

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

**Date: 19 June 2018**

**Subject: Whitehall Road / Northern Street Junction Improvement**

**Capital Scheme Number: 32227**

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): City and Hunslet	<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

- On the 27 July 2016 the Executive Board approved the Whitehall Road / Northern Street junction improvement scheme with the recommendation that remaining decisions relating to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders will be reported to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation).
- Detailed design was completed and works started on site in February 2017. At the Developer request, a loading only bay was later added to the design and constructed to provide a convenient place for deliveries during the construction phase and permanently for servicing purposes once works are completed.

## Recommendations

- The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to give approval to advertise a draft Traffic Regulation Order for the loading only bay on Whitehall Road, as shown on drawing number drawing 732227/LCC/HWT/DR/EP/12\_03a and; if no valid objections are received, to make, seal and implement the order as advertised.

## 1 Purpose of this report

- 1.1 To obtain authority to advertise a draft Traffic Regulation Order and subject to no valid objections being received, to make, seal and implement the Order as advertised.

## **2 Background information**

- 2.1 On the 27 July 2016 the Executive Board approved the Whitehall Road / Northern Street junction improvement scheme. The highway works are to accommodate several large scale developments in the area, namely The Wellington Place Development, The Central Square Development and The Whitehall Riverside Development.
- 2.2 The highway works includes widening of the Northern Street/Whitehall Road junction and cycling facilities forming part of the City Cycle Loop.
- 2.3 The highway works commenced on site in February 2017. During construction the Developer enquired if a loading bay could be incorporated to provide a suitable place for deliveries for the retail unit functions. Following further design, it was found a permanent bay could be accommodated on Northern Street without any detrimental effect to the original design.
- 2.4 To accommodate the loading bay an additional area of the developer's land was agreed to be adopted.

## **3 Main issues**

- 3.1 A Traffic Regulation Order prohibiting parking other than for loading/unloading in the parking bay is required for the purpose of improving the amenity of the area.
- 3.2 The proposals are shown on drawing no. 732227/LCC/HWT/DR/EP/12\_03a.

## **4 Corporate Considerations**

### **4.1 Consultation and Engagement**

- 4.1.1 The Road Safety Audit Team was consulted in February 2018 and a comment that a sufficient loading bay width is required to allow delivery vehicles opening passenger side doors without endangering cyclists. It was confirmed that the design allowed suitable width.
- 4.1.2 Internal consultation has taken place with colleagues in the Highways and Transportation Services on the proposed layout, March 2018. No comments were received.
- 4.1.3 Ward Members were notified and no further comments were received.

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

- 4.2.1 A full impact assessment screening was carried out on the original proposed layout and was submitted with the Directors Board Report no. 3981/2017.
- 4.2.2 There are no additional impacts identified that requires a further assessment screening to be carried out as a result of the added loading bay.

### **4.3 Council policies and City Priorities**

- 4.3.1 The proposed Traffic Regulation Order accords with the Local Transport Plan and other Council policies as it supports and provides a safe means of access for all users of the Highway.

### **4.4 Resources and value for money**

- 4.4.1 The additional cost for incorporating the loading only bay is fully funded by the Developer. The estimated cost for the construction of the layby including diversions of underground services and implementing the Traffic Regulation Order is £106,472.48, which have been paid by the Developer.

### **4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In**

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

### **4.6 Risk Management**

- 4.6.1 There are no risks due to incorporating the loading only bay into the highway works.

## **5 Conclusions**

- 5.1 The making and sealing of the TRO will provide the required prohibition to make the bay for loading/unloading only. The bay will be an amenity for the area.

## **6 Recommendations**

- 6.1 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to give approval to advertise a draft Traffic Regulation Order for the loading only bay on Whitehall Road, as shown on drawing number drawing 732227/LCC/HWT/DR/EP/12\_03a and; if no valid objections are received, to make, seal and implement the order as advertised.

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

- 7.1 Appendix 1 – Drawing no. 732227/LCC/HWT/DR/EP/12\_03a

---

<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.

## 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: City Development</b>	<b>Service area: Engineering Projects</b>
<b>Lead person: Neil Foster</b>	<b>Contact number: 0113 37 87403</b>

<b>1. Title: Traffic Regulation Order, Whitehall Road / Northern Street</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: Highway Works</b>			

<b>2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening</b>
<p>The screening will be on the proposed Whitehall Road / Northern Street Junction Improvement. The proposals include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Prohibition of the right turn movement from Whitehall Road (South West bound) into Northern Street (Northbound)</li> <li>▪ Approve the designation of cycle tracks on the public highway</li> </ul>

<p><b>3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration</b></p> <p>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.</p>
--

<p>The following questions will help you to identify how relevant your proposals are.</p> <p>When considering these questions think about age, carers, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation. Also those areas that impact on or relate to equality: tackling poverty and improving health and well-being.</p>		
Questions	Yes	No
Is there an existing or likely differential impact for the different equality characteristics?	x	
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the policy or proposal?		x
Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom?		x
Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment practices?		x
Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment</li> <li>• Advancing equality of opportunity</li> <li>• Fostering good relations</li> </ul>		x

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

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

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

<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> (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)</li> </ul> <p>The main scheme proposals are inclusive to allow use by pedestrians and other mobility modes which include wheelchair users, pushchairs, mobility scooters and cyclists.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Key findings</b></li> </ul> <p>(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)</p>

<p><b>Positive Impacts –</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Improved and increased controlled signalised pedestrian crossing points</li> <li>ii) Scheme creates a dedicated cycling facility suitable for all abilities, and will encourage cyclists with disabilities or impairments to make more journeys by cycle</li> <li>iii) Scheme will improve access to employment, skill development and education for all socio-economic classes</li> </ul> <p><b>Negative Impacts –</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) More vulnerable pedestrians may feel uneasy mixing with cyclists in shared use areas such as the signalised crossings. However, cycle routes have been conspicuously designed in shared use areas using a combination of green coloured surfacing / white cycle symbols - this will particularly assist pedestrians with hearing impairments. In addition crossings for cyclists will specifically include signals with cycle symbols to help minimise potential confusion.</li> </ul> <p>• <b>Actions</b> (think about how you will promote positive impact and remove/ reduce negative impact)</p> <p>None</p>
---

<p><b>5. If you are <b>not</b> already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you <b>will need to carry out an impact assessment</b>.</b></p>	
Date to scope and plan your impact assessment:	
Date to complete your impact assessment	
Lead person for your impact assessment (Include name and job title)	

<p><b>6. Governance, ownership and approval</b> Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening</p>		
<b>Name</b>	<b>Job title</b>	<b>Date</b>

<p><b>7. Publishing</b></p> <p>Though <b>all</b> key decisions are required to give due regard to equality the council <b>only</b> publishes those related to <b>Executive Board, Full Council, Key Delegated Decisions</b> or a <b>Significant Operational Decision</b>.</p> <p>A copy of this equality screening should be attached as an appendix to the decision making report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governance Services will publish those relating to Executive Board and Full Council.</li> <li>• The appropriate directorate will publish those relating to Delegated Decisions and Significant Operational Decisions.</li> <li>• A copy of all other equality screenings that are not to be published should be sent to <a href="mailto:equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk">equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk</a> for record.</li> </ul> <p>Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached screening was sent:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>For Executive Board or Full Council – sent to</td> <td>Date sent:</td> </tr> </table>	For Executive Board or Full Council – sent to	Date sent:
For Executive Board or Full Council – sent to	Date sent:	

<b>Governance Services</b>	
For Delegated Decisions or Significant Operational Decisions – sent to appropriate <b>Directorate</b>	Date sent:
All other decisions – sent to <a href="mailto:equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk">equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk</a>	Date sent: