

Report to Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation)

Date: 20 November 2018

Subject: 2018/19 Adel & Wharfedale Traffic Regulation Order Associated with Residential Development of Former Department for Work and Pensions Government Buildings – Objection Report

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Adel & Wharfedale;	<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 Following approval of a report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) in May 2018, Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.46) 2014, Amendment Order No.1 2018 was duly advertised and attracted two objections and one petition.
- 2 This report seeks approval of the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) to consider and overrule the reported objections to the proposed parking restrictions detailed in Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.46) 2014, Amendment Order No.1 2018.
- 3 The Best Council Plan 2018 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 scheme meets these objectives by providing a safer and more user friendly road environment, through improved accessibility and visibility for all persons using the roads in question.

Recommendations

- 5 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:
- i) Consider and over-rule the objections raised to Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.46) Order 2014, Amendment Order No.1 2018;
 - ii) Request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.46) Order 2014, Amendment Order No.1 2018; and
 - iii) Request the City Solicitor to write to the objector informing them of the decision taken by the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation).

1 Purpose of this report

- 1.1 This report details the objections received against the proposed Traffic Regulation Order that forms a package of measures across the Adel and Wharfedale ward to improve road safety, pedestrian accessibility and traffic flow. The report requests the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) consider the objections and the recommendations.
- 1.2 The purpose of the report is to obtain authority to over-rule the objections received and seeks approval to implement the waiting restrictions and the seal the Traffic Regulation Order as advertised.

2 Background information

- 2.1 As detailed in the original report in May 2018, this scheme links to an outline planning permission for residential development on the now former Department for Work and Pensions Government Buildings site (reference 13/04008/OT). A Reserved Matters application for 135 dwellings was subsequently approved by Plans Panel on 4th April 2016 (reference 15/06808/RM).
- 2.2 A condition was placed upon the developer to make a contribution to the Council for the introduction of a Traffic Regulation Order upon the adopted highway to ensure no potential parking as a result of the construction or subsequent occupation of the site. A contribution of £5,500 was subsequently made to satisfy this.
- 2.3 Following recent correspondence with Ward Members, the Police and the general public, Leeds City Council proposes a small number of measures across the wider ward not directly related to the development site. By utilising this Traffic Regulation Order scheme, these small elements can be introduced to satisfy safety concerns elsewhere in the ward more immediately than waiting for a further Traffic Regulation Order to do so. The works costs for these elements will be borne by Leeds City Council, resulting in no additional cost to the developer.

- 2.4 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) approved this package of measures, presented in a report in May 2018. The Traffic Regulation Order was subsequently advertised between 23 July 2018 and 23 July August 2018. A total of two objections were received. One petition was received prior to the formal advertisement period, as detailed in paragraph 5.1.4.

3 Main issues

- 3.1 The wider scheme contains a number of measures across separate sites within the ward. Objections were received to two specific elements, which are detailed below:
- 3.1.1 **Long Causeway & Wayland Drive, Adel:** Provision of 'no waiting at any time' as detailed on drawing TM/1/2980/TRO2/LC. Parking associated with Adel St. John The Baptist CoE Primary School is noted to take place around junctions and access points close to the school and these measures seek to remedy that.
- 3.1.2 **The Crescent, Adel:** Provision of 'no waiting at any time' as detailed on drawing TM/1/2980/TRO8/TC to prevent parking close to junctions along The Crescent which are seen to reduce accessibility and visibility.
- 3.2 Appendix A, the objection summary table, details the objectors concerns and Highways' response.

4 Programme

- 4.1 It is anticipated that the proposals will be implemented within the 2018/2019 financial year, subject to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) approving the contents of this report.

5 Corporate Considerations

5.1 Consultation and Engagement

- 5.1.1 Ward Members: Ward Members were consulted via email 28/11/2017, with no objections being received and some minor adjustments to original proposed being requested and subsequently adopted. As a result of this report, one Ward Member expressed direct support for the whole scheme proposals.
- 5.1.2 Emergency Services and the West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA): The Emergency Services and West Yorkshire Combined Authority were also consulted by email 28/11/2017. A response was received from West Yorkshire Police on 28/11/2017 offering their support to the proposals. A response was received from West Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service on 30/11/17, offering no objection to the proposals. A response was received from WYCA on 28/11/17 offering their support to the proposals.
- 5.1.3 A direct consultation period with residents was undertaken via letter in March 2018. Some further changes were adopted following this period and these changes were presented to Ward Members, with no objections.

5.1.4 Following the initial residential consultation, a petition was received from residents regarding the 'Dale Parks' element of the proposals, detailed on drawing TM/1/2980/HB10/DP, requesting that the proposals be dropped. It was determined that, considering the reasoning behind the proposals, it was appropriate to proceed with the proposals. The petition lead was contacted prior to the end of the public advertisement period, inviting a formal objection be raised, however no such objection was received. However, in the interest of transparency, the original petition shall be treated as an objection by this report, to ensure any signatory's concerns are considered appropriately.

5.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

5.2.1 An Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration screening has been undertaken and identified that a full impact assessment is not required. An Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Impact Assessment has been carried out for the implementation of this scheme, the impacts of which are included below and detailed fully in Appendix B.

Positive Impacts:

5.2.2 The scheme introduces parking restrictions which eliminate parking at potentially hazardous locations in the Adel and Wharfedale area and those areas 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, particularly at junctions.

5.2.3 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.

5.2.4 There will be improved safety for all pedestrians when crossing the road as cars will no longer hinder vision, which will be of particular benefit to carers/ parents with young children and people with mobility issues.

Negative impacts:

5.2.5 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.

5.2.6 Some road users may see the parking restrictions as a negative measure, however this is not an issue for blue badge holders.

5.3 Council policies and City Priorities

5.3.1 The proposals contained in the report have no implications for the council constitution.

5.3.2 Local Transport Plan 3: **Strategic Approaches: Connectivity:** P18: Improve safety and security. P22: Develop networks and facilities to encourage cycling and walking.

5.4 Resources and value for money

5.4.1 As part of a planning condition, the developer has made a £5,500 contribution to Leeds City Council for the implementation of a Traffic Regulation Order to prevent parking in the vicinity of the site access to A660 Otley Road, Adel. This money has been placed within the Traffic Management Revenue budget.

5.4.2 The total estimated works costs for the Traffic Regulation Order works are £6,500, including an additional £1,000 contribution from Traffic Management towards the additional works that are to be undertaken.

5.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

5.5.1 There are no specific legal implications included within this report, nor is any information contained within the report to be deemed confidential. The scheme is expected to be complete within the 2018/2019 financial year subject to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) approving the contents of this report.

5.6 Risk Management

5.6.1 There are no risk issues, over and above those expected when working in the public highway, generated by the proposals contained within this report. The introduction of the scheme will mitigate existing risks caused by on-street parking.

6 Conclusions

6.1 Over-ruling the received objections detailed in Appendix A, in accordance with the recommendations, will allow this scheme to progress.

6.2 Provision of these measures will improve safety at key points on various roads within the Adel and Wharfedale ward, particularly accessibility and visibility around junctions.

7 Recommendations

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

- i) Consider and over-rule the objections raised to Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.46) Order 2014, Amendment Order No.1 2018;
- ii) Request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.46) Order 2014, Amendment Order No.1 2018; and

- iii) Request the City Solicitor to write to the objector informing them of the decision taken by the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation).

8.1 Background documents¹

8.1.1 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 ADEL AND WHARFEDALE PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.46) Order 2014 Amendment Order No.1 Order 2018

SUMMARY OF OBJECTION	HIGHWAYS RESPONSE
<p>Objection No.1</p> <p><i>This objection focuses on the Long Causeway & Wayland Drive element of the wider scheme, shown on drawing TM/1/2980/TRO2/LC.</i></p> <p>Objector states that the intention of implementing the measures on Long Causeway is not clear. Objector states they are unlikely to improve pedestrian or vehicular safety unless equidistant 'no waiting at any time' zones are added on the opposing side of the carriageway.</p>	<p>The purpose of the markings is to mainly to prevent parking behind the existing school keep clear markings in the school entrance, that blocks the dropped crossing points along the footway. Furthermore, we are protecting the entrance to the surgery and also to Wayland Drive.</p> <p>The primary purpose of the latter two elements is to ensure that vehicles accessing and egressing the surgery and Wayland Drive have an improved visibility splay at times when parking is more prevalent on Long Causeway. Should parking occur on the opposing side of the carriageway to these restrictions, whilst not ideal, this would not render the proposals unnecessary, as the visibility splays at those junctions would still be there for drivers.</p> <p>Highways believe that these restrictions will have benefit and do not need the additional items mentioned, which would be unnecessary restrictions on the public highway. Post-implementation monitoring will take place and should that monitoring show that further measures are required then these can be duly considered as a part of a future scheme.</p>
<p>Objection No.2</p> <p><i>This objection focuses on The Crescent element of the wider scheme, shown on drawing TM/1/2980/TRO8/TC.</i></p> <p>Objector states that the consequence of the proposals would be to oblige traffic proceeding along The Crescent towards Otley Road to, very often, travel on the wrong side of the road and so encounter vehicles exiting Otley Road at speed.</p> <p>Objector suggests that 'no waiting at any time' should be provided on both sides of The Crescent for a distance of at least 35 metres</p>	<p>The measures proposed are to ensure that one side of The Crescent at its junction with A660 remains free from parking, following concerns raised regarding two sided parking. Furthermore, by protecting one side, adequate vehicular accessibility can be maintained.</p> <p>Initially, when consulting local residents and businesses, it was proposed to place the restrictions on the north side of The Crescent, by the Co-Op. However, local representations were made against this proposal on the basis that there would be a more significant loss of well-used parking provision for the commercial premises in the area. Furthermore, delivery wagons occasionally have to load in this area due to parking practices and it would be more appropriate</p>

<p>to promote a benefit to pedestrian and traffic safety.</p>	<p>for them to continue to do so on the northern side of The Crescent than the other. Finally, by allowing parking outside the Café, we would be introducing the possibility of obstructive parking over their off-street parking access points and providing a visual speed deterrent for vehicles exiting the A660.</p> <p>The proposals therefore are aligned with local views on this matter and we believe they are appropriate at this point. The matter of parking causing issues for vehicles exiting Otley Road is no different to at present and whilst this is not necessarily ideal, there have been no recorded injury accidents surrounding this matter in the last five years. Therefore, any legal challenge to any further proposals such as those suggested, we would not be able to adequately justify, compared to the minor amendments currently being proposed to better formalise the parking at present.</p>
<p>Objection No.3 (Petition)</p> <p><i>This objection focuses on the 'Dale Parks' element of the wider scheme, shown on drawing TM/1/2980/TRO10/DP.</i></p> <p>Petition states:</p> <p>' We are writing as a combined neighbourhood, in response to the 10 letters you have sent to residents of Dale Park Rise and Dale Park Avenue. We strongly object to your plans for the parking restrictions in the immediate vicinity to our properties and we are submitting this objection.</p> <p>We do agree with the proposals for the restrictions to be put into place on the main road, to Tinshill Road, this is certainly an issue due to the speed of traffic going along Tinshill Road, past the junctions of Dale Park Avenue and Dale Park View.</p> <p>However, the proposals for the restrictions at the front of our houses (Dale Park Rise and Dale Park Avenue) are totally impractical and will cause serious parking issues. This will also cause severe issues for all surrounding neighbours, the residents with spaces you plan to restrict, will have no choice than to use their spaces. The traffic which does go past where these vehicles are parked, goes slow enough to pass in a safe manner not</p>	<p>The purpose of implementing the restrictions is the result of long standing and numerous complaints from residents in this area regarding parking in the vicinity of junctions reducing accessibility and visibility at these junctions. The parking is also noted to have issues for accessibility of larger vehicles, such as those used by delivery firms and also our own refuse department. By implementing the measures proposed, we would create clear areas around the junctions in question, allowing turning manoeuvres to be unimpeded and providing improved visibility splays for drivers entering or exiting any junction.</p> <p>It is prudent to note that Dale Park Avenue, Dale Park Rise and Dale Park View form part of the publically adopted highway. This is legally defined as being a route for the passage and re-passage of traffic. There is no defined right for parking practices, whether residential or otherwise. Leeds City Council takes a pragmatic view in that we appreciate the desires of residents to park within a reasonable vicinity of their property. Subsequently, with these proposals we have sought to keep the extent of the measures to a minimum where possible, whilst still being effective.</p> <p>For example, around the junction of Dale Park Avenue with Dale Park Rise, the lines proposed at their maximum conform to Rule 243 of the Highway Code. That Rule states 'Do not stop within 10 metres of a junction' and these lines are laid to ten metres from the effective extended kerb line or indeed less than that, so to not cover</p>

<p>causing any issues at all.</p> <p>(18 signatories)</p>	<p>driveways.</p> <p>At this point, we believe that the proposals are not too intrusive to the parking practices of residents. There will be a clear improvement to road safety at this junctions through the introduction of these measures. Considering the numerous (and continuing) complaints received regarding this issue, this department believes it is appropriate at this point to pursue the implementation of the measures as proposed.</p>
---	--

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: Jonathan Waters	Contact number: 37 87492

1. Title: 2017/18 Adel and Wharfedale Traffic Regulation Order			
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 Adel and Wharfedale area of Leeds.

<p>3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration</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 and any other relevant characteristics (for example socio-economic status, social class, income, unemployment, residential location or family background and education or skills levels).</p>
--

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**.

4. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration
<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 place prior to scheme implementation. 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 in the Adel and Wharfedale area and those areas 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, particularly at junctions.
- 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.
- There will be improved safety for all pedestrians when crossing the road, as cars will no longer hinder vision, which will be of particular benefit to carers/ parents with young children and people with mobility issues.

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.
- Some road users may see the parking restrictions as a negative measure, however this is not an issue for blue badge holders.

• **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	24/1/18

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	24/1/18
Date sent to Equality Team	
Date published (To be completed by the Equality Team)	