

Report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation)

Date: 27 March 2018

Subject: Pudsey Ward Traffic Regulation Order – Objection Report

Capital Scheme Number: 299582

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Weetwood	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number: Appendix number:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Summary of main issues

1. The Best Council Plan 2015-20 outlines how Leeds City will achieve its ambition to become the Best City in the UK and Leeds City Council the best local authority. According to the Best Council Plan, the success of the Best Council objective: ensuring high quality public services will be partly measured through reduced numbers of people killed or seriously injured on the city's roads. This report proposes a scheme that will contribute to this objective and improve road safety which is also a priority within the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan.
2. Following approval of a report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) in October 2017, amendments to the Leeds City Council Traffic Regulation Consolidation Order (No.W19) 2014, the Pudsey Ward Consolidation Order, were advertised and attracted ten objections.
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.W19) Order 2015 Pudsey Ward Consolidation Order No.1 Order 2017.

Recommendations

4. The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) 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.W19) Order 2015 Pudsey Ward Consolidation Order No.1 Order 2017.
- iii) request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.W19) Order 2015 Pudsey Ward Consolidation Order No.1 Order 2017.
- 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 to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order that forms a package of work to improve road safety and 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 a number 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 within the Pudsey ward with the intention of improving accessibility and visibility at key points and providing a turnover of parking nearby to local businesses.
- 2.2 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) approved this package of measures on the 21st October 2017, presented in a separate report. This report was approved and allowed legal advertisement to take place on the scheme.
- 2.3 The Traffic Regulation Order was subsequently advertised between 15th November 2017 and 15th December 2017. As a result of the advertisement period, a total of ten objectors arose.

3 Main issues

- 3.1 This report refers to a Traffic Regulation Order scheme that seeks to implement a package of No Waiting at Any Time Restrictions, No Waiting between Specified Hours and areas of Time Limited Waiting.
- 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: Consultation took place on 14th June 2017 with all three ward members – no adverse comments were received to the proposals.

- 4.1.2 Emergency Services and West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA): The Emergency Services and WYCA were consulted by email on 14th June 2017. No adverse comments were received.
- 4.1.3 As detailed in paragraph 2.3, the formal public advertisement of the proposals was undertaken between 15th November 2017 and 15th December 2017

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

Positive Impacts:

- 4.2.1 The scheme introduces parking restrictions which eliminate parking at potentially hazardous locations around junctions where accessibility and visibility is currently reduced. This ensures that road users can proceed in a safe manner, which is to the benefit of themselves, other road users and also pedestrians in the vicinity.
- 4.2.2 Clearer sightlines at junction crossing points for all pedestrians, which will be of greater benefit to the infirm, disabled, elderly and children, as it will provide improved visibility.
- 4.2.3 The time-limited waiting provision will ensure a turn-over of parking close to commercial properties, allowing a localised parking provision for these facilities.

Negative Impacts:

- 4.2.4 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 effect 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 total estimated works costs for this Traffic Regulation Order works are £5000, to be funded from the Traffic Management Capital budget.

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. The implementation of the scheme will mitigate existing risks caused by on-street parking.

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 road safety and parking provision within the immediate area whilst protecting accesses and creating a turnover of parking as required by local commercial properties.

6 Recommendations

6.1 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) 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.W19) Order 2015 Pudsey Ward Consolidation Order No.1 Order 2017.
- iii) request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.W19) Order 2015 Pudsey Ward Consolidation Order No.1 Order 2017.
- 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 THE PUDSEY WARD TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.W19) Order 2015 Pudsey Ward Consolidation Order No.1 Order 2017.

SUMMARY OF OBJECTION	HIGHWAYS RESPONSE
<p>Radcliffe Lane – 3 Objectors</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Parking on the road is already limited and by introducing additional restrictions the situation will have a detrimental effect on available on-street parking2. Time limited parking or a resident permit parking area should be introduced.3. As Radcliffe Lane is not gritted cars often lose control coming down the hill and slide into vehicles on the park side of the road. The proposed restrictions raise this risk.4. Thefts have taken place involving vehicles on the park side of the road as this is where the pavement is. The proposed restrictions raise the risk of this happening.5. Cars use excessive speed on Radcliffe Lane which makes pulling out of Radcliffe Gardens challenging – these vehicles are currently slowed by the parked vehicles.	<p>Radcliffe Lane</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The restrictions remove five parking spaces from the road, one in front of the access to number 38 Radcliffe Lane, three to the east of this and one to the west. The remainder of this is already covered by existing accesses and a keep clear bar marking. Whilst parking is busy on Radcliffe Lane, the displacement of five vehicles should not have a large detrimental effect on this. There is still ample on-street parking available.2. Whilst Radcliffe Lane does have some parking relating to local amenities, there are a large number of available spaces throughout the surrounding area at most times of the day. Resident permit parking is not appropriate in this location.3. The road layout will remain similar to the current arrangement with the removal of up to five vehicles which will allow more manoeuvrability around the bend near to Radcliffe Gardens. It is not envisioned this would raise the risk of loss of control accidents; the proposals will improve conditions.4. It is not envisioned that the restrictions would raise the risk of robberies taking place. The introduction of restrictions would not influence or raise the risk of robberies taking place.5. The provision of a double yellow line restriction along the frontage of Radcliffe Gardens will make exiting considerably easier, with longer sight lines being provided by the restrictions. A rise in vehicle speeds is not expected here and a post-implementation survey will be carried out following their introduction.

<p>Woodlands Park Road – 1 Objector</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 16 metres of double yellow lines is excessive 2. The grass verges on the road should be paved over to allow safer parking for all vehicles on the road. 	<p>Woodlands Park Road</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whilst the Highway Code recommends that vehicles do not park within 10 metres of a junction, by only installing 10m on the western side of Woodlands Park Road would result in vehicles attempting to park in the small gap left between the restriction and the driveway of 87 Fartown resulting in either sight lines when exiting the property being reduced, or the driveway becoming obstructed. It is sensible to extend the restrictions on the opposite side of the road to the same length to avoid causing confusion. 2. The hardening of verges is not within the remit of this scheme and would incur significant cost in comparison to the allotted budget for this Traffic Regulation Order.
<p>Greenside – 1 Objector</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. With parking already difficult, the changes will greatly impact resident's ability to park near their properties, resident permit parking should be introduced to combat this. 2. The changes feel rushed through with minimal opportunity for community consultation 	<p>Greenside</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whilst Greenside does have some parking relating to local amenities, there are a large number of available spaces throughout the surrounding area at most times of the day. Resident permit schemes do not guarantee residents can park directly outside the frontage of their property, but instead guarantee a parking space within a reasonable distance from their property – this is already the case on Greenside. 2. Letters were sent to the directly affected residents on the 10th July 2017 with further consultation taking place via advertisements in the local press and notices placed on street lighting columns from 15th November 2017 to 15th December 2017.
<p>South Parade – 1 Objection</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Installing these restrictions will make parking nearby more difficult which is particularly problematic owing to a disabled resident 	<p>South Parade:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leeds City Councils Mobility Officer has been contacted and the application pack for a disabled bay has been sent out. Furthermore, vehicles displaying blue badges can park on double yellow lines so this should not be effected.
<p>Clifton Hill – 1 Objection</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. With the introduction of additional restrictions it will become more difficult for vehicles to park resulting in a decrease in business 	<p>Clifton Hill – 1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whilst the frustration of removing parking spaces nearby to businesses is appreciated, the safety of all road users must be taken into consideration. There are a lot of available parking spaces within the immediate area of the shop and the removal of four parking spaces is

<p>Pudsey Road – 1 Objection</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The restrictions will prevent parking my vehicle within sight of my property and I do not feel safe having to park further away. 	<p>very unlikely to negatively impact the business.</p> <p>Pudsey Road</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whilst it is preferential to park directly outside your own property it is not the job of the Highways Authority to ensure that this is possible. The proposed restrictions look to alleviate issues of vehicle sight lines when exiting the properties westward from Baden Terrace. There are usually many free spaces available on the southern side of Pudsey Road within a short walking distance.
<p>Rosemont Street – 1 Objection</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is currently a lack of parking spaces in the area, by introducing restrictions this will only further exacerbate the issue 	<p>Rosemont Street</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed restrictions cover a small section of Rosemont Street, and are placed in order to combat sight line issues when entering/exiting its junction with The Lanes. Vehicles regularly park directly within the junction, and the proposed restrictions look to prevent this from parking occurring within 10m of the junction (as specified in the Highway Code).
<p>Bankhouse – 1 Objection</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The restrictions should be extended to cover up to the access of 54 Bankhouse giving greater sight lines to vehicles exiting here. 	<p>Bankhouse</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The restrictions aim to increase the road safety and visibility around the southernmost corner of Bankhouse whilst maintaining safe levels of on street parking which is desirable in the area. The extension of these markings would result in the displacement of seven vehicles which would be displaced further towards residential properties creating further issues.
<p>Church Lane – 1 Objection</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. By extending the parking restrictions in the area it will make it more difficult to park within the vicinity – resident permit parking should be proposed on the northern side of Church Lane to combat this. 2. The existing bus stop clearway was installed at this length to accommodate the bendy-buses which used to service the area. As they no longer travel this route, could the bus stop be reduced in size 	<p>Church Lane</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whilst Church Lane does have some parking relating to local amenities, there are a number of available spaces throughout the surrounding area at most times of the day. For this reason, resident permit parking is not appropriate in this location. 2. The existing bus stop was originally installed to accommodate bendy-buses but following there cancellation a decision was made to retain the length of the existing bus stop clearway. The bus stop clearway helps maintain access and visibility across the park entrance and junction opposite which are both used by vehicles.

Appendix B

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: City Development	Service area: Traffic Management
Lead person: Andrew Richardson	Contact number: 378 7489

1. Title: Pudsey Ward Traffic Regulation Order 2017		
Is this a:		
<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy / Policy	<input type="checkbox"/> Service / Function	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
If other, please specify		

2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening
This screening report focuses on a report presented at highways board, which seeks authority to advertise and implement a Traffic Regulation Order in the Pudsey Ward of Leeds.

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"> • Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment • Advancing equality of opportunity • Fostering good relations 		✓

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>4. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration</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"> • 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) <p>Consultation on the proposals has taken place with the following stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Councillors • Emergency Services (Police, West Yorkshire Fire and Ambulances Services) • Metro • Local Residents where affected. <p>Formal advertisement in the form of an advert in the Yorkshire Post, along with notices posted on lighting columns in the area will take during the legal advertising period. Any objections received will be considered prior to taking the scheme forward and where not withdrawn following dialogue with the objector(s), will be presented to the Chief Officer Highways and Transportation at highways board, for his consideration.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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)

Positive Impacts:

- The scheme introduces parking restrictions which eliminate parking at potentially hazardous locations around junctions where accessibility and visibility is currently reduced. This ensures that road users can proceed in a safe manner, which is to the benefit of themselves, other road users and also pedestrians in the vicinity.
- Clearer sightlines at junction crossing points for all pedestrians, which will be of greater benefit to the infirm, disabled, elderly and children, as it will provide improved visibility.
- The time-limited waiting provision will ensure a turn-over of parking close to commercial properties, allowing a localised parking provision for these facilities.

Negative Impact

- 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 effect 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.

- **Actions**

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

The Traffic Regulation Order shall be monitored post-implementation for their effectiveness and also their impact on parents, carers, those with mobility issues and the infirm. Should any overriding issues become apparent, then these can be investigated and mitigated and a later date.

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	Principal Engineer	xxx

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	10/10/16
Date sent to Equality Team	
Date published (To be completed by the Equality Team)	