14/05/12

<b>14. Monitoring progress for equality, diversity, cohesion and integration actions</b> (please tick)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	As part of Service Planning performance monitoring
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	As part of Project monitoring
<input type="checkbox"/>	Update report will be agreed and provided to the appropriate board Please specify which board
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please specify)

<b>15. Publishing</b>	
<b>Date sent to Equality Team</b>	
<b>Date published</b>	

