

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

**Date: 29 January 2019**

**Subject: Alwoodley Ward 20mph Zone Objection Report**

**Capital Scheme Number: 32352**

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Alwoodley	<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 2018-19 outlines how Leeds City will achieve its ambition to become the Best City in the UK and Best Council. According to the Best Council Plan, the success of the Best Council objective is ensuring Health and Wellbeing, creating Resilient Communities, being a Child Friendly city and building a Transport and Infrastructure for the future. This report proposes a scheme that will contribute to the objective and improve road safety which is a priority within the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan.
2. This report seeks approval to consider the objections received to (Traffic Regulation)(Speed Limit)(N<sup>o</sup>6).Order 2016 and the S90c Traffic Calming notice relating to the provision of a 20mph zone in Alwoodley which encompasses 3 separate areas; Alwoodley, Alwoodley Park and Primley Park.
3. This report also seeks approval to revise the scheme and consider highway responses to the representations made and consider the recommendations to the proposed 20 mph zone as shown on TM-02-2593-REV.

**Recommendations**

4. The Chief Officer is requested to:
  - i) note the contents of this report;
  - ii) consider and over-rule the objections to Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Speed Limit) (No.6) Order 2016;

- iii) approve the revised scheme as shown on TM-02-2593-REV and request the City Solicitor to remove Lakeland Crescent, Sandmoor Avenue, Sandmoor Chase, Sandmoor Close, Sandmoor Drive, Sandmoor Green, Sandmoor Lane and Sandmoor Mews from the advertised order, including their associated traffic calming features;
- iv) approve the experimental use of Speed Indicator Devices (SIDs) in lieu of traffic calming on The Avenue and The Fairway for an initial period of 6 months with findings to be subject to a follow up report; and
- v) 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 against the proposed 20mph zone in Alwoodley which encompasses 3 separate areas; Alwoodley, Alwoodley Park and Primley Park as shown on TM-02-2593-REP and makes appropriate recommendations to each.
- 1.2 The report seeks approval to make amendments to the advertised scheme, following the formal public advertisement period.

## **2 Background information**

- 2.1 A report was presented to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) dated 22 November 2016, regarding a proposed scheme to introduce a 20mph zone in Alwoodley which encompasses 3 separate areas; Alwoodley, Alwoodley Park and Primley Park as shown on TM-02-2593-REP.
- 2.2 The public advertisement phase of the scheme was undertaken between 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2017 and 27<sup>th</sup> February 2017.
- 2.3 27 Representations were made with general objections relating to the 20mph speed limit and its effectiveness, the use of traffic calming, damage to suspension, pollution, noise, visual impact and cost effectiveness.
- 2.4 A response was sent to each who made representation explaining the rationale behind the scheme and detailed responses were sent to those to address specific concerns. 1 objection was withdrawn and 4 objectors replied stating their wish for their objection to remain. No responses were received from the remaining objectors who made representation including Alwoodley Parish Council who requested a highways officer to attend a meeting to discuss the proposals. The table in appendix A & B provides Highways responses to the various points raised from representations, with the point identified to individual objections.
- 2.5 Speed surveys were undertaken within the proposed 20mph zone which identified all roads where average speeds recorded were over 24mph as requiring traffic calming measures. This is in line with the most recent Department for Transport guidance on the introduction of 20mph zones, which states that speed reduction achieved with the use of 20 mph signs alone is likely to be small, about 1 mph. Therefore, 20 mph speed limits enforced by signs alone would be most appropriate where mean speeds are already low (24 mph or below). On streets where mean speeds exceed 24mph Traffic calming measures should be considered.

### 3 Main issues

3.1 Surveys were undertaken on streets in the identified 20 mph zone to show where mean speeds are over 24mph there was a requirement for traffic calming measures to ensure that the scheme is self-enforcing.

3.2 The identified streets are:

The Avenue	Mean speed NB 25.6 mph & SB 24.6 mph.
The Fairway	Mean speed EB 25.7 mph & WB 27.1 mph
Sandmoor Lane	Mean speed NB 30.9 mph & SB 27.9 mph
Sandmoor Drive	Mean speed NB 28.2 mph & SB 31.8 mph
Lingfield Drive	Mean speed EB 27.4 mph & WB 23.1 mph

3.3 This report details the objections received and the wishes of Ward Members and residents not to introduce traffic calming features on The Avenue, The Fairway, Sandmoor Lane and Sandmoor Drive. The Ward Members have indicated that they have no objections to the traffic calming measures on Lingfield Drive appreciating the close proximity of the Khalsa Science Academy School.

3.4 Ward members have stated that they support a 20mph speed limit but without traffic calming measures on the streets as detailed in 3.3. They have indicated that they would have no objection to Sandmoor Lane, Sandmoor Drive and the adjacent streets off them (which comprise of; Sandmoor Avenue, Sandmoor Chase, Sandmoor Close, Sandmoor Green, and Sandmoor Mews) being within the 20 mph zone and subject to a 20mph speed limit but without traffic calming measures. However, such an approach is not supported by the Police.

3.5 The recorded mean speeds are higher on Sandmoor Lane and Sandmoor Drive and there is a requirement for traffic calming to be introduced to reduce speeds to a self-enforcing level. Signing alone, as ward members and residents have requested will not reduce speeds to satisfactory level.

3.6 During discussions with ward members an agreement has been reached in that if traffic calming measures are not introduced on Sandmoor Lane and Sandmoor Drive then these streets along with the adjacent streets will be removed entirely from the scheme and remain subject to the existing 30mph speed limit. Ward members have agreed to this aspect.

3.7 In lieu of physical traffic calming on The Avenue and The Fairway, it is the desire of ward members to use Speed Indicator Devices (SIDs) to reduce speeds and after a period of time monitor the resulting traffic speeds. If this form of speed reduction does not achieve a satisfactory reduction in actual speed, then vertical measures will be introduced as first proposed. The approach is supported by ward members and the Police.

3.8 The initial monitoring period is proposed for 3 months following installation with a follow up after a further 3 months. Data from the SID will be used to evaluate the success of this approach.

## **4 Corporate Considerations**

### **4.1 Consultation and Engagement**

- 4.1.1 Emergency Services and Metro were consulted by letter and email on the 26 May 2016. No objections have been received.
- 4.1.2 Ward Members: Ward Members were consulted by email on the 26 May 2016 and 2 ward members supported the proposals in principle but would require further consultation once a detailed design had been prepared as to the type of traffic calming features to be used.
- 4.1.3 A meeting arranged by Alwoodley Parish Council was attended on 4th July 2016 and the proposed scheme was discussed. Whilst there was no objection to the principle of a 20mph zone being introduced, there were concerns raised to the use and type of traffic calming measures. It was agreed that further consultation would take place once a detailed design had been prepared.
- 4.1.4 Following meetings with the 3 Ward Members to discuss scheme proposals, the Ward Members had indicated that they were in favour of a 20mph speed limit but were not supportive of traffic calming measures and requested that if traffic calming is implemented that all the traffic calming features be implemented as full width humps. However, the allocated funds from LTP did not extend to all the features being implemented as full width humps. On some roads where speed cushions were proposed, the Ward Members indicated that additional funding of £30,000 was available from Ward based Initiative (WBI) to upgrade the speed cushions to full width humps. This offer has since been amended to fund Speed Indicator devices instead, in line with the details in 3.7 above.
- 4.1.5 A Highways Officer was invited to the Annual Alwoodley Parish Council meeting on the 25 April 2017 to discuss and provide an update following the advertising period. The rationale behind the scheme was presented and a vote taken at the end of the meeting. The votes cast were: 6 votes in favour of a 20mph speed limit with traffic calming measures and 49 votes in favour of a 20mph speed limit without traffic calming measures.
- 4.1.6 The police were consulted on 9 August 2017 on the alternative scheme requested by local residents and were requested to make comment on whether they supported a scheme without the use of traffic calming, this on streets where originally they were proposed. They were also requested to comment on the use of Speed Indicator Devices as an alternative to traffic calming measures. The police have provided a response stating that the proposal where traffic calming measures are not used on streets where recorded speeds are above 24mph and that Speed Indicator Devices be used as an alternative, appears proportionate, reasonable and consistent with the strategy of preventing offending behaviour by drivers.
- 4.1.7 Recently, the Ward Members have requested that this scheme be progressed to address ongoing road safety concerns.

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

- 4.2.1 A full Equality, Diversity / Cohesion and Integration impact assessment has been carried out for 20mph schools schemes (see appendix C).

#### 4.2.2 Positive Impact: Making 20mph the normal speed limit would:

- Provide safer passage whilst crossing the road to all pedestrians, especially those with mobility issues, disabled people, parents supporting pushchairs and young and old people
- Greater independence and choice for children travelling to school
- Dramatically increases chances of survival if hit by a car to 97%
- Make it more pleasant to walk or cycle, encouraging a more healthy lifestyle
- Reduce pollution and noise.
- Improve quality of life for the local community

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

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

### 4.3 Council Policies and City Priorities

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

4.3.2 By providing a safer road environment where needed and justified, the ongoing 20mph zone programme is helping to achieve Leeds' ambition to become the Best City by reducing the number of pedestrians killed or seriously injured on the city's roads, by fostering links between the communities and local facilities, especially where the highway forms a considerable barrier, and by enabling more sustainable travel choices for local journeys, including for new developments within the city.

4.3.3 Environmental Policy: The reduction in speed limit to 20mph will not have any significant impact on carbon emissions, air pollutants should remain similar to that of 30mph.

4.3.4 Local Transport Plan 3: **Strategic Approaches:**  
**Travel Choices:** P10. Promote the benefits of active travel.  
**Connectivity:** P18. Improve safety and security  
P22. Develop networks and facilities to encourage cycling and walking.

4.3.5 Transport Policy Approval: The design instruction for this scheme was received in April 2015 and the proposed scheme is approved in principle by Transport Policy.

#### **4.4 Resources and Value for Money**

- 4.4.1 The estimated total cost to implement this scheme is £84,000 which comprises of £70,500 works costs, £12,500 Staff fees and £1,000 legal fees, £54,000 to be funded from the LTP Transport Policy Capital Programme. £30,000 from the councillors Ward Based Initiative (WBI) programme – this already has the required authority to spend.

#### **4.5 Capital Funding and Cash Flow**

**Parent Scheme Number:** 99609  
**Title:** LTP Transport Policy Capital Programme

- 4.5.1 There should be no additional revenue costs as a result of this capital scheme.

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

- 4.6.1 The scheme is in the Annual Programme and subject to resolving the objections received it is anticipated to be completed within the 2018/2019 financial year.

#### **4.7 Risk Management**

- 4.7.1 If no action was taken then the road environment around the school for pedestrians and cyclists will not improve and the potential of injury to pedestrians and cyclists will not be addressed.

### **5 Conclusions**

- 5.1.1 The provision of this 20mph scheme will contribute to the Council's ambition by improving the safety and quality of life of Leeds residents by enabling safe pedestrian and cycling journeys in local communities. It will also provide a safer environment around the school and residential areas thus encouraging more sustainable travel behaviours for all users.

### **6 Recommendations**

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) (Speed Limit) (No.6) Order 2016;
- iii) approve the revised scheme as shown on TM-02-2593-REV and request the City Solicitor to remove Lakeland Crescent, Sandmoor Avenue, Sandmoor Chase, Sandmoor Close, Sandmoor Drive, Sandmoor Green, Sandmoor Lane and Sandmoor Mews from the advertised order, including their associated traffic calming features;

- iv) approve the experimental use of Speed Indicator Devices (SIDs) in lieu of traffic calming on The Avenue and The Fairway for an initial period of 6 months with findings to be subject to a follow up report; and
- v) request the City Solicitor to write to the objectors informing them of the Chief Officer's (Highways and Transportation) decision.

## **7 Background documents**

7.1 None.

## APPENDIX A

### SUMMARY OF POINTS OF OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

<b>SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS</b>	<b>HIGHWAYS RESPONSE</b>	<b>OBJECTION NO. COMMENTS WITHIN</b>
1. Legal Notices do not provide adequate publicity to members of the public	The formal public advertisement period was conducted via a notice in the Yorkshire Post 3 February 2017, as well as notices installed on street lighting columns throughout the affected area between 3 <sup>rd</sup> February 2017 and 27 <sup>th</sup> February 2017. A Highways and Transportation Officer has also attended an Alwoodley Parish Council meeting to discuss the proposals and there have been numerous extensive discussions with local Ward Members. The approach taken is similar to that undertaken elsewhere, bearing in mind the area covered by this scheme.	Objection 3, Objection 5, Objection 11, Objection 12, Objection 13, Objection 15, Objection 21, Objection 23, Objection 26
2. Support speed limit reduction to 20mph but do not want traffic calming	<p>It is acknowledged that traffic calming measures are not always popular, but are often necessary to control vehicle speeds. The City Council considers the implementation of the 20mph zone scheme and traffic calming measures to be appropriate. The scheme continues with the Government's and the Council's desire to reduce the speed limit on residential roads to 20mph. The traffic calming measures have been kept to a minimum and to a level that should achieve the aims of the scheme. The scheme should have a wider benefit in the reduction of accidents, whilst hopefully improving the perceived environment for walking and cycling.</p> <p>Based on the DfT's instruction, the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) subsequently issued guidance that for their Police forces to accept and agree to the reduction of a speed limit on a road to 20mph, the post-implementation mean speed should be 24mph or below and Leeds City Council consequently designs its schemes with this figure in mind. It is therefore encouraged that engineering measures be introduced to ensure that a scheme is self-enforcing.</p>	Objection 7, Objection 9, Objection 11, Objection 14, Objection 17, Objection 20, Objection 25

	<p>In this instance it is proposed to replace some of the verticals traffic calming with SIDs on an experimental basis on The Avenue and The Fairway. The Sandmoors element is to be removed from the wider project following discussions with local Ward Members.</p>	
<p>3. The Justification for a 20mph speed limit is questioned.</p>	<p>The scheme is part of a national approach which is being promoted by Central Government and the Department for Transport, who took the decision that all residential streets, not just those around schools, should ideally be subject to a 20mph speed limit so as to increase road safety, improve the quality of life for local residents and encourage greener more healthier modes of transport.</p> <p>The provision of twenty miles-per-hour (20 mph) speed limits contribute to the ambition of improving the safety and quality of life of Leeds residents by enabling safe pedestrian and cycling journeys in local communities. They also help to reduce traffic collisions to make a specific contribution to the Best City for Communities and a Child Friendly City.</p> <p>The Council initiated the development of a new programme for expanding the use of 20mph speed limits in 2010 with a trial project focussing on the environs of schools. Subsequently this programme has been expanded and developed with the ultimate goal of the expanded provision of schemes in local neighbourhoods to incorporate all schools within the setting of a lower speed limit. This approach and programme was endorsed by the Executive Board in February 2014 in response to a deputation from the 20s Plenty for Us campaign group as identified within the 'The Provision of 20mph speed limits in Leeds. Scrutiny Board report dated 17th March 2015 highlights Leeds vision that all residential streets within its district will be governed by a 20mph speed limit by 2020 if funding continues at present levels.</p> <p>More recently the former Scrutiny Board (Sustainable Economy and Culture) reviewed the programme and evidence in March 2015 noting the change in emphasis from a road casualty reduction programme to a more broad based approach which also gives emphasis to the broader benefits for improved opportunities for walking, cycling and community cohesion. Endorsement was given to the continued delivery of the programme of 20mph speed limits in residential areas around schools.</p>	<p>Objection 5, Objection 10, Objection 12, Objection 13, Objection 18, Objection 22, Objection 24</p>

<p>4. Speed Humps cause damage to vehicle suspension steering and are a discomfort</p>	<p>The potential effect traffic calming features have on vehicles has been studied thoroughly and independently in the past. The Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents notes in their '20mph Zones and Speed Limits' found no evidence that speed cushions and speed humps caused vehicle damage, or permanent changes to the vehicles suspension systems. The report also concluded that the levels of discomfort caused by the humps were generally acceptable if they were traversed at an appropriate speed (15-20mph), and that the forces on the spine were an order of magnitude smaller than that which typically causes an injury. Leeds City Council installs traffic calming features to a standard detail that has been refined over time, so that it can install measures that are an appropriate width, length and height and all are in accordance with the necessary Traffic Calming regulations.</p> <p>'Local Transport Note 1/07 'Traffic Calming'' issued by the Department for Transport in March 2007, specifically mentioned in paragraphs 4.5.28 and 4.5.29. The study undertaken showed <i>'No damage to any of the vehicles was seen, despite repeated passes at speeds up to 40mph.'</i></p>	<p>Objection 1, Objection 3, Objection 10, Objection 11, Objection 12, Objection 13, Objection 20, Objection 23, Objection 25</p>
<p>5. Speed humps increase pollution</p>	<p>There is evidence which suggests that regardless of the measures used, introducing a 20mph zone in place of a 30mph will, overall, improve air quality generally across the overall length area.</p> <p>The evidence shows that overall, emissions of NOx for petrol cars increase 7 % from a 30mph to 20mph zone, however a diesel vehicle reduced by 8%. But as emissions from a diesel car at these speed ranges can be around 10 times greater than petrol there is an overall benefit. Moreover the emissions of particulates, which are known to be more harmful than NOx emissions, are reduced for both types of vehicles in 20mph zones.</p> <p>So over all, it could be expected that impact of these changes are negligible and certainly not demonstrated to be such that other safety aspects of road users should be compromised. The report does highlight that there can be some quite significant increases in emissions related to navigating certain types of calming measures.</p> <p>If the overall effect is to have lower emissions within the general area, personal exposure to residents is on the whole is likely to reduce. Evidence shows that if drivers travel consistently and slowly through the system of traffic calming, the impact is negligible.</p>	<p>Objection 3, Objection 11, Objection 23</p>

<p>6. Allocation of resources / a waste of taxpayers money</p>	<p>Funding for such schemes is sourced from central government and is allocated for these schemes only, thus being unavailable to utilise for other purposes such as highway maintenance. The objective of such schemes relates to the ambition of improving the safety and quality of life of Leeds residents by enabling safe pedestrian and cycling journeys in local communities. They also help reduce traffic collisions to make a specific contribution to the Best City for Communities and a Child Friendly City.</p>	<p>Objection 9, Objection 10, Objection 20</p>
<p>7. 20mph zones are unenforceable</p>	<p>20mph speed limits are legally enforceable, however, in order to make them effective and without excessive demands on police resources, traffic calming measures are introduced where speeds of 24 mph and above are recorded prior to the scheme being introduced. They are designed to slow the speed of the vast majority of responsible drivers, rather than prevent the occasional reckless driver whose behaviour should be the focus of the Police.</p>	<p>Objection 10,</p>
<p>8. No requirement for traffic calming as amount of speeding is low</p>	<p>Based on the DfT's instruction, the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) subsequently issued guidance that for their Police forces to accept and agree to the reduction of a speed limit on a road to 20mph, the post-implementation mean speed should be 24mph or below and Leeds City Council consequently designs its schemes with this figure in mind. It is therefore encouraged that engineering measures be introduced to ensure that a scheme is self-enforcing.</p> <p>In this instance it is proposed to replace the vertical traffic calming with SIDs on an experimental basis on The Avenue and The Fairway.</p>	<p>Objection 1,</p>
<p>9. Traffic calming features will result in traffic being displaced onto adjacent streets</p>	<p>Typically, through experience of introducing schemes elsewhere in the city, the level of traffic deciding to use alternate routes following the introduction of traffic calming features, is negligible. It should be noted that all roads in the proposed area are lengths of public adopted highway and the purpose of these roads is to facilitate the passage of traffic and therefore, additional traffic is not unreasonable. As with all such schemes, post-implementation monitoring will be undertaken and if the level of displacement results in road safety issues, then additional work can be considered as appropriate.</p> <p>In this instance, it is proposed to replace the vertical traffic calming with SIDs on an experimental basis on The Avenue and The Fairway. Furthermore, the proposals for the 'Sandmoors' has been dropped from the scheme entirely.</p>	<p>Objection 2, Objection 4,</p>

<p>10. Traffic calming features ruin the aesthetic of the road</p>	<p>Leeds City Council as the highway authority is tasked with improving road safety and facilitating more walking and cycling in the area. The introduction of vertical traffic calming features has been noted as a measure that assists in improving road safety through an associated reduction in prevailing vehicle speeds. That reduction in speed can also encourage walking and cycling through a safer road environment. The features are designed to be minimalistic, using the same material as the carriageway surface and having only small, but appropriate, road markings. It is not felt that the features will be a visual burden on the area.</p>	<p>Objection 3, Objection 10, Objection 19</p>
<p>11. Traffic calming not justified as no associated road traffic incidents</p>	<p>Where Leeds City Council is able to compare pre and post-implementation injury incident data over a 3 and above year period, this data shows an average reduction in these incidents of around 40%. As these schemes have typically included traffic calming features on roads where the mean speed has required their introduction (refer to point 9) it is appropriate to continue introducing features where required.</p> <p>In this instance it is proposed to replace the vertical traffic calming with SIDs on an experimental basis on The Avenue and The Fairway.</p>	<p>Objection 5, Objection 22, Objection 26</p>
<p>12. Speed tables are unfriendly to cyclists</p>	<p>Leeds City Council has typically introduced speed humps/ tables (full width or 'free-draining' with a channel) as opposed to speed cushions on schemes associated with cycling following feedback from cycling groups. Cyclists typically say that, whilst they have to traverse the hump, this is typically safer than cycling through a gap by a speed cushion, as the markings force them into the driving line of a following vehicle. Therefore, by not having to adjust their riding line, they feel safer.</p>	<p>Objection 5, Objection 11,</p>
<p>13. Traffic calming features are uncomfortable for bus passengers</p>	<p>Leeds City Council designs all traffic calming features on bus routes in a specific manner to reduce discomfort to bus passengers. Speed cushions are generally preferred by the bus companies, as the width of the bus axle allows the vehicle to straddle these features with no noticeable interaction with the wheels. Where speed tables are used, these are installed with a 6 metre long 'top', to allow the full wheelbase of the bus to 'land' on the 'top', reducing the up-and-down movements. Speed 'humps' are generally not used on bus routes. The bus companies are consulted, along with the West Yorkshire Combined Authority (formerly METRO) on all such schemes and no objections have been received to this proposal.</p>	<p>Objection 11,</p>

	In this instance it is proposed to replace the vertical traffic calming with SIDs on an experimental basis on The Avenue and The Fairway.	
14. Traffic calming does not slow vehicles down	<p>Our experience of introducing such schemes shows that the introduction of traffic calming features will typically reduce the mean speed of traffic along a route by anything between 1mph to 4mph and will also reduce the amount of traffic travelling at higher speeds by a considerable amount. A recent example in Adel showed a 14% reduction in daily traffic travelling above the speed limit.</p> <p>In this instance it is proposed to replace the vertical traffic calming with SIDs on an experimental basis on The Avenue and The Fairway.</p>	Objection 1, Objection 4, Objection 10, Objection 25
15. Emergency Services delayed by traffic calming features	<p>Leeds City Council fully consults all the Emergency Services on all proposals and this was undertaken as part of this scheme. No objections were received by the Emergency Services to the proposals and we are happy that the proposals will not unduly impact on their services.</p> <p>In this instance it is proposed to replace the vertical traffic calming with SIDs on an experimental basis on The Avenue and The Fairway.</p>	Objection 11, Objection 15
16. Unfair to introduce traffic calming that penalises the majority of drivers for small number of speeders	<p>Whilst it is acknowledged that many drivers adhere to the speed limit and that a proportion do not, the Council must act with measures that are realistically available to it to combat the matter of drivers who choose to travel at speeds higher than desired. Measures such as speed cameras are not readily available to the Council (see Appendix B). The resultant impact is that the road environment is made safer for all and a primary function of the highway authority is to improve road safety.</p> <p>In this instance it is proposed to replace the vertical traffic calming with SIDs on an experimental basis on The Avenue and The Fairway.</p>	Objection 11,
17. Parking on The Avenue slows traffic and therefore traffic calming not required.	Leeds City Council only introduces traffic calming on streets where the prevalent mean speeds require it (see point 9). The mean speed results on The Avenue showed there was still a requirement for these measures when originally proposed.	Objection 9, Objection 13

	In this instance it is proposed to replace the vertical traffic calming with SIDs on an experimental basis on The Avenue and The Fairway.	
18. Speed humps would prevent vehicles from being parked on flat carriageway	<p>The public highway is defined as a route to facilitate the passage and re-passage of traffic. There is no specific right for vehicles to park. As the Highway Authority, Leeds City Council is charged with improving road safety and as outlined in point 12 regarding injury incident reduction seen with these schemes, the measures as originally proposed would be justified over above any concerns relating to parking practices.</p> <p>In this instance it is proposed to replace the vertical traffic calming with SIDs on an experimental basis on The Avenue and The Fairway.</p>	Objection 13
19. Traffic calming causes damage around base of feature	<p>Investigations are undertaken to the condition of the carriageway surface in the vicinity of the new features, prior to work being undertaken. If it is found to be weak or possibly cause issues in the future, then an area of 5 metres either side of the new feature is resurfaced at the time to implementation, to protect against the type of carriageway failure noted.</p> <p>In this instance it is proposed to replace the vertical traffic calming with SIDs on an experimental basis on The Avenue and The Fairway.</p>	Objection 15
20. The Council should introduce 25mph speed limit and no traffic calming, rather than 20mph with traffic calming.	<p>Only specific speed limits approved by the Department for Transport can be introduced by highway authorities and these are in 10mph denominations from 20mph to 70mph. Therefore it is not feasible to introduce a 25mph speed limit on the public highway and the Council must proceed as it intends to do.</p> <p>In this instance it is proposed to replace the vertical traffic calming with SIDs on an experimental basis on The Avenue and The Fairway.</p>	Objection 15
21. Traffic calming aggravates existing back conditions.	<p>Leeds City Council defers to guidance contained within Department for Transport LTN1-07, 'Traffic Calming'. This LTN states that care should be taken over the design of traffic calming features as they can be noted to aggravate existing back conditions. The Leeds City Council standard design for traffic calming features therefore shows a design height of 75mm from carriageway to top of feature, whereas the legal maximum is 100mm. On speed tables and humps, the approach ramps are implemented at a degree noticeable,</p>	Objection 16

	<p>but not severe and the dimensions of speed cushions have been tailored to ensure these are noticeable but not unnecessarily harsh. The Council considers that there is a road safety benefit to introducing these measures, but has taken into account the concern raised regarding aggravating existing back conditions.</p>	
<p>22. Traffic calming causes major disruption to traffic</p>	<p>Traffic calming in the form of speed cushions, humps or tables are designed as a series of measures, so that the driver can adopt one consistent speed along the road, rather than braking and accelerating repeatedly. Furthermore, they do not cause vehicles to have to stop and wait as a chicane feature would do. In reality, there is little impact on journey times.</p>	<p>Objection 3, Objection 10</p>
<p>23. No specific reason for Lakeland Crescent to be included within the Order, nor specified within the Statement of Reasons</p>	<p>Lakeland Crescent has been withdrawn from the Order, as per the attached drawing TM-02-2953-REV. The Statement of Reasons can give a blanket reason for a blanket order in this manner, if the reason for the introduction of the Order is the same for each individual street.</p>	<p>Objection 21</p>

## APPENDIX B

### ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS MADE TO THE PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Request	Highways Response	OBJECTION NO. COMMENTS WITHIN
1. Request for Speed Cameras	<p>The City Council, together with the other West Yorkshire Authorities, West Yorkshire Police, Magistrates' Court Service and the Highways Agency has formed the West Yorkshire Casualty Reduction Partnership. The Partnership is responsible for identification, provision, erection and management of all speed cameras throughout West Yorkshire. Leeds City Council does not have powers to install speed cameras. Since April 2009 the criteria for cameras has been based on the number of accidents where someone is Killed or Seriously Injured (KSI) and a points system where each KSI accident scores 5 points and slight injury accidents score 1.</p> <p>For General Fixed Cameras:</p> <p>At least 4 accidents causing death or serious injury in the previous 3 complete years prior to commissioning of the site. A score of at least 36 points per km if the speed limit is 40mph or less and 30 points per km if the speed limit is over 40mph. Also, surveyed traffic speeds showing 1 vehicle in 10 is exceeding the speed limit by 10% plus 2mph outside of peak periods for 40mph limits and below, or by 5mph for limits above 40mph.</p> <p>For further information regarding speed cameras visit: <a href="http://www.safetycameraswestyorkshire.co.uk">http://www.safetycameraswestyorkshire.co.uk</a></p>	Objection 1, Objection 4, Objection 9,
2. Request Speed Indicator Devices (SIDs)	<p>Some residents have requested SIDs as an alternative to traffic calming measures.</p> <p>As a general note on SIDs; a SID provides a clear visual display of what drivers are doing and they also directly influence those drivers. There is plenty of anecdotal evidence to suggest that drivers travelling at higher speeds do reduce their speed to the limit as a result of seeing their speed displayed on the screen. As a result, SIDs also appears to assist in managing the perceptions of the local community and can provide some reassurance that most drivers do drive sensibly. In our professional opinion however, whilst SIDs are a useful</p>	Objection 4, Objection 7, Objection 8, Objection 9, Objection 19,

	<p>acquisition in reducing speeds their effectiveness over a long period of time are not as effective as physical measures which consistently reduce vehicular speeds, however it is agreed to introduce SID features on The Avenue and The Fairway on an experimental basis to determine whether there is true benefit to introducing on a longer term basis.</p>	
<p>3. Alwoodley Lane should be reduced to 30mph from 40mph</p>	<p>When considering whether to reduce the speed limit on a road, consideration is given to its prevailing mean speed, injury incident level and the general status of the road.</p> <p>The latest speed surveys for Alwoodley Lane show the mean speed as ranging between 34mph and 37mph. Whilst below the existing 40mph speed limit, this is also significantly above the lower 30mph speed limit. It is clearly stated within the Setting Local Speed Limits guidance document that drivers do not adjust their speed to a new speed limit, instead continue to drive to the prevailing conditions. Therefore, without significant engineering intervention the mean speed along Alwoodley Lane could not be realistically adjusted and would sit significantly higher than the speed limit. Consequently, such a proposal could not be supported by the Police.</p> <p>In the last five year period, there have been six injury incidents on Alwoodley Lane, none of which were directly or indirectly related to the speed of any of the vehicles involved. Therefore, no measures can be recommended on this basis.</p> <p>As Alwoodley Lane, whilst serving residential properties, is a local distributor route for vehicles travelling between Harrogate Road and King Lane (including those further accessing the estate south of Alwoodley Lane), with mean speeds appropriate for such a road, the 40mph speed limit remains appropriate at this current time.</p>	<p>Objection 6, Objection 17</p>
<p>4. Existing traffic calming features should be replaced with new features</p>	<p>As this scheme is a road safety scheme (rather than a highway maintenance scheme) with funding specifically ring-fenced, only in situations where the traffic calming is deemed to not be effective enough should consideration be given to replacing/ upgrading the features to a more robust feature.</p>	

## APPENDIX C

# Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Impact Assessment

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. In all appropriate instances we will need to carry out an equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment.

This form:

- can be used to prompt discussion when carrying out your impact assessment
- should be completed either during the assessment process or following completion of the assessment
- should include a brief explanation where a section is not applicable

<b>Directorate:</b> City Development	<b>Service area:</b> Highways and Transportation
<b>Lead person:</b> Mary Levitt-Hughes	<b>Contact number:</b> 0113 2477515
<b>Date of the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment:</b> 17 April 2012 (Reviewed June 2017)	

<b>1. Title:</b> 20mph Speed Reduction Schemes Around Schools
Is this a:
<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Policy <input type="checkbox"/> Service <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Function <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Is this:
<input type="checkbox"/> New/ proposed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already exists and is being reviewed <input type="checkbox"/> Is changing
(Please tick one of the above)

## **2. Members of the assessment team:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Role on assessment team</b>
Mary Levitt-Hughes	Principal Project Officer, Technical Support	Equality Lead
Lisa Powell	Performance & Improvement	Equality Support

	Manager	
Gurdip Bahi	Transport Policy	Transport Planner
Philippe Nirmalendran	Traffic Management	Traffic Engineer
Gary Pritchard	Traffic Management	Traffic Engineer
Kasia Szczerbinska-Speakman	Strategy and Policy	Access and Mobility Officer
Peter Morris	Highways Design & Construction	Trainee Engineer
Sean Hewitt	Highways Design & Construction	Group Engineer
Christopher Way	Traffic Management	Traffic Engineer

### 3. Summary of strategy, policy, service or function that was assessed:

The approach to 20mph speed limits has been evolving in line with changes to the guidance regulation from the DfT and regularly reported to Lead Members and was considered further in 2009 by Lead Members and Leader Management Team. Subsequently a review of such measures was instigated. This review has focused on a particular interest in lower speed limits in the vicinity of schools, changes to the DfT guidance and the costs benefits of the programme.

The review of 20mph Zones and Limits has given regard to the following issues:

- Member / stakeholder views and aspirations
- increasing pressure on resources;
- the forthcoming preparation of the third Local Transport Plan;
- the need to effectively target casualty reduction;
- reducing Rates of Return of 20 Zones as presently configured;
- the future role of Home Zones; and
- the need to continue demonstrating value for money.

As a result of this review the following actions were suggested as a way forward:

- i) That the principle of utilising 20 mph speed limits as a core part of the casualty reduction strategy for local communities and neighbourhoods continues to be supported.
- ii) That the principle of incorporating schools into 20 Zones or Limits is endorsed and that where there is a record of road injuries in the vicinity such schemes may be prioritised for Local Transport funding. Elsewhere if transport funding criteria are not achieved such measures will be a matter for local discretion, community priorities and funding.
- iii) To consider a small project comprising 20 Limits in the environs of 10-20 schools, identified on the basis of road injury records, for piloting a school based approach based on sites with an identified road injury record.
- iv) Review present proposals for 20 Zones to see if the alternative 20 Limit approach could deliver equally effective schemes at a lower and more affordable cost, so that the results can be used to inform the treatment of

these areas and stretch the coverage of future 20 mph programmes.

The above actions were approved by LCC Corporate Leadership Team and a pilot of 6 schemes have been completed with a further trench being progressed. Ongoing annual programmes will be progressed in line with the approved strategy and this Equality assessment.

### **Regulation Changes**

Recent changes to the DfT regulations that came into effect in November 2011 allow 20mph 'Schemes' to be implemented. The new guidance encourages local authorities to introduce more 20 mph speed limits and 20mph zones, and clearly highlights a more flexible approach in the use of 20 mph speed limits. In particular where pedestrian and cyclist movements are high, such as around schools, shops, markets, playgrounds and other areas which are not part of any major through route then 20 mph speed limits or 20mph zones are recommended for introduction.

These changes allow us to:

- Create larger 20mph speed limit areas without features where speeds are already low.
- Create 20mph Zones with a minimum number of features. These are now only installed where we have high speeds or an number of injury accidents. The type of feature used is left to the designer to identify based on the site conditions etc.
- Effect use of budget to install more 20mph schemes for our money.

### **20mph Zones**

20 mph Zones comprise of traffic calming features and signs and were previously considered appropriate where excessive speeds occurred and where measures were needed to keep speeds at or below 20mph. The regulations for zones required physical features at frequent intervals, even where the features were not needed for safety at all the locations within the zone, increasing the cost of zones but without necessarily bringing commensurate benefits.

### **20mph Limits**

20mph Limits were introduced by the erection of signs and road markings. These are regarded as most appropriate where speeds were already relatively low and further traffic calming features were not needed. Also, they were intended for very small areas, typically of one or two streets.

**4. Scope of the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment**  
 (complete - 4a. if you are assessing a strategy, policy or plan and 4b. if you are assessing a service, function or event)

<b>4a. Strategy, policy or plan</b> (please tick the appropriate box below)	
The vision and themes, objectives or outcomes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The vision and themes, objectives or outcomes and the supporting guidance	<input type="checkbox"/>
A specific section within the strategy, policy or plan	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Please provide detail:**

The ambition for Leeds City Council is that all schools across the city will have a 20 mph speed limits in place and this aim is supported by the Local Transport Plan's (LTP3) 2 key objectives highlighted below:

1. Economy. To improve connectivity to support economic activity and growth in West Yorkshire and the Leeds City Region.
2. **Low-Carbon.** To make substantial progress towards a low carbon, sustainable transport system for West Yorkshire, while recognising transport's contribution to national carbon reduction plans.
3. **Quality of Life.** To enhance the quality of life of people living in, working in and visiting West Yorkshire.

To help deliver the above objectives the following LTP3 "proposals" are applicable to the 20mph schemes:

- **Proposal 7** - *Implement a targeted programme of travel behaviour change including marketing, information, education and support activities.*
- **Proposal 9** - *Provide tailored education and training to support habitual behaviour change to more sustainable travel modes.*
- **Proposal 17** - *Develop a new model for transport planning at a community level to enhance local accessibility.*
- **Proposal 18** - *Improve safety and security, seeking to minimise transport casualties*
- **Proposal 22** - *Define, develop and manage networks and facilities to encourage cycling and walking.*

<b>4b. Service, function, event</b> please tick the appropriate box below	
The whole service (including service provision and employment)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A specific part of the service (including service provision or employment or a specific section of the service)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Procuring of a service (by contract or grant) (please see equality assurance in procurement)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Please provide detail:</b>	

## **5. Fact finding – what do we already know**

Make a note here of all information you will be using to carry out this assessment. This could include: previous consultation, involvement, research, results from perception surveys, equality monitoring and customer/ staff feedback.

### **Casualty Reduction**

In terms of road casualties around schools, research over several years has shown that over 90% of injuries to children on the school journey occur beyond the vicinity of the school. Analysis of the casualty data indicates, using a five year average, shows that around 25% of all child casualties (approx. 93 annually) occur during the times of a school journey.

### **School Assessment Process**

The primary objective of 20mph schemes has always been casualty reduction. Therefore the prioritisation of the programme has been based on the recorded injury accidents. To allow for the varying sizes of the zones the overall area of the zone or the length of road covered by the proposed zone has been used to establish the accidents per km<sup>2</sup> or per km, and ranked accordingly.

The areas are identified using main and primary roads as natural boundaries and can therefore vary in size.

Following the introduction of the school 20mph pilot. All the remaining schools and their surrounding residential areas have been included into the assessment process and have now been ranked on the number of injury accidents per km<sup>2</sup>. This has been done as an interim measure and soon we will have the information based on accidents per km.

Given that the number of casualties are reducing as more and more zones are treated it is proposed to develop this process by establishing a scoring system to factor in other benefits or element which are present in the areas such as.

- Number of schools pupils
- Community centres
- Other vulnerable users centres in the area
- Shops and high streets
- Contributions from external funding.
- Population

### **Design Process**

- Investigate speed surveys and accident data
- Determine possible extent of 20mph limit/zone
- Onsite investigation of existing conditions/environment
- Determine costs of draft proposals
- Initial consultation
- Report to Highways and Transportation Board for approval to advertise the

- necessary Traffic Regulation Order (TRO)
- Introduce scheme if no resolved objections received\*
- Monitor effects e.g. carry out further speed surveys and accident studies

Where possible the Road Safety's School Travel Team go into schools prior to scheme implementation to give a presentation to the children about the 20mph and raise awareness and promote the schemes.

**Are there any gaps in equality and diversity information**

None

**Action required:**

Ongoing monitoring of schemes, by using speed surveys and accident statistics

**6. Wider involvement – have you involved groups of people who are most likely to be affected or interested**

Yes       No

**Please provide detail:**

The following stakeholders are consulted prior to the implementation of the 20mph schemes.

- Emergency Services
- Metro
- Ward Members
- Schools
- Local residents
- Parish Councils (if applicable)

**Action required:**

None

**7. Who may be affected by this activity?**

please tick all relevant and significant equality characteristics, stakeholders and barriers that apply to your strategy, policy, service or function

**Equality characteristics**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Age	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disability
<input type="checkbox"/> Gender reassignment	<input type="checkbox"/> Race	<input type="checkbox"/> Religion or Belief
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sex (male or female)	<input type="checkbox"/> Sexual orientation	

Other

**Please specify:** Social class may be more affected as they are more likely to live near busy roads and walk or use public transport.

**Stakeholders**

Services users

Employees

Trade Unions

Partners

Members

Suppliers

Other please specify

**Potential barriers.**

.....

Built environment

Location of premises and services

Information and communication

Customer care

Timing

Stereotypes and assumptions

Cost

Consultation and involvement

specific barriers to the strategy, policy, services or function

**Please specify**

**8. Positive and negative impact**

Think about what you are assessing (scope), the fact finding information, the potential positive and negative impact on equality characteristics, stakeholders and the effect of the barriers

**8a. Positive impact:**

Making 20mph the normal speed limit would:

- Dramatically increases chances of survival if [hit by a car](#) to 97%
- Make it more pleasant to [walk or cycle](#), encouraging a more healthy lifestyle
- Reduce [pollution and noise](#).
- Improve quality of life for the local community
- Provide safer passage whilst crossing the road to all pedestrians, especially those with mobility issues, disabled people, parents supporting pushchairs and young and old people

- Greater independence and choice for children travelling to school

**Action required:**

None

**8b. Negative impact:**

- There is a slight reduction in air quality when speed limits are reduced, however, this is offset by the potential reduction in fatal accidents as a consequence of reduced speeds and safety features introduced as part of 20 mph zones/limits
- Perceived displaced traffic may increase congestion on other roads, although the level of displacement would differ for every scheme and assessing this would be costly without necessarily bringing commensurate benefits.
- Potential noise increase, due to the reduction in vehicle speeds, although this is compensated by improving road safety for pedestrians and potentially only an issue at the beginning and end of the school day
- Journey times may be increased very slightly within the relatively small area of the scheme, however, every measure is taken to ensure that this is minimal by working closely with Metro to lessen the impact on commuters on buses.
- Speed calming features may have a slight impact on emergency services, though this is mitigated by ensuring that the appropriate features are used as part of the scheme design process
- Increases future maintenance costs, particularly for raised features e.g. speed cushions, road markings

**Action required:**

None

**9. Will this activity promote strong and positive relationships between the groups/communities identified?**

Yes

No

**Please provide detail:**

The introduction of 20mph schemes will have a beneficial affect in the localised area as it will provide a safer environment for the local community.

**Action required:**

None

**10. Does this activity bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other (e.g. in schools, neighbourhood, workplace)?**

**Yes**

**No**

**Please provide detail:**

Improves community safety and makes it more of a social event as it encourages parents and children to walk or cycle to school.

**Action required:**

None

**11. Could this activity be perceived as benefiting one group at the expense of another?**

**Yes**

**No**

**Please provide detail:**

It may be perceived that the schemes have a more positive impact on pedestrians and cyclists over motorists. However, the reduction in road casualties has a beneficial effect on all three groups.

**Action required:**

None

**12. Equality, diversity, cohesion and integration action plan**

(insert all your actions from your assessment here, set timescales, measures and identify a lead person for each action)

<b>Action</b>	<b>Timescale</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Lead person</b>
Monitoring of schemes, by using speed surveys and accident statistics	Ongoing	Accident reduction	Paul Foster

<b>13. Governance, ownership and approval</b>		
State here who has approved the actions and outcomes from the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment		
Name	Job Title	Date
Gwyn Owen	Project Manager, Transport Policy	14/05/12
Nicholas Hunt	Traffic Engineering Manager	22/06/17

<b>14. Monitoring progress for equality, diversity, cohesion and integration actions</b> (please tick)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	As part of Service Planning performance monitoring
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	As part of Project monitoring
<input type="checkbox"/>	Update report will be agreed and provided to the appropriate board Please specify which board
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please specify)

<b>15. Publishing</b>	
<b>Date sent to Equality Team</b>	
<b>Date published</b>	