

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

**Date: 13 August 2019**

**Subject: Speed Limit Order (Speed Limit) (No.71) Order 2018**

**Westerton, Blackgates and Thorpe Primary Schools - 20mph zones – Objection Report**

**Capital Scheme Numbers: 32150 and 32151**

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Ardsley & Robin Hood and Morley South	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number: 10.4 (2) Appendix number:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

**Summary of main issues**

- 1 Leeds City Council has a long standing ambition to provide 20mph zones and speed limits in residential areas, as endorsed by Executive and Scrutiny Boards in recent years and in line with ambitions of the Best Council Plan to make Leeds a Child Friendly City, to improve Transport and Infrastructure and to improve Health & Wellbeing. These schemes are also an integral part of the Council's Safer Roads Action Plan and have been making a major contribution to reducing road casualties which are at a record low level.
- 2 Following approval of a report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) in November 2018, a Speed Limit Order was advertised on site which attracted one objection.
- 3 This report details the objection and asks the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) to consider and overrule the objection to Leeds City Council (Speed Limit) Order (No 71) 2018

## **Recommendations**

- 1 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:
  - i) note the contents of this report and the full text of the objection appended as background documents;
  - ii) consider and overrule the objection to Leeds City Council (Speed Limit) Order (No 71) 2018; and
  - iii) request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Speed Limit) Order (No 71) 2018 as advertised and inform the objector accordingly of the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation's) decision.

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

- 1.1 To consider an objection received to Leeds City Council (Speed Limit) Order (No 71) 2018 relating to a proposed 20mph zone in West Ardsley and Thorpe and decide on whether to overrule or uphold the objection.

### **2 Background information**

- 2.1 Following approval of a report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) in August 2014, Leeds City Council (Speed Limit) Order (No 24) 2014 was advertised on site and this attracted one objection. This objection stated that flaws in the original approval process and subsequent advertisement could leave the scheme open to a legal challenge.
- 2.2 Following due consideration it was decided to abandon the scheme as previously advertised and a further review of the scheme undertaken by officers.
- 2.3 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) approved a report on 16<sup>th</sup> December 2015 to advertise a draft Traffic Regulation Order for a 20mph speed limit in areas of West Ardsley, Tingley and Thorpe (Speed Limit) Order (No. 2) 2016).
- 2.4 The draft Order was advertised from the 24<sup>th</sup> February 2016 to the 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2016 and two objections were received.
- 2.5 The objections were reported to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) at Highways Board in August 2016 and the decision was made to overrule the objections.
- 2.6 One of the objectors identified that one element of their objection was not detailed in the report and a decision was made to introduce a new 20mph Order and to revoke the made 2016 Order under it.

- 2.7 The draft Order (Speed Limit) Order (No 71) 2018) was advertised from the 1<sup>st</sup> February 2019 to the 1<sup>st</sup> March 2019 and one objection was received from the same objector dated 21 February 2019, who objected both in relation to the merits of the Order and procedural issues relating to it (annexed to this report as confidential background document 7.4).
- 2.8 The objector also submitted a further letter dated 7 May 2019 querying whether the initial justification for advertising the Order was still valid (annexed to this report as confidential background document 7.5)

### **3 Main issues**

- 3.1 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 areas around all schools within the setting of a lower speed limit. This approach was first approved by the Executive Board in June 2012, in response to a deputation requesting a 20 mph speed limit on Haven Chase in Cookridge, and subsequently endorsed by the Executive Board in February 2014 in response to a deputation from the 20s Plenty for Us campaign group.
- 3.2 More recently the former Scrutiny Board (Sustainable Economy and Culture) reviewed the programme and evidence in November 2014, noting, as schemes progress, 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 on improved opportunities for walking, cycling and community cohesion. Endorsement was given in September 2015 to the continued delivery of this programme (in accordance with executive board approval) and to the aim that the majority of residential streets within Leeds district will have a 20mph speed limit by 2020, concentrated around schools and their local residential areas.
- 3.3 Further approval was given in a report to the Executive Board in March 2018 for the completion of schemes at all remaining identified sites for residential 20mph zones and speed limits programme in Leeds.
- 3.4 The boundaries for the 20mph schemes currently being progressed are designed to not only improve and maintain road safety in the immediate vicinity of individual schools but also to give added benefit to the wider residential areas around these schools and hence improve the environment for cycling and walking on school journeys. National statistics show that around 25% of all child casualties happen on a school journey, but very few occur in the immediate vicinity of the school, emphasising the need to consider the whole of the journey to school when designing a 20 mph scheme. Whilst the schools are the "focal point" for the schemes, it is considered that the benefits on the wider community are also an important part of the overall principle.
- 3.5 It is anticipated that implementation of each individual scheme within the current phase of the wider programme will be complete within the 2019/2020 financial year.

- 3.6 It is also expected that schools within the 20mph zone will benefit from the added incentive of a lower speed limit to make positive changes in the modal shift for the school journey, with parents being encouraged to allow children to walk or cycle to school. Fifty three percent of pupils at Blackgates Primary currently walk, cycle or scoot to school, around half the pupils walk to Westerton Primary. A comprehensive programme to support schools in enabling and promoting active travel and road safety for pupils is in place. A school Crossing Patrol Warden has previously highlighted the issue of speeding on Sykes Lane, and the issue of speeding and 20 mph limit as a solution, are identified in both the schools Travel Plans. Specific concerns over the impact of busy traffic have been identified on Hesketh lane, Rein Road, Westerton Road and Lowry Road by parents as barriers to walking and cycling.
- 3.7 The impacts of the aforementioned 20 mph limit project will be monitored as part of the wider road casualty reduction programme. The modal shift of the school journey will be monitored via the School Travel Plans and additional surveys where required.
- 3.8 Approval to this particular scheme was given in the December 2015 report to The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) under the “improved opportunities for walking, cycling and community cohesion” rationale.

### 3.9 Design Proposals and Full Scheme Description

A 20mph speed limit is currently in place on residential streets in Tingley, Thorpe and West Ardsley as shown on drawing numbers TMW-3-2-604-5 and TMW-3-2-605-4a.

### 3.8 Programme

- 3.8.1 It is anticipated that the scheme will be completed, subject to approval, within the 2019/ 2020 financial year.

## 4 Corporate Considerations

### 4.1 Consultation and Engagement

- 4.1.1 Ward Members: Ward Members for Ardsley & Robin Hood and Morley South were consulted on the re-advertisement of the Speed Limit Order by email dated the 18<sup>th</sup> September 2018. 5 responses have been received in support of the proposal (3 Ardsley and Robin Hood and 2 from Morley South) No adverse comments have been received.
- 4.1.2 Emergency Services and WYCA were consulted on the re-advertisement of the Speed Limit Order by email dated the 18<sup>th</sup> September 2018 and no comments have been received.
- 4.1.3 The general public consultation was via notices on street lighting columns during the public advertisement phase, along with an advert in the Yorkshire Post newspaper between the dates 1<sup>st</sup> February 2019 to the 1<sup>st</sup> March 2019.

## 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 and is attached as Appendix 1.

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 noise pollution.
- 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 vehicle emissions due to lower speeds. It is expected there will be a reduction of between 1- 2mph for the average speeds across the zone and that the potential air quality implications will be negligible and offset due to more uniform driving behaviour and potential increased 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' Best City ambition 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 Climate Emergency: The provision of the proposals in this report will encourage sustainable travel, particularly to and from the primary school. This is expected to include walking, cycling and scooting. This will contribute to a reduction in motorised traffic and hence a reduction in vehicular emissions.

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 2014 and the proposed scheme is approved in principle by Transport Policy.

#### **4.4 Capital Funding and Cash Flow**

- 4.4.1 The approval for expenditure of £4,000, which comprises of £2,000 staff fees and £2,000 legal fees, was included in a previous report.

**Parent Scheme Number:** 99609

**Title:** LTP Transport Policy Capital Programme

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

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

- 4.5.1 The scheme is in the Annual Programme and subject to resolving the objection received; it is anticipated to be completed within the 2019/2020 financial year.

- 4.5.2 The Appendix to this report has been marked as exempt from publication under Access to Information Procedure Rules 10.4 (2) on the basis that it contains information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual.

#### **4.6 Risk Management**

- 4.6.1 If no action was taken then access to the schools for pedestrians and cyclists will not improve and the potential of injury to pedestrians and cyclists will not be addressed.

### **5 Conclusions**

- 5.1 The provision of this 20mph scheme will contribute to the Councils ambition by improving the safety and quality of life of Leeds residents by enabling safer 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**

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

- i) note the contents of this report and the full text of the objection appended as background documents;
- ii) consider and overrule the objection to Leeds City Council (Speed Limit) Order (No 71) 2018; and
- iii) request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Speed Limit) Order (No 71) 2018 as advertised and inform the objector accordingly of the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation's) decision.

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

7.1 Report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) dated 16<sup>th</sup> December 2015 (Approval to advertise and implement) (Speed Limit) Order (No. 2) 2016).

7.2 Report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) dated 30<sup>th</sup> August 2016 (consider objections) (Speed Limit) Order (No. 2) 2016).

7.3 Report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) dated 6<sup>th</sup> November 2018 (revocation and re-advertisement of Draft Traffic Regulation Order) (Speed Limit) Order (No. 71) 2018).

7.4 Objection letter dated 21 February 2019 (Exempt from publication under Access to Information Rule 10.4(2))

7.5 Further correspondence from Objector dated 7 May 2019 (Exempt from publication under Access to Information Rule 10.4(2))

---

<sup>1</sup>





**8 Objection to the Leeds City Council (Speed Limit) Order (No 71) 2018 and Officer Comments <sup>2</sup>**

**Details of Objection (the full text of which is attached for consideration as background documents 7.4 and 7.5)**

<b><u>Objection relating to Blackgates &amp; Westerton 20mph Zone</u></b>		<b><u>Officers Response</u></b>
1.	<p align="center"><b>Background Document 7.4.</b></p> <p>The council needs to demonstrate that, in respect of each and every road included in the first schedule in the Order are necessary and capable of being achieved by the proposals.</p>	<p>The wider introduction of 20mph speed limits throughout large areas of the city is likely to have a cumulative impact much greater than that realised in individual residential areas. The anticipated effect of ‘normalising’ a 20mph speed within these areas is to the long term benefit of actual and perceived road safety with significant additional improvements to use of these streets by the people of the city.</p>
2.	<p>The 20mph speed limit is not necessary on streets whew it is not physically possible to exceed that speed, and there is no evidence of danger or risk to health or wellbeing as a result of the current speed limit. There is no benefit to their inclusion in the scheme.</p>	<p>The majority of roads within the proposed zone do have characteristics and conditions that calm vehicle speeds. The proposed change in speed limit will provide further reductions and promote a culture of low speed that will benefit walking and cycling in residential areas. This culture shift is made possible by having a consistent approach to speed limits on residential roads.</p>

3.	<p>There is no justification given for the extents of the zones. The justification for the scheme has changed but the boundary has remained the same. The Council will not share evidence of pedestrian movements to support the extents.</p>	<p>In order to encourage a greater use of sustainable travel options, the school 20mph program aims to reduce speeds and improve road safety for the journeys to school as well as the immediate vicinity. Therefore the 20mph zone has been proposed across the larger residential area which is the catchment of local schools.</p> <p>The extents described by an ambition to improve safety on school journeys will be identical to the extents described by an ambition to promote sustainable school journeys. The zone boundaries were therefore unchanged.</p> <p>The evidence available to justify the extents of the zone was a document from the school travel plan for Westerton Primary School. This contained a map of the local area with the location children's houses, and their means of travelling to school clearly marked. As this contains confidential information, it could not be shared with the general public.</p>
4.	<p>There is no justification for the part lengths of roads included in the scheme. Particularly Westerton Road and Baghill Road.</p>	<p>Westerton Road was established as the boundary of the proposed zone, similar to Bradford Road and Dewsbury Road. As such it would remain at its current speed limit. The western half of the western limb of Westerton Road however, becomes too contained within the larger residential area to be considered a boundary after it passes Hesketh Lane. As a consequence it was included in the 20mph zone.</p> <p>The boundary on Westerton Road was originally proposed to be at its junction with Hesketh Lane. It was later noted that the existing traffic calming extends a short distance beyond this point. It was then proposed to extend the zone so that it matched the length which is traffic calmed.</p> <p>The point on Baghill Road was chosen because it represented a clear change in character. The majority of its length to the south of this point has open fields to one side and set back houses on the other. Whereas the length to the north of this point there are houses on both sides of the road and we begin to see building lines brought closer to the road. Lastly, the bend in the road creates a feature which causes a reduction in vehicle speeds. This reinforces the reduction in speed limit at that point. The boundary was placed south of the bend so that the signing could be erected in clearly visible positions.</p>

5.	<p>The Council needs to specify why in this particular circumstances, that it is not following the advice of Department for Transport Circular 1/2013 and 01/2016, that 20mph limits should not be applied to roads where vehicle movement is the primary function. The councils own approach is ensuring that traffic can still move efficiently on those streets which have a distribution function.</p>	<p>Paragraph 77 of the DfT Circular 1/2013 specifically recommends that traffic authorities should consider a 20 mph speed limit on residential streets and other town and city streets with high pedestrian and cyclist movement, while paragraph 78 acknowledges that 'main traffic routes have a mixture of functions, including traffic, commercial and residential', but leaves the decision as to what the primary function of a given road is to the local traffic authority. Paragraph 84 makes it explicit that traffic authorities have the powers to introduce 20mph speed limits on major streets where there either are, or could be, significant numbers of journeys on foot/ by bicycle and that this is in addition to 'Residential streets in cities, towns and villages, particularly where the streets are being used by people on foot and on bicycles, there is community support and the characteristics of the street are suitable' and paragraph 97 states that 'the implementation of 20 mph limits over a larger number of roads should be considered where mean speeds at or below 24 mph are already achieved over a number of roads.</p> <p>The DfT Circular quotes the evidence of the effectiveness of the 20 mph speed limits in terms of road safety, encouraging and enabling sustainable modes and environmental benefits, which was in turn cited in the report to the Chief Highways Officer, along with evidence from national and local case studies.</p> <p>LCC consider that the roads referred to as district distributor roads (Syke Road, Baghill Road, Westerton Road, Lowry Road &amp; Constable Road are primarily residential in status and, in fact, suffer from a through traffic issue that the 20mph speed limit would serve to deter. Further Lowry Road had, in the previous five years, 5 accidents, involving 1 adult and 1 child cyclist and a young adult pedestrian; Constable Road had a child cyclist casualty and two loss of control accidents where vehicles failed to negotiate bends and struck roadside objects (indicating excessive speeds), Hesketh Lane saw an accident involving a cyclist and Syke Road 1 accident involving a child pedestrian and another involving a cyclist (3 in total). In the last five years there were 14 accidents altogether, including a KSI (serious injury to cyclist).</p>
----	--	--

6.	<p>The council needs to be consistent between areas. Middleton Park Avenue, Haigh Moor Road and the eastern extents of Westerton Road have a distribution function, yet also serving directly a primary school, a health centre, shops, multiple individual accesses and side roads. The council cannot reasonably justify the variation in standards being applied.</p>	<p>Middleton Park Avenue connects the A654 to the Ring Road Middleton, as well as serving as access to a significantly larger residential area. The average annual traffic volume is approximately 3000 move vehicles than Constable Road or Lowry Road. For these reasons it was not considered appropriate for a 20mph speed limit.</p> <p>Haigh Moor Road has been included in the current 20mph speed limit being progressed in that area.</p> <p>Westerton Road was established as the boundary of the proposed zone, similar to Bradford Road and Dewsbury Road. As such it would remain at its current speed limit. With the nearest school (Blackgates Primary School) being located perpendicular to the direction of this road, the majority of journeys that would benefit from the reduced speed limit would be travelling north/south through the zone, and not along Westerton Road. The decision was made to leave this as a route for traffic to leave the area at its current speed limit.</p>
7.	<p>A reference to the revocation of the existing Speed Limit Order should be made as a Clause in the main body of text in the Traffic Regulation Order.</p>	<p>The requisite Clause pertaining to the revocation of the existing 20mph Speed Limit Order was accidentally omitted from the draft Order originally circulated will be included in the final Traffic Regulation Order in th event that that the Chief Officer (Highways &amp; Transportation) determines that all points of objection should be overruled and the Order proceed to be made.</p>
8.	<p>The person considering any Objections (Chief Officer, Highways and Transportation) should not have played any part in the promotion of the scheme to which the objection is made.</p>	<p>Traffic Regulation Orders come under the Council's duties in relation to Highways and Transportation including a) the authority's role as a highways authority including b) maintenance of highway assets of roads, bridges, retaining walls, street lighting and associated infrastructure; c) design and delivery of major and minor highway schemes; d) development of the Council's transport policy; and e) the making of agreements for the execution of highways works under The Highways Act 1980. These accord with the Local Authorities (Functions and responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000 (as amended) and consequently the Director of City Development is authorised in compliance with the Officer Delegation Scheme to carry out the above functions on behalf of Full Council and the Executive.</p> <p>Each Director of the Council has the benefit of a number of delegations which are set out separately in two schemes, one for Council functions(delegated by Full Council) and one for Executive Functions(delegated by the Leader of Council). Each scheme is further separated into the general functions which are shared, so that all Directors can carry out those functions in relation to areas within their remit, and specific functions which may only be carried out by or</p>

		<p>on behalf of the named Director.</p> <p>The Sub Delegation scheme details those officers who can carry out each function on the Director's behalf together with the details of any terms and conditions which the Director has imposed on that sub-delegation (these are decisions that can be taken by the City Director, or Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) or under powers delegated by the Director of City Development's Sub-delegation Scheme.</p> <p>The specific power relating to minor and major Highway Schemes, which include Traffic Regulation Order may be discharged by the City Director but also Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) and where relevant, the Head of Service for Highways and Transportation and consequently the same or other authorised officers are able to take the relevant decision.</p>
9.	The person making the decision should have sight of the objection in full.	The full objection in this instance, is included as confidential background documents.
10.	The objector should be entitled to a hearing in front of the decision maker, and prior site of the engineer's comments. This is the practice when objecting to planning applications, even though there is no legal requirement for the Council to allow this.	Highways Board is not a Planning Committee or other constituted Committee of Leeds City Council. As explained in the previous comments above, the Council's constitution permits decision making by authorised Officers and there is no requirement to invite objectors to be heard at Board
11	<p><b>Background Document 7.5</b></p> <p>Further correspondence querying whether speed surveys and accident records taken since the (Speed Limit) Order (No 2) 2016) came into force, justify the basis upon which this Order (See Background Document 7.5).</p>	<p>Certain signage improvements and road marking additions are to be introduced under the new Order. Therefore it is not considered appropriate to monitor speeds until such time the full scheme has been introduced.</p> <p>In the lead up to the introduction of the 20MPH Order of 2016, there were seven personal injury accidents leading up to the implementation of that scheme, in relation to three of which excessive vehicle speed may have been a contributory factor. Since the introduction of 2016</p>

		<p>Order, there have been five injury collisions, in relation to one of which excessive vehicle speed may have been a contributory factor.</p> <p>The basis upon the Order was which advertised is still valid in the circumstances.</p>
--	--	--



# Appendix 1

## 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: Highways Services</b>	<b>Service area: Traffic Management</b>
<b>Lead person: Michael De-Lucchi</b>	<b>Contact number: 0113 2475294</b>

### 1. Title: 2014/ 2015 20mph schemes – Westerton & Blackgates Primary Schools

Is this a:

Strategy / Policy

Service / Function

Other

If other, please specify

### 2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening

A major Part of the Best City ambition is to improve life for the people of Leeds and make our city a better place to live. The provision of twenty miles-per-hour (20 mph) speed limits contributes to this ambition by 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.

As part of the ongoing 20mph schemes programme, following guidance and recommendations from the Department for Transport (DfT), this report seeks approval to introduce a 20mph zone in West Ardsley.

### 3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

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

If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.

Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).

- **How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration?** (think about the scope of the proposal, who is likely to be affected, equality related information, gaps in information and plans to address, consultation and engagement activities (taken place or planned) with those likely to be affected)

The Emergency Services and Ward Members have been consulted. No negative comments have been received.

A formal advertisement will be undertaken with notices on site.

- **Key findings**

(think about any potential positive and negative impact on different equality characteristics, potential to promote strong and positive relationships between groups, potential to bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other, perception that the proposal could benefit one group at the expense of another)

Positive:

- 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 noise pollution.
- Improve quality of life for the local community

Negative:

- Slight reduction in air quality due to lower speeds, however this is offset by the potential to prevent accidents.

- **Actions**

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

After Highways Board approval a formal advertisement will be undertaken for the proposed speed limit.

**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
Simon Booker	Senior Engineer	

**7. Publishing**

This screening document will act as evidence that due regard to equality and diversity has been given. If you are not carrying out an independent impact assessment the screening document will need to be published.

Please send a copy to the Equality Team for publishing

**Date screening completed**

**Date sent to Equality Team**

**Date published**  
(To be completed by the Equality Team)