

Report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation)

Date: 25 April 2017

Subject: 2016/2017 Harewood Traffic Regulation Order Objection Report

Capital Scheme Number : 32568

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Harewood	<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 Order (No.59) 2014, the Harewood ward Order, were advertised and attracted a total of four objections, two of which remain. These objections are with regards to a proposal in Barwick in Elmet.
- 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.59) Order 2014 Harewood Ward Amendment No1 Order 2017.

Recommendations

- 4 The Chief Officer 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.59) Order 2014 Harewood Ward Amendment Order No.1 Order 2017;
- iii) request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.59) Order 2014 Harewood Ward Amendment Order No.1 Order 2017; 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 Harewood 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 representations via Ward Members, members of the public and officer observations, a scheme was developed to introduce a number of waiting restriction measures within the Harewood ward with the intention of improving accessibility and visibility at key points, thus improving road safety.
- 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 16 December 2016 and 31 January 2017. As a result of the advertisement period, a total of four objections were received. Other representations have been received which, whilst not objecting, have been taken into consideration.
- 2.4 Following the advertisement of proposed restrictions and amendment to existing restrictions in Shadwell near the primary school and post office, two objections and two representations were received. One objection was subsequently withdrawn following an explanation of the proposal. One of the representations was from a local Ward Member who requested that a holistic approach was undertaken to review various issues in Shadwell and any proposed restrictions around the primary school can be undertaken within this review. We have agreed with this approach and the proposed restrictions near the primary school have subsequently been withdrawn from this Traffic Regulation Order. The remaining objector to this part of the proposals has been informed of this.

2.5 The two remaining objections are to proposals at the junction of Aberford Road / Fieldhead Drive in Barwick in Elmet. The proposal originated from a resident who reported their concerns regarding vehicles being parked at the junction that hindered visibility sightlines and traffic movements. This parking originates from a local business that is located on Aberford Road.

2.6 Other restrictions within the Harewood Ward which were advertised as part of this proposal received no objections.

3. Main issues

3.1 This report refers to a Traffic Regulation Order that seeks to implement various restrictions including a length of 'No waiting at any time' at the junction of Fieldhead Drive / Aberford Road in Barwick and Elmet in Harewood Ward, as shown on drawings TM-16-2587-12-4.

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 2 June 2016. The parish councils of Shadwell, Barwick and Scholes and Collingham and Linton were also consulted on the 2 June 2016. No objections were received and one Ward Member supported the proposals.

4.1.2 Emergency Services and West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA): The Emergency Services and WYCA were consulted by email on 2 June 2016.

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 and it is considered that the introduction of the Traffic Regulation Order at this location will provide positive impacts to all road users by improving the free movement of traffic and the inter-visibility between pedestrian and vehicle users. The proposal 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.

4.2.4 A consequence of the implementation of parking restrictions is that parking will displace to new locations which may be further into Fieldhead Drive, however this will be away from the junction which will improve the current situation as noted in paragraph 4.2.1.

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

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

TRO	£2500
Staff fees	£3500
Legal fees	£1000

4.4.2 The scheme is funded by the Traffic Management Capital budget and its completion is anticipated within the 2017/18 financial year.

4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

- The scheme is not eligible for Call In.

4.6 Risk Management

- 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 the visibility sightlines and turning movements at the junction of Fieldhead Drive / Aberford Road.

6. Recommendations

6.1 The Chief Officer 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.59) Order 2014 Harewood Ward Amendment Order No.1 Order 2017;
- iii) request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.59) Order 2014 Harewood Ward Amendment Order No.1 Order 2017; 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 HAREWOOD PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.59) Order 2014 Harewood Ward Amendment Order No.1 Order 2017

SUMMARY OF OBJECTION	HIGHWAYS RESPONSE
<p>Objection No.1</p> <p>The objector states they are concerned that drivers will park their vehicles further in to Fieldhead Drive and then further double yellow lines will be proposed.</p> <p>The objector states the restrictions would look unsightly in a semi-rural location.</p> <p>The objector is concerned that Fieldhead Drive will become a permit zone involving further road markings and the possibility of a fine.</p> <p>Objection No.2</p> <p>The objectors does not think the proposals will reduce the volume of car users seeking to park near to the businesses and that Leeds City Council should adapt the roadside facilities to make more parking for the business.</p> <p>The objector thinks the double yellow lines will spoil this part of Barwick and that the Highway Code already covers parking so the restrictions are not required.</p>	<p>The restrictions are proposed at the junction of Fieldhead Drive / Aberford Road to improve visibility sightlines and assist turning movements at the junction. No further restrictions are proposed at this location.</p> <p>This location is not within a conservation area and it is considered that the safety benefits provided by the double yellow lines should take precedence over the visual impact that this short length of restrictions will have.</p> <p>There are no proposals for a residents permit parking zone on Fieldhead Drive</p> <p>The intention of the restrictions is to manage the location of the current on-street parking that takes place in this area away from the junction to improve visibility sightlines for all road users. There is no funding available as part of this proposal to create off street parking facilities for local businesses.</p> <p>This location is not within a conservation area and it is considered that the safety benefits provided by the double yellow lines should take precedence over the visual impact that this short length of restrictions will have.</p> <p>Many of the rules in the Highway Code are legal requirements and such rules are identified by the words 'MUST/MUST NOT'. In relation parking at junctions the Highway Code states 'DO NOT...stop or park opposite or within 10m (32 feet) of a junction except in an</p>

	<p>authorised parking space'. This rule in itself is not a legal requirement. As such the proposed restrictions are required to remove parking at the junction and so to enable enforcement of the double yellow lines.</p>
--	---

Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Screening



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

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

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

Directorate: Development	Service area: Traffic Management
Lead person: Craig Williams	Contact number: 37 87494

1. Title: 2016/2017 Harewood Ward Traffic Regulation Order

Is this a:

Strategy / Policy

 Service / Function

 Other

If other, please specify: Traffic Regulation Order

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

The screening focuses on a report to the Highways and Transportation Board requesting authority to implement a Traffic Regulation Order in the Harewood ward, specifically overruling objections received during the public advertisement period.

3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

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

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

When considering these questions think about age, carers, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation and any other relevant

characteristics (for example socio-economic status, social class, income, unemployment, residential location or family background and education or skills levels).		
Questions	Yes	No
Is there an existing or likely differential impact for the different equality characteristics?	X	
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the policy or proposal?	X	
Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom?		X
Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment practices?		X
Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment • Advancing equality of opportunity • Fostering good relations 		X

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

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

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

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

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 has taken place with the following stakeholders:

- Local Councillors
- Emergency Services (Police, West Yorkshire Fire and Ambulances Services)
- Metro
- Local Residents – via public notice, advert in the local press and Leeds City Council's 'Traffweb' web page.
- Parish Councils

Two objections have been received by residents, as detailed in the summary table in Appendix A.

• **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)

The introduction of the Traffic Regulation Order at this location will provide positive impacts to all road users by:

- Improving the free movement of traffic and the inter-visibility between pedestrian and vehicle users.
- Improving 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.

Negative Impacts of the Scheme Features:

- A consequence of the implementation of parking restrictions is that parking will displace to new locations which may be further into Fieldhead Drive, however this will be away from the junction which will improve the current situation as noted above.

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

Should any negative impacts arise from this proposal then this can be considered and addressed as necessary.

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	Traffic Engineering Manager	29/3/2017

7. Publishing

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

Please send a copy to the Equality Team for publishing

Date screening completed	29 March 2017
Date sent to Equality Team	
Date published (To be completed by the Equality Team)	