

## Report to the Chief Officer of Highways and Transportation

**Date: 30 January 2017**

**Subject: Design & Cost Report for Highway Works associated with the Phoenix Development, Horsforth, Leeds**

**Capital Scheme Number: 32860**

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Horsforth	<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 authority. According to the Best Council Plan, the success of the Best Council objective: will be partly measured through reduced numbers of people killed or seriously injured on the city's roads. By enhancing the local residential environments and by reducing vehicle speeds, this will provide a safer and friendly road environment for all.
- 2 Highway works are required in connection with the TTP office development by the Phoenix Partnership at Low Lane, Horsforth. A S106 was signed for financial contributions to be made by the developer towards the provision of a 20mph scheme and waiting restrictions to manage parking in the vicinity.
- 3 The developer has requested that the City Council undertakes the highway works in order to meet with the requirements of the planning permission and the S106 Agreement.
- 4 This report seeks authority to implement the detailed design as set out in drawing TM-18-2851-01-02 and give authority to incur expenditure of £22,200 to be fully funded by the developer via funding secured by S106 obligation.

### 5 Recommendations

The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:

- i) Authorise, subject to public consultation the detailed design as outlined in drawing TM-18-2851-01-02 and give authority to implement the works;
- ii) give authority to incur expenditure of £22,200 being £13,000 works costs and £9,200 staff costs, all to be fully funded by the developer from the signed S106 Agreement; and
- iii) Request the City Solicitor to:
  - a. Advertise a draft Speed Limit Order and associated 90C Notice under the Highways Act 1980 to inform the public of the proposed traffic calming elements as shown on attached drawing number TM-18-2851-01-02;
  - b. Advertise a Traffic Regulation Order to introduce Waiting Restrictions as deemed appropriate; as shown on attached drawing number TM-18-2851-01-02; and
  - c. Subject to no objections being received, to make seal and implement the above Orders.

## **1.0 Purpose of this report**

- 1.1 To authorise, subject to public consultation, the implementation of a 20mph zone and Waiting Restrictions associated with the TPP development on Low Lane, Horsforth, which was granted approval in 2014 (reference 13/04490/FU).
- 1.2 To obtain authority to incur expenditure of £22,200 being £13,000 works costs and £9,200 staff costs all to be fully funded by the developer from the signed S106 Agreement.

## **2 Background information**

- 2.1 Planning permission for a four storey office building with undercroft parking on a former car showroom site on Low Lane in Horsforth was granted permission in 2014 (reference 09/00856/FU).
- 2.2 The construction of the development is complete and full occupation of the building is yet to take place.
- 2.3 A Section 106 Agreement was signed in 2014 which committed the developer to paying a sum of money towards the provision of an extension to the existing 20mph zones in the vicinity prior to the occupation of the building and funds towards the introduction of parking restrictions on occupation of the building. The details of the proposals are shown drawing TM-18-2851-01-02 and is attached to this report.
- 2.4 The amounts for the provision of the works (£22,200) have been paid to the Council and are held in the S106 Account.
- 2.5 The S106 Agreement requires the proposals shown on the attached plan TM-18-2851-01-02 to be carried out by the Council. Funding of the works has been provided from the S106 contribution and a further legal Agreement, such as a S278 Agreement, is not necessary as the funding for the highway works is already in place.
- 2.6 The developers have requested the City Council to commence the carrying out of the highway works.

## **3 Main issues**

- 3.1 The proposals within this report are concerned only with the delivery of the proposed works, the principle of these works having been considered as part of the planning process.
- 3.2 The proposed works are shown in outline on plan TM-18-2851-01-02 attached and will consist of the following:-
- An extension to the existing 20mph zones in the vicinity of the development with associated traffic calming measures;
  - The introduction of waiting restrictions on various roads including 'No Waiting At Any Time' and shared 'Resident Permit Parking' & 'Time Limited Waiting' bays in the vicinity of the development;

## **4 Programme**

- 4.1 The building is currently partly occupied and the design and construction of the works will be carried out within the financial year 2018/19.

## **5 Corporate Considerations**

### **5.1 Consultation and Engagement**

#### **5.1.1 Ward Members:**

Members were consulted by email dated 23/5/2017 and all have responded in support of the scheme.

#### **5.1.2 Emergency Services and the West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA):**

The Emergency Services and WYCA were consulted by email dated 23/5/2017 and no adverse comments have been received.

#### **5.1.3 Local Residents:**

The affected residents at each location were consulted via letter/email between 18/9/2017 and 27/11/2017. 10 out of the 12 objections received were resolved through minor changes to the proposals and 2 objections remain outstanding.

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

- 5.2.1 An Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Screening has been completed as attached in Appendix 1. The positive and negative impacts of the scheme have been identified as follows:

#### **5.2.2 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.
- Improve quality of life for the local community.

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

- Have the potential to provide a slight increase in vehicular emissions due to lower speeds. It is expected there will be a reduction of between 1-2mph for the average speed across the zone and that the potential air quality implications will be negligible and offset due to the more uniformed driving behaviour and potential increase in modal shift to more sustainable travel choices.

5.2.3 Positive Impact: The introduction of the proposed waiting restrictions would:

- Improve the control of indiscriminate parking in the vicinity and improve road safety issues such as clearing sightlines for motorists and improving vehicular access.

Negative Impact: The proposed waiting restrictions may:

- Result in displaced parking to other residential streets but the negative impact of introducing the restrictions is far outweighed by the road safety benefits highlighted above.

## **6. Council policies and City Priorities**

6.1 The proposed highway works which allow the development to take place accord with:

6.2 The Councils Local Transport Plan in that they provide a safe means of access for all users of the highway, to and around the development.

6.3 The Best Council Plan 2015-20 that outlines how Leeds City will achieve its ambition to become the Best City in the UK and Leeds City Council the best authority. According to the Best Council Plan, the success of the Best Council objective: will be partly measured through reduced numbers of people killed or seriously injured on the city's roads. By enhancing the local residential environments and by reducing vehicle speeds, this will provide a safer and friendly road environment for all.

### **6.4 Resources and value for money**

6.4.1 The total estimated cost of the scheme is £22,200 being £13,000 works costs and £9,200 staff costs, all to be fully funded by the developer from the contributions secured by S106 Agreement attached to planning permission 09/00856/FU.

### **6.5 Capital Funding and Cash Flow**

6.5.1 Funding: The total cost of the scheme will be funded from the contribution secured by the S106 Agreement, including the works costs, statutory undertakers costs and the cost of staff fees.

6.5.2 Staffing: The design and supervision of the works can be carried out within the existing staff resources.

<b>Funding Approval :</b>	<b>Capital Section Reference Number :-</b>						
<b>Previous total Authority to Spend on this scheme</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>TO MARCH</b>	<b>FORECAST</b>				
	<b>£000's</b>	<b>2017 £000's</b>	<b>2017/18 £000's</b>	<b>2018/19 £000's</b>	<b>2019/20 £000's</b>	<b>2020/21 £000's</b>	<b>2021 on £000's</b>
LAND (1)	0.0						
CONSTRUCTION (3)	0.0						
FURN & EQPT (5)	0.0						
DESIGN FEES (6)	0.0						
OTHER COSTS (7)	0.0						
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Authority to Spend required for this Approval</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>TO MARCH</b>	<b>FORECAST</b>				
	<b>£000's</b>	<b>2017 £000's</b>	<b>2017/18 £000's</b>	<b>2018/19 £000's</b>	<b>2019/20 £000's</b>	<b>2020/21 £000's</b>	<b>2021 on £000's</b>
LAND (1)	0.0						
CONSTRUCTION (3)	13.0			13.0			
FURN & EQPT (5)	0.0						
DESIGN FEES (6)	9.2		8.2	1.0			
OTHER COSTS (7)	0.0						
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>22.2</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Total overall Funding (As per latest Capital Programme)</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>TO MARCH</b>	<b>FORECAST</b>				
	<b>£000's</b>	<b>2017 £000's</b>	<b>2017/18 £000's</b>	<b>2018/19 £000's</b>	<b>2019/20 £000's</b>	<b>2020/21 £000's</b>	<b>2021 on £000's</b>
Section 106	22.2		8.2	14.0			
Total Funding	22.2	0.0	8.2	14.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Balance / Shortfall =</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## 7 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

- 7.1 The works are exempt from call in being a consequence of and in pursuance of a regulatory decision.

## 8 Risk Management

- 8.1 A maximum sum of £22,200 is available to the scheme from the contributions to the provision and future maintenance of the 20mph zone and proposed waiting restrictions secured by S106 Agreement attached to planning permission (reference 09/00856/FU). The full amount of the contributions have been collected and the full amount for the total estimated cost of the scheme will be transferred from the S106 Account to the Capital Scheme Number when Highway Board approval and a DDN notice can be presented to the Planning Finance officer. The balance of the actual cost will be settled on completion of the scheme with any remaining funds to be provided toward the future maintenance of the works proposed.
- 8.2 The total estimated cost of the scheme is expenditure of £22,200 being £13,000 works costs and £9,200 staff costs. It is anticipated that the contributions received through the S106 would more than cover the total cost of the works.

## 9 Conclusions

- 9.1 The scheme will facilitate safe and efficient access to the development site for users of the highway network.
- 9.2 This report seeks authority to incur expenditure of £22,200 being £13,000 works costs and £9,200 staff costs, all to be fully funded by the developer via funding secured by S106 obligation.

## **10 Recommendations**

- 10.1 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:
- i) Authorise, subject to public consultation the detailed design as outlined in drawing TM-18-2851-01-02 and give authority to implement the works;
  - ii) give authority to incur expenditure of £22,200 being £13,000 works costs and £9,200 staff costs, all to be fully funded by the developer from the signed S106 Agreement; and
  - iii) Request the City Solicitor to:
    - a) Advertise a draft Speed Limit Order and associated 90C Notice under the Highways Act 1980 to inform the public of the proposed traffic calming elements as shown on attached drawing number TM-18-2851-01-02;
    - b) Advertise a Traffic Regulation Order to introduce Waiting Restrictions as deemed appropriate; as shown on attached drawing number TM-18-2851-01-02; and
    - c) Subject to no objections being received, to make seal and implement the above Orders.

## **11 Background documents<sup>1</sup>**

- 11.1 Appendix 1 - Equality Impact Assessment Screening.

---

<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 1

# 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:</b> City Development	<b>Service area:</b> Highways & Transportation
<b>Lead person:</b> John Mills	<b>Contact number:</b> 0113 3787479

### 1. Title: Phoenix Development, Horsforth

Is this a:

☐

**Strategy / Policy**

☒

**Service / Function**

☐

**Other**

**If other, please specify**

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

The screening focuses on the report seeking approval to introduce a Speed Limit Order for a 20mph zone and a Traffic Regulation Order for various traffic management measures, in the vicinity of the TPP development on Low Lane, Horsforth; to be fully funded by the developer via funding secured by a S106 obligation.

### 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?		√
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**.

<b>4. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration</b>
<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>The Emergency Services, WYCA, Ward Members and residents directly affected have been consulted. The Ward Members have responded in support of the proposals and 10 out of the 12 objections received from residents to date have been resolved through minor amendments to the scheme proposals.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Key findings</b> (<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)</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Waiting restrictions:</u></b></p>



Positive: The introduction of the proposed waiting restrictions will improve the control of indiscriminate parking in the vicinity and improve road safety issues such as clearing sightlines for motorists and improving vehicular access.

Negative: The proposed waiting restrictions may result in displaced parking to other residential streets but the negative impact of introducing the restrictions is far outweighed by the road safety benefits highlighted above.

### 20mph zone:

Positive: 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.
- 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.

### Negative:

- 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.
- 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.

- **Actions**

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

N/a.

**5.** If you are **not** already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and

integration you <b>will need to carry out an impact assessment</b> .	
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
Gary Pritchard	Senior Engineer	05/12/2017

## 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.

If this screening relates to a **Key Delegated Decision, Executive Board, full Council** or a **Significant Operational Decision** a copy should be emailed to Corporate Governance and will be published along with the relevant report.

A copy of **all other** screening's should be sent to [equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk](mailto:equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk). For record keeping purposes it will be kept on file (but not published).

Date screening completed	05/12/2017
If relates to a Key Decision - <b>date sent to Corporate Governance</b>	
Any other decision – <b>date sent to Equality Team (equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk)</b>	05/12/2017