

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

**Date: 15 January 2019**

**Subject: Moortown Ward TRO - Objection Report**

**Capital Scheme Number: 32428**

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Moortown	<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 Leeds City Council the best local authority. According to the Best Council Plan, the ambitions of the Best Council are supporting healthy lifestyles, building strong cohesive communities, keeping children safe and connecting people and places. This report proposes a scheme that will help deliver these objectives by restricting unsafe sections of the highway and thus reduce the likelihood of obstruction, congestion and injury collisions.
2. Following approval of a report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) in June 2018, Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.46) Order 2014 Amendment No.1 2018, was advertised and attracted a total of one objection.
3. This report seeks approval of the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) to consider and overrule the reported objection associated to the proposed waiting restrictions on Stonegate Road and its southern access road as detailed in items 5 & 6 in the first schedule of Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.46) Order 2014 Amendment No.1 2018

## **Recommendations**

4. The Chief Officer (Highways and Transport) is requested to:

- i) note the contents of this report;
- ii) consider and overrule the objection to Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.46) Order 2014 Amendment No.1 2018 giving authority to implement the scheme as per the advertised order; and
- iii) request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.46) Order 2014 Amendment No.1 2018 and inform the objector accordingly of the Chief Officer's (Highways and Transportation) decision.

### **1 Purpose of this report**

- 1.1 This report details the objection received against the proposed Traffic Regulation Order that forms a package of work to improve road safety through the introduction of waiting restrictions on various streets within the Moortown Ward and requests the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) to consider the objection and the Officer's response.
- 1.2 The purpose of the report is to obtain authority to overrule the objection received to the proposals on Stonegate Road and its southern access road and in addition seeks approval to implement and seal the waiting restrictions as per the advertised Order.

### **2 Background information**

- 2.1 Due to the rising levels of indiscriminate parking experienced on various roads within Moortown, concerns have been raised via Ward Members, members of the public and local businesses, regarding its adverse effect on sight lines, general access for the residents and the free movement of traffic. A scheme was collated as a consequence to introduce a series of waiting restrictions within the Ward with the intention of improving accessibility and visibility at key points, thus improving road safety.
- 2.2 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) approved this package of measures as part of the wider Traffic Management Capital scheme report presented in June 2018 and gave authority to advertise and implement a Traffic Regulation Order subject to objections.
- 2.3 The Traffic Regulation Order was subsequently advertised between the 30<sup>th</sup> November 2018 and the 4<sup>th</sup> January 2019. As a result of the advertisement period, a total of one response was received to the advertised proposals, which was in objection. The objection is outlined in Appendix A.

### **3 Main issues**

- 3.1 This report refers to a Traffic Regulation Order scheme that seeks to implement lengths of waiting restrictions on various streets across the Moortown Ward. The

proposals on Stonegate Road and its southern access road received an objection and are detailed on drawing TM-24-059-TRO-01.

- 3.2 Appendix A, the objection summary table, details the objector's concerns and the Highways Officer's response to the objection.

## **4 Corporate Considerations**

### **4.1 Consultation and Engagement**

#### **4.1.1 Ward Members:**

These proposals have been developed in conjunction with the local ward members at the time. Ward Members were initially consulted by email on 15<sup>th</sup> August 2018 and a meeting with all three Ward Members confirmed their support for the scheme on the 13<sup>th</sup> September. The scheme was subsequently amended in response to local resident consultation.

#### **4.1.2 Emergency Services and West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA):**

The Emergency Services and WYCA were consulted by email on 15<sup>th</sup> August 2018. No adverse comments were received regarding the proposals.

#### **4.1.3 Local Residents:**

The affected residents were consulted on the 12<sup>th</sup> October 2018 via letters prior to the legal advertisement. Following feedback one location was removed and one other location was altered to alleviate concerns that had been raised. Some aspects of the proposals were clarified to the satisfaction of the enquirers.

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

- 4.2.1 An Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration screening form was completed for the proposed scheme, which found that the proposals would ensure that vehicular access is maintained along narrower stretches of highway, around junction radii and points of access to private property, where existing concentrated parking is causing issues.

- 4.2.2 The same restrictions will also improve pedestrian accessibility, particularly carers with children and those pedestrians with pushchairs and/or wheelchairs. The restrictions will create lengths of highway free from parked vehicles, allowing increased visibility for all.

- 4.2.3 A consequence of the implementation of parking restrictions is that parking will displace to new locations, which cannot be accurately determined until the restrictions have been implemented. This may have a negative impact on the accessibility for road users and/or pedestrians at a separate location. Any such issues that arise following this displacement can be considered as part of a new scheme, moving forward.

### 4.3 Council policies and City Priorities

4.3.1 The Best Council Plan 2018-19 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 ambitions of the Best Council are supporting healthy lifestyles, building strong cohesive communities, keeping children safe and connecting people and places.

4.3.2 The proposal contributes to the policies in the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 2011-26 as follows:

**Transport Assets:** P2. Maintain to a suitable and sufficient standard.

**Travel Choices:** P10. Promote the benefits of active travel.

**Connectivity:** P18. Improve safety and security

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

### 4.4 Resources and value for money

4.4.1 The full scheme is estimated at £15,000 comprising:

Works	£5,000
Legal	£1,000
Staff fees	£9,000

4.4.2 The scheme is funded by the Traffic Management Capital budget and its completion is anticipated within the 2018/19 financial year.

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

4.5.1 The scheme is not eligible for Call In.

### 4.6 Risk Management

4.6.1 There is a risk that if the restrictions are not introduced, then access for residents and emergency services will be severely restricted.

4.6.2 There is a risk that if the restrictions are not introduced, then inter-visibility between road users will be severely restricted

## 5 Conclusions

5.1 These proposals are designed to remove indiscriminate parking and improve access and visibility for many local residents at various locations within the Moortown ward.

5.2 Over-ruling the received objection detailed in Appendix A, and in accordance with the recommendations will allow this scheme to progress as per the advertised proposals.

5.3 Provision of these measures will improve safety at key points on various roads within the Moortown Ward, particularly accessibility and visibility around junctions and also protecting access to private property where required.

## **6 Recommendations**

6.1 The Chief Officer is requested to:

- i) note the contents of this report;
- ii) consider and overrule the objection to Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.46) Order 2014 Amendment No.1 2018 giving authority to implement the scheme as per the advertised order; and
- iii) request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.46) Order 2014 Amendment No.1 2018 and inform the objector accordingly of the Chief Officer's (Highways and Transportation) decision.

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

7.1 Appendix A – Objection Summary & Highways Response

7.2 Appendix B – EDCI Screening Document

---

## APPENDIX A

### SUMMARY OF OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED MOORTOWN TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

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

A total of one objection remains which refers to Stonegate Road and its southern access road as detailed in items 5 & 6 of the first schedules and as shown on drawing TM-24-059-TRO-01. These restrictions have been proposed in order to prevent indiscriminate and obstructive parking and to facilitate the movement of traffic, in particular the manoeuvres made by emergency service vehicles. The issues raised in the objection have been categorised below with the highways response to the comments. A copy of the objection will be available to the Chief Officer; these have not been published as they contain personal information.

<b>Objection</b>	<b>Highways Response</b>	<b>Number</b>
Note: A single objection was received made up of the following five points:		
<i>The proposed restrictions are unnecessary</i>	These proposals have been requested by ward members on behalf of the Moor Allerton Sports and Social Centre who have expressed concerns about obstructive parking preventing the access of emergency service vehicles and other large vehicles that required access to the Moor Allerton Sports and Social Centre. Officers investigated these claims and noted that the road width was too small to safely accommodate parking.	1
<i>Loss of available parking for residents</i>	It is the duty of the local Highways Authority to ensure the safe movement of traffic and so restrictions are only used in locations where there is highlighted concern. It is accepted that the Highways Authority will facilitate parking for residents in locations that are safe and where they do not cause obstructions.  Additionally the restrictions will have the benefit of improving accessibility for the Moor Allerton Sports and Social Centre as well as reducing the risks caused by low visibility.	1
<i>The road is private</i>	The road in question (Stonegate Road's southern access road) is in fact publicly maintained highway.	1
<i>The restrictions wont be enforced and thus are unworkable</i>	In terms of enforcement, once the scheme has been introduced the Council's own Civil Enforcement officers will enforce the restrictions	1
<i>Error between schedule and plan</i>	In respect of the alleged discrepancy between the schedules and the plan, these documents have been checked by several senior members of staff both in the Traffic section and our legal department, before and after receiving the objection and their assessment is that the wording is satisfactory. There error between the schedules was not clarified by the objector.	1

## 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.

<b>Directorate: City Development</b>	<b>Service area: Traffic Management</b>
<b>Lead person: Luke Wood</b>	<b>Contact number: 0113 37 87495</b>

<b>1. Title: Moortown Ward Traffic Regulation Order 2018/19</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: Traffic Regulation Order</b>

<b>2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening</b>
The screening focuses on a report to the Highways and Transportation Board requesting authority to implement a traffic regulation order in the Moortown Ward, specifically overruling objections received during the public advertisement period.

<b>3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration</b> All the council's strategies/policies, services/functions affect service users, employees or the wider community – city wide or more local. These will also have a greater/lesser relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.  The following questions will help you to identify how relevant your proposals are.  When considering these questions think about age, carers, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation and any other relevant characteristics (for example socio-economic status, social class, income, unemployment, residential location or family background and education or skills levels).
---

Questions	Yes	No
Is there an existing or likely differential impact for the different equality characteristics?	✓	
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the policy or proposal?	✓	
Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom?		✓
Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment practices?		✓
Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment</li> <li>• Advancing equality of opportunity</li> <li>• Fostering good relations</li> </ul>		✓

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"> <li>• <b>How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration?</b> (<b>think about</b> 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>Consultation on the proposals has taken place with the following stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Councillors</li> <li>• Emergency Services (Police, West Yorkshire Fire and Ambulances Services)</li> <li>• West Yorkshire Combined Authority</li> <li>• Local Residents</li> </ul> <p>Support for the scheme has been received from Local Councillors with no objections raised from other statutory consultees. One objection has been received from a resident, as detailed in the summary table in Appendix A.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Key findings</b></li> </ul> <p>Positive Impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By combining various areas into Ward based Traffic Regulation Order we are able to address more issues within the allocated funding;</li> <li>• Reducing the number of injury accidents on the highway network, by providing</li> </ul>

formal pedestrian facilities, reducing the speed limit and removing obstructive parking;

- Providing a safer environment for members of the public, especially children travelling to and from the schools area and improving the situation for the residents and businesses in the areas of the various schemes;
- Benefiting those members of the public who, through infirmity, may have difficulty in keeping out of the way of motor traffic, typically older people, school children, parents, carers and supporting wheelchairs and pushchairs; people who are visually impaired and disabled people; and
- Maintaining access to the locality, for those members of the public who may have mobility issues by means of providing DDA compliant crossing facilities.

The various scheme proposals may have also provide negative impacts on road users by,

**Negative Impacts:**

- The removal of on street parking could lead to parking being displaced to the surrounding residential streets, but this will be monitored following the implementation of the parking restrictions. There is a possibility that during the legal advertisement of the Traffic Regulation, Movement & Speed Limit Orders, objections could be received from members of the public and even those not local to the area.
- Requests for schemes continue throughout the year however the service will be unable to deliver identified schemes within a reasonable timescale due to the budget restriction. This will have an adverse effect on the perception of the service and the council generally

• **Actions**

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

Any such issues that arise following the negative impact can be considered as part of a new scheme, moving forward.

**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

<b>Name</b>	<b>Job title</b>	<b>Date</b>
-------------	------------------	-------------

Nicholas Hunt	Traffic Engineering Manager	10 <sup>th</sup> April 2018
---------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------

### **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

<b>Date screening completed</b>	10 <sup>th</sup> April 2018
<b>Date sent to Equality Team</b>	10 <sup>th</sup> April 2018
<b>Date published</b> (To be completed by the Equality Team)	