

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

**Date: 09 May 2017**

**Subject: 2016/17 Kippax and Methley Traffic Regulation Order Objection Report**

**Capital Scheme Number : 32568**

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Kippax and Methley	<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.7) 2015, the Kippax and Methley ward Order, were advertised and attracted a total of 16 objections, of which 13 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 waiting restrictions detailed in Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.7) Order 2015 Kippax and Methley Ward Consolidation Order No.1 Order 2016. The report also seeks approval to withdraw a previously proposed and advertised element of the scheme, following representations from a Ward Member on behalf of residents that have been locally re-consulted.

## **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 (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.7) Order 2015 Kippax and Methley Ward Consolidation Order No.1 Order 2016;
  - iii) approve the withdrawal of an element of 'no waiting at any time' on Hirst Street, Allerton Bywater from the wider Traffic Regulation Order as shown on drawing TM-2596-TRO2.1;
  - iv) request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.7) Order 2015 Kippax and Methley Ward Consolidation Order No.1 Order 2016; and
  - v) 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 Kippax and Methley ward and requests the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) to consider these objections and the recommendations.
- 1.2 The report also details an element of 'no waiting at any time' on Hirst Street, Allerton Bywater that is proposed to be withdrawn from the wider scheme, following representations to officers by a Ward Member following objections from local residents.
- 1.3 The purpose of the report is to obtain authority to over-rule the objections received, withdraw the element of previously advertised 'no waiting at any time' on Hirst Street, Allerton Bywater and seeks approval to implement and seal the waiting restrictions as per the revised, 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 Kippax and Methley 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 in 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 16 objections were received. Three objections were subsequently withdrawn, leaving 13 outstanding objections, detailed in the summary of objections at the end of this report.
- 2.4 Two objections were received from residents of Hirst Street, Allerton Bywater, regarding a section of 'no waiting at any time' that was proposed to cover the access road that runs to the rear of properties 1 to 13. The measures extended a slight distance either side and the objectors raised concerns regarding the inability to park outside their property as a result of the proposals. Officers were subsequently contacted by a Ward Member on behalf of the objectors, with an enquiry as to whether the measures could be withdrawn. Officers agreed to undertake localised, direct consultation with other residents whose properties backed onto the access road. The consultation returned no objections to the removal of the measures and subsequently it was agreed appropriate to do so. The two objections are therefore considered as resolved pending approval of this report.
- 2.5 Following the receipt of two objections to the proposed measures on Main Street, Ledston, a sense check of the scheme determined that the previously proposed no waiting at any time could be relaxed to allow resident parking away from school opening and closing times, when parking around the bus stop on Main Street was noted to cause a highway obstruction. The subsequent 'No waiting, Monday to Friday, 8am-9am and 3pm-4pm' restriction was subsequently advertised between 3 March 2017 to 31 March 2017. Whilst the newly advertised measure should have resolved the objections received, the objectors declined to respond to any dialogue on this matter and for completeness, those objections remain as outstanding and are represented within this report.

### **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 across the ward, the full details are also provided on drawings TM-21-2596-TRO-1.1 to TM-21-2596-TRO1.11.
- 3.2 This report also requests approval to withdraw a proposed section of 'no waiting at any time' on Hirst Street, Allerton Bywater as per drawing TM-21-2596-TRO2.1 for the reasons detailed in paragraph 2.4.
- 3.3 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.
- 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.
- 4.1.3 The formal public advertisement of the scheme was undertaken between 19 August 2016 and 19 September 2016. The subsequent localised consultation as detailed in paragraph 2.4 was undertaken between 16 November 2016 and 5 December 2016. The further localised consultation as detailed in paragraph 2.5 was undertaken between 3 March 2017 and 31 March 2017.

## **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 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 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 £6,000 comprising:

Construction	£3,000
TRO	£1,000
Staff fees	£2,000

4.4.2 The scheme is funded by the Traffic Management Capital budget and it's completion is 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 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 Kippax and Methley ward, particularly accessibility and visibility around junctions and also protecting private accesses and subsequently it is considered appropriate to overrule the objections received and implement the Traffic Regulation Order.

5.3 Following localised consultation with residents affected by the potential withdrawal of the Hirst Street element, it is considered appropriate to withdraw the element in question as those residents who responded to that consultation expressed no objections to its removal.

### **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.7) Order 2015 Kippax and Methley Ward Consolidation Order No.1 Order 2016;

- iii) approve the withdrawal of an element of 'no waiting at any time' on Hirst Street, Allerton Bywater from the wider Traffic Regulation Order as shown on drawing TM-2596-TRO2.1;
- iv) request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.7) Order 2015 Kippax and Methley Ward Consolidation Order No.1 Order 2016; and
- v) 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 Letter sent to residents of Brexdale Avenue, Kippax, 12 September 2016.
- 7.2 Letter sent to residents of Brexdale Avenue, Kippax, 3 November 2016.

---

<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 KIPPAX AND METHLEY PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

#### Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.7) Order 2015 Kippax and Methley Ward Consolidation Order No.1 Order 2016

<b>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION</b>	<b>HIGHWAYS RESPONSE</b>
<p><b>Objection No.1</b></p> <p><i>This objection focuses on the A639 Leeds Road/ Station Road elements of the wider scheme.</i></p> <p>Objector claims that as the location where the measures are proposed is not a safe place to park, vehicles do not park there.</p> <p>Objector states that parking in front of their property is not an issue.</p> <p>The objector states that they do not wish to see the road being 'defaced by ugly yellow lines which serve no purpose, especially in such a beautiful and rural area'.</p>	<p>The information previously received and observations from colleagues centre on the parking around the junction and most normally around the bend on Leeds Road when events are taking place at the café. The parking noted causes concern in the sense that vehicles are pushed into the middle of the road and this needs to be resolved.</p> <p>The proposals take into account the distinct possibility that drivers when faced with this change detailed above, would try to park on Station Road as a secondary option and The Council seeks to ensure that such parking should it take place, does not do so by the junctions and access points to off-street parking.</p> <p>With regards to the physical markings, the standard width of a line is 100mm, separated by a 100mm gap. However, reducing the widths to 75mm or 50mm is permissible. The Council would have no issue in compromising on this by reducing the width of the lining to subsequently reduce the impact of the markings.</p>
<p><b>Objection No.2 &amp; Objection No.3</b></p> <p><i>This objection focuses on the Main Street, Ledston elements of the wider scheme. This objection should be satisfied by the alternate proposal as detailed in paragraph 2.5 of this report but is included for completeness due to a lack of dialogue from the objectors.</i></p> <p>Objector states that the proposals are totally unacceptable to them. The objector claims that parking in Ledston was not an issue until the school expanded.</p> <p>The objector states that to have no parking outside their property is unfair. Objector states the only time the road is busy is during school pick up and drop off periods, where 'outsiders that visit this village' block driveways and park indiscriminately.</p>	<p><b><i>This response was the initial reply from officers, prior to the decision to advertise the alternate restriction as detailed in paragraph 2.5 of this report.</i></b></p> <p>The proposals are the result of sustained complaints from Ledston residents regarding the parking practices of drivers at busier school times. The Council has a degree of sympathy with residents regarding this issue and it is one regularly received as parent parking is an issue that appears to be associated with many schools across the wider metropolitan district.</p> <p>The proposals put together are designed to ensure that Main Street is not blocked during those busier times when the bus pulls up to the stop, to maintain accessibility for residents into their driveways around this point of concern and to ensure that parked vehicles around the Green</p>

	<p>Lane/ Main Street junction do not park so close they adversely impact on the ability to safely negotiate that junction.</p> <p>The Council is mindful that outside of school times the village is quiet and the design has been kept to a minimum to achieve the highway benefit desired, without unduly impacting on a larger proportion of Ledston residents outside the busier periods.</p>
<p><b>Objection No.4 to No.13</b></p> <p><i>This objection focuses on the Brexdale Avenue, Kippax element of the wider scheme. The representation summarised below was received as one letter on behalf of and signed by the ten objectors.</i></p> <p>The objectors believe that resident permit parking should be introduced as part of the advertised Order, and object on the basis that this has not been included.</p> <p>The objectors believe that their requests for resident-only parking are not to be agreed to because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The road is not busy for the whole day – the staff who apparently made this observation didn't make themselves known to us so we are not sure how much times was spent observing.</li> <li>• The road is only busy at the start and end of the school day.</li> <li>• There are not the resources to police it.</li> <li>• Parents will ignore the restrictions anyway.</li> </ul> <p>The objector feels that it is doubtful that officers did survey the road all day.</p> <p>The objector explains that the school operates a number of other elements outside of the standard school year teaching day The objector claims officers failed to take into account deliveries to school, coaches, after school parent meetings, PTFA events and lettings to organisations such as Slimming World etc. The objector claims delivery trucks often park in the middle of the road and unload onto the pavements.</p> <p>The objector claims if the council take the</p>	<p>Because a resident permit parking zone does not prevent pick up and drop off activities, the Council considers permit parking in the vicinity of schools to not be an effective measure in preventing non-residential parking. The properties on Brexdale Avenue have off-street parking provision, meaning residents have an alternate parking provision to the public highway. There are other legitimate demands on this road and those need to be catered for appropriately. Poor parking practices occur at many schools across the city at the busiest times as some parents/carers 'forget' the usual rules and niceties of road etiquette. It is possible for that behaviour, if it results in obstruction, to be dealt with under existing legislation.</p> <p>It is fully understood that schools generate traffic and that parents/carers do not always show the consideration for residents or other road users. Many schools run wrap-around care facilities and offer their premises for other activities at times when the children are not there and all schools have events outside the normal school day.</p> <p>Observations were made at the busier times of the day. These are the times when the majority of children are being taken to/from school and tend to be representative of the 'worst case' scenario. Observations have also been made in passing at other times. It is accepted that officers have not carried out any form of formal survey and neither has a member of staff been present for an extended period.</p> <p>Enforcement of either restrictions or obstruction of the highway is not legally possible using cameras. If a driveway is blocked then the Council's Parking Services enforcement team can act, and need to be contacted by the occupier of the affected property by calling 0113 3950050. All other instances of obstruction (of the carriageway or footway) can only be enforced by the police. They cannot enforce using third party photographic</p>



<p>view that there are insufficient resources to enforce parking measures, there never be any implemented and using this to excuse ignoring the needs of residents to enjoy their property is wholly unacceptable. The objector queries whether measures such as CCTV could be utilised.</p> <p>The objector claims if parents received penalty notices or points on their licences, we are sure that the majority would be deterred from parking illegally.</p> <p>The proposal is that the junction of Leeds Road and Brexdale Avenue is to have extensions to the double yellow lines to make turning into and out of the Avenue safer to motorists. The objectors believe that the council seem to be focussed solely on the well-being of motorists.</p> <p>The objector believes that by not implementing a resident-only parking policy residents, they will be</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Frequently unable to enter of [sic] leave their properties</li><li>• Will be constantly disturbed by motorists entering and leaving the school during the day and on occasion, at night</li><li>• Prevented from receiving access by emergency services if required</li><li>• Will continue to have property damaged by motorists</li><li>• Will be at serious risk of injury due to motorists failure to adhere to the speed limit and general ignorance of other road users and pedestrians.</li></ul>	<p>evidence. The non-emergency police contact number is 101.</p> <p>The school is aware of the impact it has on its neighbours and does a good deal of work to encourage alternative means of travel to school and also work with the local neighbourhood policing team.</p> <p>The proposed extents of double yellow lines at the junction are to provide an improved clear area away from the junction, allowing improved access and egress around a junction where visibility splays are reduced due to walls and hedgerows. Vehicles passing one another in the middle of Brexdale Avenue have been seen to do so close to the junction with Leeds Road and the new measures will push this practice into an area further away from the junction.</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 Kippax &amp; Methley 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. Thirteen 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>5.1.1 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.

5.1.2 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.

Negative Impacts of the Scheme Features:

5.1.3 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)

6 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)	