

REPORT TO THE CHIEF OFFICER (HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION)

DATE: 17 NOVEMBER 2009

Subject: Objection Report

**Scheme Title: GLEN ROAD AND ANCASTER ROAD AREAS OF WEETWOOD
PROPOSED RESIDENT PERMIT PARKING AND ASSOCIATED
PARKING RESTRICTION – OBJECTIONS TO ADVERTISED
ORDER**

Capital Scheme Number: 14257

Electoral Wards Affected:

WEETWOOD

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

Eligible for Call In

Not Eligible for Call In
(Details contained in the report)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Following submission of a report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation), approval was granted on 28 July 2009 to advertise a Traffic Regulation Order to introduce restrictions in numerous streets surrounding the Glen Road and Ancaster Road areas of Far Headingley and West Park, Weetwood. Contributory factors to the parking include Leeds Metropolitan University, commuters, schools, local shops and residents.

This report details objections received on advertising of the Traffic Regulation Order as well as the Officer's responses. The report asks the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) to consider these objections and if appropriate, give authority to seal the order

1.0 PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) of objections received to the Glen Road and Ancaster Road Areas of Weetwood Proposed Resident Permit Parking Traffic Regulation Order in order to consider them along with the officer's recommendations and if appropriate, give authority to seal the order as detailed in drawing TMW/32/1169/014B, 022B, 023B.

2.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2.1 Background for this scheme has been detailed in report 2572/2009 of 28 July 2009, a copy of which is attached.

- 2.2 The Traffic Regulation Order (Leeds City Council, Waiting Restrictions Order W40) was advertised from Friday 7 August 2009 to Monday 7 September 2009.
- 2.3 In excess of eight hundred properties were consulted which elicited about three hundred replies, leading to changes to the proposal. Advertising of the Order generated sixty three responses of which six were in full support and forty four were objecting. Some correspondees had more than one objection. All objections as well as reactions from Highway Services are detailed within this report.
- 2.4 The needs upon the highway in the locations detailed are many fold and it should be noted that the local authority has complied with Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act in its consideration of the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic, including pedestrians.

3.0 MAIN ISSUES

- 3.1 Eighteen elements of the proposal have resulted in objections and some for more than one reason. Each element of objection has therefore been considered individually although the number of objectors per topic is recorded.
- 3.2 **OBJECTION 1 - The Exclusion of the North (wide) Side of Ancaster Road from Resident Permit Parking:**
- 3.2.1 OBJECTION: Inability to park on street outside their home. (seven representations)
- 3.2.2 RESPONSE:
- i) all properties have off street parking;
 - ii) on street parking is not day long. Surveys recorded a turnover of spaces (see Ancaster Road Area Parking Survey attached);
 - iii) all properties on northern side are eligible to permits for adjacent on street permit parking; and
 - iv) number of spaces on northern side is twenty one, number of properties is seven. Unwilling to lose so many spaces when demand is high.
- 3.2.3 OBJECTION: Road will become unsafe due to speed of vehicles. (thirteen representations)
- 3.2.4 RESPONSE:
- i) as on street parking reduces usable road width and gives perception of less space, it is generally accepted as a method of supporting vehicle speed reduction; and
 - ii) vehicle manoeuvres (into spaces, accesses, road junctions) will reduce potential for excessive speed.
- 3.2.5 OBJECTION: There will be an increase in noise (four representations).
- 3.2.6 RESPONSE: The proposal will not result in any increase in the level of parking that currently takes place although it must be stated that before the changes within the Becket Park Campus, parking amongst these streets was minimal. Any noise generated is that associated with normal use of the public highway.
- 3.2.7 OBJECTION: There will be an increase in litter. (four representations)

3.2.8 RESPONSE: The proposal will not result in any increase in the level of parking that currently takes place although it must be stated that before the changes within the Becket Park Campus, parking amongst these streets was minimal. There is no evidence to support that the proposal will generate an increase in litter.

3.2.9 OBJECTION: Poor parking will result in accesses being obstructed. (1 representation)

3.2.10 RESPONSE: Residents have been afforded opportunity for formal parking restrictions to protect their access. Some have accepted, some have declined and subsequently objected. Should obstruction take place, action can be taken by either the Police or the Local Authority's Parking Services.

3.3 **OBJECTION 2 – The Exclusion of Kepstorn Road from Resident Permit Parking:**

3.3.1 OBJECTION: Inability to park on street outside their home. (five representations)

3.3.2 RESPONSE:

i) all properties have off street parking;

ii) all properties on Kepstorn Road are eligible to permits for adjacent on street permit parking; and

iii) unwilling to lose so many on street spaces when demand is high.

3.3.3 OBJECTION: Road will become unsafe due to speed of vehicles. (fifteen representations)

3.3.4 RESPONSE:

i) as on street parking reduces usable road width and gives perception of less space, it is generally accepted as a method of supporting vehicle speed reduction; and

ii) vehicle manoeuvres (into spaces, accesses, road junctions) will reduce potential for excessive speed.

3.3.5 OBJECTION: There will be an increase in noise. (seven representations)

3.3.6 RESPONSE: The proposal will not result in any increase in the level of parking that currently takes place although it must be stated that before the changes within the Becket Park Campus, parking amongst these streets was minimal. Any noise generated is that associated with normal use of the public highway.

3.3.7 OBJECTION: There will be an increase in litter. (eight representations)

3.3.8 RESPONSE: The proposal will not result in any increase in the level of parking that currently takes place although it must be stated that before the changes within the Becket Park Campus, parking amongst these streets was minimal. There is no evidence to support that the proposal will generate an increase in litter.

3.3.9 OBJECTION: There will be an increase in pollution from vehicle emissions. (two representations)

3.3.10 RESPONSE: The proposal will not result in any increase in the level of vehicular movements that currently takes place although it must be stated that before the changes within the Becket Park Campus, this level was much reduced. However, the roads are public highway and even with the parking, usage is comparable to similar streets.

3.3.11 OBJECTION: Damage to verges. (five representations)

3.3.12 RESPONSE:

- i) by controlling parking with effective and clear restrictions, likelihood of damage reduced as drivers should not leave vehicles in incorrect location in ignorance; and
- ii) only roads with significant width are to be left unrestricted as these can accommodate vehicles wholly on carriageway.

3.4 **OBJECTION 3 – Reduction in the Number of On Street Parking Spaces to Serve West Park Parade of Shops.**

3.4.1 OBJECTION: Will result in closure of shops. (six representations)

3.4.2 RESPONSE: Number of suitable spaces lost due to proposed restriction: 10 about 155m from shops and 2 at 40m from shops. Spaces with two hour limited waiting created as part of proposal: 7 at 15m from shops. Unrestricted spaces created due to proposal: 4 about 90m from shops. In summary, 12 spaces lost and 11 created. Other spaces are to be changed from unlimited to two hour limited waiting. Furthermore, 4 spaces on Otley Road immediately outside shops are seldom used and are available for majority of day.

3.4.3 OBJECTION: Scheme provides no provision for staff. (six representations)

3.4.4 RESPONSE: Proposal provides in excess of 60 unrestricted spaces within 200m of the parade of shops.

3.4.5 OBJECTION: Unsafe for staff of shops to walk to parked vehicle. (two representations)

3.4.6 RESPONSE: The council is unaware of any specific reasons why pedestrians travelling between property and vehicles are at greater risk within this location.

3.5 **OBJECTION 4 – Insufficient Short Term Spaces for Customers:**

3.5.1 OBJECTION: Nothing to support Objection. (nine representations)

3.5.2 RESPONSE: Proposal provides 27 spaces with limited waiting (one or two hours) within 140m of shops. Currently, no spaces have restriction and therefore no guarantee of turnover for customers. Staff occupy those spaces in immediate vicinity of shops for duration of working day, preventing a turnover of those spaces. Furthermore, 4 spaces on Otley Road immediately outside shops are seldom used and are available for majority of day.

3.5.3 OBJECTION: Permit holders will use Limited Waiting Spaces. (one representation)

3.5.4 RESPONSE: Only 10 spaces will have exemption for permit holders and these are those furthest from the shops. These locations currently have very little resident parking during the working day.

3.5.5 OBJECTION: Customers will be unable to load and unload. (one representation)

- 3.5.6 RESPONSE: In addition to all spaces, restricted or limited, there is in excess of 75m of 'No waiting at any time' within 40m of the parade of shops, which will facilitate loading and unloading.
- 3.6 **OBJECTION 5 – Duration of Short Term Parking (two hours) is Insufficient:**
- 3.6.1 OBJECTION: Some treatments in hairdresser or salon require more than two hours (seven representations).
- 3.6.2 RESPONSES: Proposal provides in excess of 60 unrestricted spaces within 200m of the parade of shops.
- 3.7 **OBJECTION 6 – Inadequate Consultation**
- 3.7.1 OBJECTION: Claim that shops were not included in consultation. (four representations)
- 3.7.2 RESPONSE: Consultation started in December 2007 with a letter drop to over eight hundred properties. A further letter drop was completed in September 2008 which detailed the scheme proposal. In April 2009, all premises within Ancaster Road and Glen Road areas had a letter and drawings detailing the intended scheme to be advertised. Following a claim from some of the shop owners, a further letter was delivered in May 2009 to each shop within the Otley Road parade of shops.
- 3.7.3 OBJECTION: Substantial change to principle of scheme part way through meant that complete consultation should have been re-started. (one representation)
- 3.7.4 RESPONSE: This substantial change to one element of the scheme (from waiting restrictions to resident permit parking) happened due to significant amount of requests from consultees. Consultation deemed to have garnered ideas and feeling of those affected and in order to progress, decision taken to advertise to determine formally those in favour or against. In part justified with only forty four objections received.
- 3.7.5 OBJECTION: Claim that three hundred responses over the duration of the consultation is not representative and therefore is inadequate consultation. (one representation)
- 3.7.6 RESPONSE: Consultation deemed to have garnered ideas and feeling of those affected and in order to progress, decision taken to advertise to determine formally those in favour or against. In part justified with only forty four objections received. Leeds City Council cannot force consultees to respond. A lack of response has to be interpreted as a general acceptance of the proposal.
- 3.8 **OBJECTION 7 – Wholly Including Welburn Avenue within Resident Permit Parking**
- 3.8.1 OBJECTION: Inclusion of Welburn Avenue has reduced on street parking that could have accommodated parking for Otley Road parade of shops. (two representations)
- 3.8.2 RESPONSE: Welburn Avenue has seven two hour limited waiting spaces. Rest of the street is designated Residents Only Parking as one part of street has purpose built maisonettes and houses without off street parking.
- 3.9 **OBJECTION 8 – The Omission of 'No waiting at any time' for a Length of Seven Metres on Church Wood Avenue**

- 3.9.1 **OBJECTION:** A parked vehicle at this proximity to Otley Road will hinder larger vehicles when turning into Church Wood Avenue. (one representation)
- 3.9.2 **RESPONSE:** No change to existing restriction as part of this order and parking has been restricted within 28m of Otley Road for some time. No recorded problems at this location. This restriction runs for 28m from junction on both sides of minor road and it should be noted that there are few articulated vehicles over seventeen metres in length.
- 3.10 **OBJECTION 9 – Insufficient Restrictions at the junction of Kepstorn Road/Ancaster Road and Kepstorn Road and Northolme Crescent.**
- 3.10.1 **OBJECTION:** Concentration of student parking in this area is likely to result in vehicular conflict. (one representation)
- 3.10.2 **RESPONSE:** The proposed ‘No waiting at any time’ for Kepstorn Road at its junction with Ancaster Road runs for 15m either side of the minor road. The restrictions running into the minor road butt up to the residents permit parking and therefore do not permit any other parking within Ancaster Road.
- 3.10.3 **RESPONSE:** There are no proposed restrictions for Kepstorn Road at its junction with Northolme Crescent. The road width is in excess of eleven metres at this point and will accommodate parking and still permit two way traffic along Kepstorn Road.
- 3.11 **OBJECTION 10 – There will be an Increase in Car Crime.**
- 3.11.1 **OBJECTION:** A large concentration of unsupervised parking creates the potential for increased local car-related crime. (one representation)
- 3.11.2 **RESPONSE:** There are suggestions that locations without regular human interaction suffer from higher crime levels (town and city centre regenerations have aimed to increase pedestrians to, in part, counter criminal activity). More specifically, there are suggestions that house crime has risen in suburban areas where parking has been cleared out, due to a lack of ‘natural surveillance’. The duration of parking associated with the Beckett Park Campus is mainly two to four hours, resulting in regular pedestrian movements which may be deemed a deterrent to criminals.
- 3.12 **OBJECTION 11 – As a similar Street (Church Wood Avenue) already has Permit Parking, a precedent has been set.**
- 3.12.1 **OBJECTION:** Roads of similar width to Kepstorn Road were included in the Beckett’s Park permit zone, leading to a concern about consistency of approach. (six representations)
- 3.12.2 **RESPONSE:** Resident only parking bays were introduced along one side of Church Wood Avenue in 2004. Church Wood Avenue is similar to Ancaster Road in both width and having housing only along one side. All properties have off street parking. The permit only bays along Church Wood Avenue are seldom used by residents as they utilise their own off street parking. This road space could have been better used for on street parking, whether restricted or otherwise.
- 3.13 **OBJECTION 12 – Introduction of ‘No waiting at any time’ along centre section of Kepstorn Road**

- 3.13.1 OBJECTION: Inability to park on street outside their home. (three representations)
- 3.13.2 RESPONSE: Kepstorn Road is in excess of nine metres wide along most of its length excepting the length between Welburn Avenue and Harrowby Road where it narrows to seven metres. Parking has occurred on both sides of this length and geometry of road leaves insufficient width for larger vehicles to gain access. Introduction of staggered 'No waiting at any time' will ensure access for refuse collections and emergency access.
- 3.14 **OBJECTION 13 – Hollin Gardens Resident Permit Parking Operating Time is unsuitable**
- 3.14.1 OBJECTION: Proposed start time of 10:00 am will not overcome problem of school parking around 9:00 am which contributes significantly to obstruction. (two representations)
- 3.14.2 RESPONSE: Operating time to be amended to begin at 8:00 am.
- 3.15 **OBJECTION 14 – Proposed Restrictions along Weetwood Lane**
- 3.15.1 OBJECTION: Parking will be displaced from Weetwood Lane into Weetwood Walk. (one representation)
- 3.15.2 RESPONSE: Weetwood Walk is along Weetwood Lane over 300m away from the Glen Road junction. Both sides of Weetwood Lane along this length (total 600m) are available for parking, allowing for access and drives. Proposed restrictions nearby (Weetwood Avenue, Weetwood Lane) should only displace about 250m of parking.
- 3.15.3 OBJECTION: Inability to park on street outside their home. (one representation)
- 3.15.4 RESPONSE: Only two properties will lose ability to park immediately outside. Both of these have significant off street parking and proposed 'No waiting at any time' will protect their access. One household specifically asked for the parking restriction to extend beyond their property. One household has not corresponded.
- 3.15.5 OBJECTION: The proposals will have a detrimental effect on businesses in the area. (one representation)
- 3.15.6 RESPONSE: The nearest businesses are near Weetwood Lane's junction with Otley Road. Any displaced parking caused by this proposal is unlikely to impact on this area.
- 3.15.6 OBJECTION: There will be an increase in vehicle speed on Weetwood Lane. (one representation)
- 3.15.7 RESPONSE: As on street parking reduces usable road width and gives perception of less space, it is generally accepted as a method of supporting vehicle speed reduction.
- 3.15.8 OBJECTION: The proposed length of 'No waiting at any time' restriction north of Glen Road is insufficient as parking will restrict visibility when using access to properties. Can length be extended to prohibit parking for a further 70 metres. (one representation)

- 3.15.9 RESPONSE: Proposed restrictions along Weetwood Lane already extend more than fifty metres from its Glen Road junction to ensure visibility for junction. Extending this restriction by 70 metres will mean a reduction in available on street spaces, extending the area of displacement.
- 3.15.10 OBJECTION: Proposed length of 'No waiting at any time' restriction north of Glen Road is insufficient as it should prohibit parking wholly along one side of Weetwood Lane in order to allow road space for traffic. (one representation)
- 3.15.11 RESPONSE: The carriageway along this section of Weetwood Lane varies in width from 8.1m to 9.3m. With the addition of two footways and a verge, appearance of the road is wide and can promote speed. The accident record at the Glen Road junction shows eleven slight injuries. This section of Weetwood Avenue comprises the 120m immediately before its junction with Glen Road. The aim of allowing on street parking along this length of Weetwood Lane is to actually narrow the usable carriageway width as well as reduce the perception of a wide street to gain speed reduction. In some locations, vehicles may have to give way to other vehicles which will again aid speed reduction on this 30mph residential road.
- 3.15.12 OBJECTION: The increase in parked vehicles further jeopardises the safety of pedestrians. (one representation)
- 3.15.13 RESPONSES: To the north of the Glen Road junction, parking on Weetwood Lane will be prohibited within 35m and 51m while to the south this will be 22m and 50m. Most pedestrian movements are associated with Glen Road and take place at this crossroads. As part of a separately Local Transport Plan funded scheme, the carriageway is to be narrowed with two build outs here to further encourage speed reduction. These also serve as more prominent staging areas for pedestrians afforded better visibility to oncoming traffic and vice versa. The width of carriageway to be negotiated is also reduced by about 1.4m.
- 3.15.14 OBJECTION: Proposals will not prevent verge damage. (one representation)
- 3.15.15 RESPONSE: By controlling parking with effective and clear restrictions, likelihood of damage reduced as drivers should not leave vehicles in incorrect location in ignorance. Some damage was caused by drivers overrunning verge to negotiate poorly parked vehicles. These locations are proposed to have restrictions to remove this parking and therefore remove the need for them to be circumnavigated.
- 3.16 **OBJECTION 15 – Inclusion of Flats above Otley Road Parade**
- 3.16.1 OBJECTION: Reduces the desirability of the flats and tenancing will become more difficult. (one representation)
- 3.16.2 RESPONSE: Unsure how desirability of flats will be reduced as tenants will be eligible for permits as well as still having unrestricted parking available in the same locations as now.
- 3.17 **OBJECTION 16 – 'No waiting at any time' Restriction on Kepstorn Road at its junction with Otley Road**

- 3.17.1 **OBJECTION:** Proposed lengths of restriction reduces the amount of on street parking available to service Otley Road Parade. (one representation)
- 3.17.2 **RESPONSE:** Two lengths of restriction are proposed for this location (25m and 8m) totalling 33m. These restrictions are necessary as parking in the minor road (Kepstorn Road) starts from the tangent point with the major road (Otley Road). This hinders visibility when egressing the minor road as well as obstructing the desire line for pedestrians when crossing the mouth of the minor road. The longer restriction runs to ensure access for a private garage.
- 3.18 **OBJECTION 17 – Wholly Including Welburn Drive within Resident Permit Parking**
- 3.18.1 **OBJECTION:** Inclusion of Welburn Drive has reduced on street parking that could have accommodated parking for Otley Road parade of shops. (one representation)
- 3.18.2 **RESPONSE:** Welburn Drive is proposed to have 'No waiting at any time' for 15m and resident permit parking for 60m. Its proximity (less than 40m) to those properties that have no off street parking (Welburn Avenue) may mean a greater concentration of resident parking in Welburn Drive and this section of Welburn Avenue.
- 3.19 **OBJECTION 18 – Proposed Restrictions along Weetwood Avenue**
- 3.19.1 **OBJECTION:** There will be a loss of on street daytime parking. (two representations)
- 3.19.2 **RESPONSE:** Proposed daytime restriction (10am to 4pm) will mean loss of daytime parking. All properties fronted with this restriction have off street parking provision. Weetwood Avenue has a carriageway width of less than five metres and on street parking has hindered and prevented refuse collections and larger vehicle manoeuvres, resulting in verge damage.
- 3.19.3 **OBJECTION:** Parking will be displaced to Hollin Drive. (two representations)
- 3.19.4 **RESPONSE:** Proposed restrictions do not include Hollin Drive which is 500m from the Glen Road and Weetwood Lane junction and unlikely to be impacted by parking generated by the Beckett Park Campus or Richmond House School. Restrictions are proposed for Meanwood Park entrance. Of twelve properties along this section of Hollin Drive, nine have off street parking. Intention is to allow parking along Hollin Drive (about 60m from park entrance) as well as allow on street parking for the three properties in Hollin Drive that have no parking provision.
- 3.19.4 **OBJECTION:** Will increase volume of traffic in Hollin Drive and increase noise. (one representation)
- 3.19.5 **RESPONSE:** The proposal will not result in any increase in the level of vehicular movements that currently takes place although it must be stated that the occasional parking for Meanwood Park is likely to relocate into Hollin Drive. Observations have never shown more than two vehicles parked on the highway at the entrance to Meanwood Park. Meanwood Park has its own car park. The roads are public highway and even with the parking, usage is comparable to similar streets.

- 3.19.6 OBJECTION: Would like to see Resident's Permit Parking. (four representations)
- 3.19.7 RESPONSE: Whilst it is likely that a permit parking scheme would remove the high amount of itinerant parking, it would not guarantee the removal of on street parking. Any on street parking along Weetwood Avenue may hinder and prevent refuse collections and access for larger vehicles. In addition, waiting restrictions are accepted as being simpler to understand as the restriction is displayed at point of parking whereas permit zones require drivers to be aware they have entered the zone. Waiting restrictions are easier to administrate (there is no application procedure regarding issuing or replacing permits) and leaves fewer avenues for appeal (drivers forgetting to display permits, "was in the property looking for permit"). Enforcement does not require inspection of individual vehicle for permit and can be observed from a distance.
- 3.19.8 OBJECTION: Duration of waiting restriction is unsuitable as parents dropping off at Richmond House School are likely to park and cause obstruction. (two representations)
- 3.19.9 RESPONSE: Parking generated by Richmond House school pick up and drop off times is likely to be less than one hour at each end of the school day as well as take place for only about two thirds of the year.
- 3.19.10 OBJECTION: There is a discrepancy in the length of one element of the waiting restriction for the Hollin View junction between the written schedule and the drawing. (one representation)
- 3.19.11 RESPONSE: This is correct. Item 51 of Schedule 1 states that restriction starts 16m west of the extended western kerbline of Hollin View. It should read 18m west of the extended western kebline of Hollin View. Item 2 of Schedule 2 states that the restriction starts 15m east of the extended eastern kerbline of Hollin View. It should read 11m east of the extended eastern kerbline of Hollin View. Authorisation is required to amend these errors within the proposed schedules.

3.20 Consultations

- 3.20.1 Ward Members: Ward Members are aware of the proposals, two of whom have been closely involved with this proposal throughout. The proposal is supported by all three.
- 3.20.2 Emergency Services and Metro (WYPTE): Emergency services have been consulted and to date the Police have responded in full support. Metro (WYPTE) have been consulted and fully support not only the bus stop improvements but all aspects of the scheme.
- 3.20.3 Residents: Initial contact from residents in October 2007 recorded disapproval of Leeds Metropolitan University and its responsibilities to the neighbourhood as well as the change in environment and appearance that the displaced parking had caused. Consultation took place throughout the University term time to monitor the problem and respond to residents information and concerns.

An experimental Traffic Regulation Order was introduced in February 2008 to improve the parking problem in the worst affected areas. This TRO was well received by residents to the east of Otley Road. Changes were made to this part of the TRO following on from information and requests from residents, and much of this experimental TRO has been requested to remain permanently.

An initial proposal was issued by Traffic Management in September 2008 for consultation. Representatives of Leeds City Council attended a public meeting arranged by Weetwood Resident's Association, a committee meeting of West Park Resident's Association and regularly attended the North West Inner Area Committee's Transport Group to further gain information and opinion.

Residents reiterated their disappointment with Leeds Metropolitan University, as well as the proposed restrictions and changes to the streets. The nature of the proposals for the west of Otley Road were amended (from waiting restrictions to residents only parking) and this was better received by majority of whole area. Still some disapproval from residents of the two roads where unrestricted parking is to be permitted has been received, despite these streets having sufficient carriageway width for it. These residents still maintain that Leeds Metropolitan University should take responsibility for the parking that they generate.

3.20.4 Otley Parade of Shops: Proprietors have some concerns about both customers and staff being able to park to attend this parade of shops. This has been alleviated by introducing some 2 hour limited waiting bays.

3.20.5 St Chad's Primary School: The school informed the Council that most parents collect or drop off pupils in adjacent streets not affected by the proposed Residents Only Parking Zone. Parking spaces for parents will be introduced within the 'Residents Only Parking Zone'. The school have concerns about staff being able to park on the highway and have requested permits. Although this is something that Traffic Management are sympathetic to, current Parking Services' practice is that schools are deemed businesses and should be restricted to three, chargeable permits. The school houses an Extended Services Hub which hosts meetings associated with the Education and Children's Services, neither of which have contributed to the parking problem. Limited waiting was introduced around the school and subsequently increased from one hour to two, but this still gives the headteacher some concern. The school has not formally objected to the proposals but have stated their case via Councillors, their Member of Parliament and the Chief Executive of Education Leeds.

4.0 IMPLICATIONS FOR COUNCIL POLICY AND GOVERNANCE

4.1 Compliance with Council Policies

4.1.1 Environmental Policy: The proposed measures will encourage greater opportunity to use public transport in accordance with Aim 6 of the Environmental Policy to improve road safety.

4.1.2 Mobility: The proposals will improve walking routes.

4.1.3 Local Transport Plan: The proposals are in line with the following core strategies:

S1 – Provide an appropriate road environment with facilities for each user group.

S4 - Encourage the correct behaviour of all road users.

C2 – Manage the demand for travel by management of car parking and re-allocation of road space.

C4 – Improve the highway network.

C6 – Promote smarter travel choices (in line with Leeds Metropolitan University Travel Plan).

4.1.4 Disabled People: Disabled access will be improved at numerous junctions.

4.2 Community Safety

4.2.1 The proposals contained within this report have no implications under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

5.0 LEGAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Scheme Design Estimate

5.1.1 Funding: The cost of promoting, advertising and introducing the order is estimated at £46,000 to be met from within the sum previously approved and funded with a Section 106 contribution from Leeds Metropolitan University (£35,000) and Leeds City Council's Traffic Management Capital Budget (£11,000) Scheme 14204 in the approved Capital Programme.

5.1.2 Staffing: There are no staffing implications associated with this scheme.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Introduction of the scheme detailed within and in attached drawing numbers (TMW32-1169-022A and 023A) will improve vehicle and pedestrian accessibility for all residents as well as visitors to the area, while still accommodating/managing the high volume of parked vehicles, minimising displacement of the on street parking to new areas.

7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

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

- i) acknowledge all objections contained within this report;
- ii) overrule the objections as detailed in the relative response(s) and amend the order as detailed in response to objections (3.19.11) without further advertising; and
- iii) give authority to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No. 40 Order) 2009 in numerous streets surrounding the Glen Road and Ancaster areas of Far Headingley, Weetwood as detailed within attached drawing numbers TMW-32-1169-014B, TMW-32-1169-023A and TMW-32-1169-022A.

8.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS

- Design and Cost Report – 2572/2009 – Glen Road and Ancaster Road Areas of Weetwood – Proposed Residents Permit Parking and Associated Parking Restriction.
- Ancaster Road Area Parking Survey.
- Table of objectors.

AUTHORITY TO INCUR CAPITAL EXPENDITURE FINANCIAL INFORMATION

SCHEME TITLE: GLEN ROAD, ANCASTER ROAD, WEETWOOD RES PARK ZONE

SCHEME NO: 14257

CURRENT FORECAST - TOTAL SCHEME (£000'S)

CPRH	Total	TO MAR 08	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013 ON
LAND (01)							
CONSTRUCTION (02) & (03)	21.0	1.4	19.6				
VEHICLES (04)							
FURN & EQUIP (05)							
DESIGN FEES (06)	25.0	13.0	12.0				
OTHER COSTS (07)							
Total Expenditure	46.0	14.4	31.6				

PREVIOUS FUNDING APPROVALS AS CAPITAL PROGRAMME OR SUBSEQUENT SPC/VIREMENT APPROVAL (£000'S)

LAND (01)							
CONSTRUCTION (02) & (03)							
VEHICLES (04)							
FURN & EQUIP (05)							
DESIGN FEES (06)							
OTHER COSTS (07)							
Total previous funding approvals							

ADDITIONAL APPROVALS REQUIRED BY EITHER VIREMENT OR INJECTION

LAND (01)							
CONSTRUCTION (02) & (03)	21.0	1.4	19.6				
VEHICLES (04)							
FURN & EQUIP (05)							
DESIGN FEES (06)	25.0	13.0	12.0				
OTHER COSTS (07)							
Total additional approvals							

NET COST AND CAPITAL RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (£000'S) AUTHORITY TO SPEND BY SERVICE COMMITTEE

Gross Expenditure by CPRH:		Total	To Mar 09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013 on
PREVIOUS ATS								
THIS APPROVAL:	LAND (01)							
	CONSTRUCTION (02) & (03)	21.0	1.4	19.9				
	VEHICLES (04)							
	FURN & EQUIP (05)							
	DESIGN FEES (06)	25.0	13.0	12.0				
	OTHER COSTS (07)							
BALANCE :								
TOTAL =		46.0	14.4	31.6				
Less Income * 100%		35.0	3.4	31.6				
Total Net Cost		11.0	11.0					
Less **% SCA :								
GENERAL RESOURCES REQUIRED		11.0	11.0					

* FOR EXAMPLE : Grants/ Contributions/ Operating Leasing/ RCCO/ SRB

REVENUE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS APPROVAL

CODE _____ / _____ Latest Estimated Revenue Effect in £'s

Employees
Running Costs
Asset Rental
Income

Net Service Cost E

2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13