

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

**Date: 23 April 2019**

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

**Capital Scheme Number: 32428**

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Rothwell	<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 2018-2019 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 while still providing parking areas which meet the residential and business needs of the area and thus reduce the likelihood of obstruction, congestion and injury accidents.
2. Following approval of a report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) in June 2018, Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.W45) Order 2014 Amendment No.3 2018, was advertised and attracted a total of 12 objections, 3 representations and one email of support.
3. This report seeks approval of the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) to consider and overrule the reported objections associated with the proposed waiting restrictions on Church Street and surrounding area detailed in Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.W45) Order 2014 Amendment No.3 2018.
4. Having re-considered/reviewed the proposal, it was considered necessary to amend the 'No Waiting At Any Time' restrictions on Pottery Lane, Woodlesford as the road is narrow and will not be able to facilitate parking on both sides of the road. These amended proposals will require re-advertisement.

## **Recommendations**

5. The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:
- i) note the contents of this report;
  - ii) consider and overrule the objections to Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.W45) Order 2014 Amendment No.3 2018 giving authority to implement the scheme with the changes to the advertised order;
  - iii) approve the revised part of scheme as shown on TM-29-052-TRO-03a;
  - iv) request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement (in part) Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.W45) Order 2014 Amendment No.3 2018, inform the objectors accordingly of the Chief Officer's (Highways and Transportation) decision; and
  - v) request the City Solicitor to re-advertise the revised part of the scheme relating to Pottery Lane.

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

- 1.1 This report details the objections 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 Rothwell Ward and requests the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) to consider the objections and the Officer's response.
- 1.2 The purpose of the report is to obtain authority to overrule the objections received to the proposals on Church Street and surrounding area and seeks approval to implement and seal the waiting restrictions as per the revised Order.

### **2 Background information**

- 2.1 Due to the rising levels of indiscriminate parking experienced on various roads within Rothwell Ward, concerns have been raised via Ward Members, the police, 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 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 23 November 2018 and 21 December 2018. As a result of the advertisement period, a total of 17 responses were received to the advertised proposals, where one supported the proposals support, thirteen are in objection and three have requested additional restrictions. The objections are outlined in Appendix A.

- 2.4 Following legal advertisement the Council received one representation that requested additional restrictions and has the support from a Ward Member. Having considered their comments and, looking again at the road layout, it was decided to amend the 'No Waiting At Any Time' restrictions on Church Lane and Beechwood, Woodlesford to accommodate their suggestions. The resident and Ward Member have been re-consulted and are now in full support of the proposals.
- 2.5 These additional proposals were re-advertised between 4 January and 4 February 2019, copies of this additional Notice were only posted in the vicinity of the affected roads. The advertisement has taken place within a local publication (Yorkshire Post) and via notices on site. No other adverse comments were received.

### **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 Rothwell Ward, the proposals on Church Street and surrounding area received objections and are detailed on drawing TM-29-052-TRO-01.
- 3.2 All objectors have received full written responses, following which one objector withdrew their objection. As such they have been removed from the final objection summary.
- 3.3 Appendix A, the objection summary table, details the objectors' concerns and Highways Officer's response to the remaining twelve objections.

### **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 14<sup>th</sup> August 2018. A total of one response was received confirming their support for the scheme. The scheme was subsequently amended in response to local resident consultation, ward members were notified by email on 20<sup>th</sup> December 2018. No other adverse comments received. Regular meetings were held with Ward Members in order to keep them updated on the progress of the scheme and the feedback from the public

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

The Emergency Services and WYCA were consulted by email on 14<sup>th</sup> August 2018 and support was received from West Yorkshire Police.

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

The affected residents were consulted on the 13<sup>th</sup> September 2018 via letters and several consultation events took place prior to the legal advertisement. Following feedback three locations were altered to alleviate concerns that had been raised.

## 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 for 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 2015-2020 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 £20,000 comprising:

Works	£6,000
Legal	£1,000
Staff fees	£13,000

- 4.4.2 The scheme is funded by the Traffic Management Capital budget and its completion is anticipated within the 2019/20 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 which may compromise road safety.

## **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 Rothwell ward.

5.2 Overruling the outstanding objections 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 Rothwell Ward, particularly accessibility and visibility around junctions and also protecting access to private property where required.

## **6 Recommendations**

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

- i) note the contents of this report;
- ii) consider and overrule the objections to Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.W45) Order 2014 Amendment No.3 2018 giving authority to implement the scheme with the changes to the advertised order;
- iii) approve the revised part of the scheme as shown on TM-29-052-TRO-03a;
- iv) request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement (in part) Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.W45) Order 2014 Amendment No.3 2018 and inform the objectors accordingly of the Chief Officer's (Highways and Transportation) decision; and
- v) request the City Solicitor to re-advertise the revised part of the scheme relating to Pottery Lane.

## **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 ROTHWELL WARD PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

#### **Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.W45) Order 2014 Amendment No.3 2018**

A total of twelve objections are remaining which all refer to Church Road and surrounding area, drawing TM-29-052-TRO-01. These restrictions have been proposed in order to improve traffic congestion, visibility at the junctions, eliminate indiscriminate parking and to facilitate the movement of traffic. Following the initial consultation period it was expressed that there were concerns about removal of parking and displacement of vehicles and as such several restrictions were amended so as to limit the perceived negative impact.

These proposals have been requested by the Ward Members, police and local residents who have road safety concerns. We have received general support from residents within the locality. The issues raised in each objection have been categorised below with the highways response to the comments. A copy of each objection will be available at the highways board, these have not been published as they contain personal information.

<b>Objection</b>	<b>Highways Response</b>	<b>Number</b>
<p><i>These objections focuses on the Church Street and surrounding area element of the wider scheme.</i></p> <p><i>Objector states that the introduction of restrictions in the Woodlesford area will prevent employees from parking near their work place as there are not enough spaces available in the vicinity.</i></p> <p><i>Objector states that by placing yellow lines it will just displace the problem and move it to other streets.</i></p>	<p>It is the duty of the local Highways Authority to insure 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/businesses in locations that are safe and where they do not cause obstructions.</p> <p>The introduction of waiting restrictions covering the first few metres of these roads is unlikely to move many vehicles and the restrictions will have the benefit of improving the visibility at the junctions and consequently reduce risk presented by low visibility. We have tried to ensure that what is being proposed will cause the minimum disruption to residents and businesses.</p>	11

<p><i>Objector states that the parking situation arises when the local primary school's pick up and drop offs occur twice a day. Objector suggests that the pub nearby has a large car park that is empty at these key times. If this were to be used the roadside would be much quieter, safer, less chaotic place for pedestrians, cars and residents.</i></p> <p><i>Objector states that by placing yellow lines it will just displace the problem and move it to other streets.</i></p>	<p>The responsibility of the highway authority is to preserve the highway for the passing and repassing of vehicles and this is what we aim to preserve.</p> <p>It is fully understood that schools generate traffic and that parents/carers do not always show the consideration for residents or other road users. Whilst it's certainly a very good idea to use a pub's car park at the school's pick up and drop off times, this would be something that would need to be introduced by the School itself and the local education authority.</p> <p>The introduction of waiting restrictions covering the first few metres of these roads is unlikely to move many vehicles and the restrictions will have the benefit of improving the visibility at the junctions and consequently reduce risk presented by low visibility.</p>	<p>1</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.

<b>Directorate: City Development</b>	<b>Service area: Traffic Management</b>
<b>Lead person: Mandeep Flora</b>	<b>Contact number: 0113 37 87507</b>

<b>1. Title: Rothwell 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 Rothwell 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>• Metro</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. Twelve objections have been received by residents and business employees, 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 of the Scheme Features:</p> <p>The proposals will ensure that points of access is maintained along stretches of highway and around junction radii, where existing concentrated parking is causing issues.</p>

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.

Negative Impacts of the Scheme Features:

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 impact on the accessibility for road users and/or pedestrians at a separate location.

- **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

Name	Job title	Date

**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>	
<b>Date sent to Equality Team</b>	
<b>Date published</b> (To be completed by the Equality Team)	