

Report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation)

Date: 10 October 2019

Subject: LTP Road Safety Scheme – Street Lane, Roundhay

Are specific electoral wards affected? If yes, name(s) of ward(s): Roundhay	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
Has consultation been carried out?	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	🗌 Yes	🛛 No
Will the decision be open for call-in?	🗌 Yes	🛛 No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? If relevant, access to information procedure rule number: Appendix number:	Yes	🛛 No

Summary

1. Main issues

- The scheme referenced within this report aims to lower the number of recorded injury collisions occurring on Street Lane, Roundhay, by raising two existing pedestrian crossings onto speed tables to reduce vehicle speeds along the length.
- Following approval of a report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) in June 2019 and as part of the ongoing Local Transport Programme, a Section 90C Notice was advertised on Street Lane, Roundhay under the Highways Act 1980. This advertisement resulted in one objection being received to the proposed works.
- This report seeks the approval of the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) to consider and over-rule the reported objection to the 90c notice stating the intent to raise the existing crossings onto speed tables.
- 2. Best Council Plan Implications (click here for the latest version of the Best Council Plan)
 - The Best Council Plan 2015-20 outlines how Leeds City will achieve its ambition to become the Best City in the UK and Leeds City Council the best local authority. According to the Best Council Plan, the success of the Best Council objective: ensuring high quality public services will be partly measured through reduced numbers of people Killed or Seriously Injured on the city's roads. This report seeks approval to overturn one objection to this scheme that will contribute to this

objective and improve road safety which is also a priority within the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan.

3. Resource Implications

• The budget for this scheme was approved and made available from the Local Transport Programme Budget 2019.

Recommendations

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

- a) Note the contents of the report;
- b) Consider and overrule the objection to the Highways Act 1980 Section 90c Notice;
- c) Request the City Solicitor to write to the objector informing them of the Chief Officer's (Highways and Transportation) decision.

1. Purpose of this report

- 1.1 This report details the objection which were received to an advertised 90c notice relating to raising two crossings onto speed tables on Street Lane, Roundhay.
- 1.2 The report requests that the objection and this report is considered and the objection be overruled accordingly.

2. Background information

- 2.1 In 2009 a scheme was introduced on Street Lane, Roundhay to improve crossing facilities and to help lower the average speed of traffic on the route. This scheme introduced a number of formal and informal pedestrian crossings along the entire length of Street Lane.
- 2.2 Following the introduction of the scheme, the number of recorded injury collisions were reduced along the length of Street Lane, falling from 37 in the five years preceding the schemes introduction (29 slight, 6 serious and 2 fatal) to 19 in the five years following the schemes introduction (15 slight, 4 serious and 0 fatal).
- 2.3 Although the scheme was successful, a higher than expected number of recorded injury collisions continued to occur in the areas close to Street Lane's junction with Roman Terrace and its junction with Norton Road.
- 2.4 A total of 12 recorded injury collisions have occurred within 100 metres of these two junctions in the past five year period (10 slight, 2 serious). 3 of these collisions are related to pedestrians. This is equal to the number of collisions that have occurred across the entire length of the road.
- 2.5 This issue was identified as part of the Local Transport Programmes Casualty Reduction programme with view to lowering the number of recorded injury collisions in this location.

2.6 A Section 90c notice was placed under the Highways Act 1980 at both locations advertising the proposals – this notice attracted one objection.

3. Main issues

3.1 Design Proposals and Full Scheme Description

- 3.1.1 The proposed scheme looks to raise two existing pedestrian crossings on Street Lane onto raised speed tables above carriageway height.
- 3.1.2 The two crossings are located immediately to the west of the junction with Norton Road, and immediately to the west of the junction with Roman Terrace.
- 3.1.3 This work will be undertaken with the required associated footway, kerbing and drainage works.

3.2 Programme

3.2.1 It is anticipated that the proposals will be constructed within the 2019/2020 financial year.

4. Corporate considerations

4.1 Consultation and engagement

- 4.1.1 The Roundhay Ward Members, Emergency Services and the West Yorkshire Combined Authority were all consulted by email on 20th February 2019. West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue, West Yorkshire Combined Authority, and two of the Ward Members responded positively to the proposals. The remaining consultees did not make any adverse comments to the proposals.
- 4.1.2 A total of 44 local properties (residential and business) with frontages onto the proposals were directly consulted on April 2nd 2019 via letter and no adverse comments were.
- 4.1.3 The Roundhay Residents Association (RoRA) were consulted on April 2nd 2019 via email and a number of comments were received regarding the proposals and the potential for wider works in the area. These queries were answered and the RoRA is in support of the scheme.

4.2 Equality and diversity / cohesion and integration

4.2.1 Implementation of this scheme will provide a safer environment for members of the public, especially the elderly, infirm and Children whom travel along this route to the local amenities and schools by further reducing mean vehicle speeds.

4.3 Council policies and the Best Council Plan

- 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 helps 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 proposals contained in this report have no implications on the Policy.
- **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

Climate Emergency

4.3.5 This scheme will contribute to a safer road environment within the locality, by reducing mean vehicle speeds and improving facilities for pedestrians, thus promoting more sustainable forms of travel.

4.4 Resources, procurement and value for money

4.4.1 There are no additional resource implications contained in this report.

4.5 Legal implications, access to information, and call-in

4.5.1 This report is not eligible for call-in.

4.6 Risk management

4.6.1 If the objection is not over-ruled the works as advertised cannot be completed and the benefits outlined above would not be achieved.

5. Conclusions

5.1 Over-ruling this objection will allow the provision of a package of works aimed at creating a safer road environment in the local centre of Roundhay.

6. Recommendations

- 6.1 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:
 - a) Note the contents of the report;
 - b) Consider and overrule the objection to the Highways Act 1980 Section 90c Notice;
 - c) Request the City Solicitor to write to the objector informing them of the Chief Officer's (Highways and Transportation) decision.

7. Background documents

7.1 None

Appendix A: Summary of objection received

Objector comments	Highways & Transportation comments	
The provision of speed bumps is an outdated idea and they do not lower the speed of drivers.	Traffic calming measures such as those proposed on Street Lane have been used for a great length of time and have been proved to be effective at lowering the average speed of traffic in an area, which contributes to a lower recorded injury collision rate.	
	Local Transport Note 1/07 suggests that the mean speed of traffic crossing a 75-100mm flat topped hump is between 12.8mph and 13.6mph. The most recent speed survey data on Street Lane (2017) shows a mean speed of traffic as 24.4mph – the proposed features would reduce mean speeds significantly from their existing figure.	
Raised vegetation beds should be laid in the carriageway instead to create a chicane effect on the carriageway. This is more environmentally friendly and will be more effective at slowing the speed of traffic.	Whilst it cannot be disagreed that this would lower the speed of traffic using the route, such a feature installed in isolation on a busy arterial route would not be appropriate. Our experience has shown that when chicanes have been implemented within Leeds they cause issues with drivers becoming impatient whilst waiting for a long line of approaching vehicles and subsequently trying to advance through gaps in traffic which are not there resulting in collisions occurring; in a lot of cases this has led to these features having to be removed. Additionally, they go against the National Institute for Care and Excellences guidance to encourage smooth driving by forcing vehicles to stop and start thus increasing air pollution.	
	Further to this, the most recent survey data shows an average of 13,742 vehicles per day travel along Street Lane, and the implementation of any chicane feature as described would create mass disruption and queuing along Street Lane which would create safety issues along the route. The current proposals will have the benefit of lowering the average speed of traffic without causing traffic disruption, congestion and additional safety issues in the area.	

Speed cameras should be installed, rather than traffic calming measures. This would ensure that the speed of traffic remains low and could generate revenue for the local community.		
	At this time of writing, two such incidents have taken place on Park Lane, which would preclude the Partnership from considering this route for permanent or mobile speed camera enforcement. For this reason this cannot be recommended on Street Lane.	

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.

Directorate: City Services	Service area: City Development
Lead person: Andrew Richardson	Contact number: 378 7489

1. Title: LTP Road Safety Scheme – Street Lane, Roundhay		
Is this a:		
X Strategy / Policy Service / Function	Other	
If other, please specify:		

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

We are screening the raising of two existing pedestrian crossings on Street Lane, Roundhay.

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	Х	

equality characteristics?		
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the policy or proposal?	X	
Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom?		x
Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment practices?		X
 Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment Advancing equality of opportunity Fostering good relations 		X

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)

Numerous scheme consultations will be carried out with local Councillors, emergency services and the general public to make everyone aware of the various scheme proposals, the aims of the proposals in terms of improving general road safety and reduce the number of recorded injury accidents in the area.

Additional consultation/engagement will also take place on certain schemes by means of the legal advertisement of the Traffic Regulation and Movement Orders, all of which will be displayed in the local media and on street by means of a public notice.

• **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)

The various schemes listed in the Traffic Management Programme for 2019/20 will provide positive impacts to all road users, especially those with mobility issues, young and old people by;

Positive Impacts:

- 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;
- Further reducing mean vehicle speeds

Negative Impacts:

- The introduction of traffic calming may cause a slight increase in road noise as vehicles pass over this
- Actions (think about how you will promote positive impact and remove/ reduce negative impact)

Any negative impact is offset by the positive impacts of reducing mean vehicles speeds and promoting a safer road environment.

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:
Date to complete your impact assessment
Lead person for your impact assessment (Include name and job title)

6. Governance, ownership and approval Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening		
Name	Job title	Date
Nicholas Hunt	Traffic Engineering Manager	August 2019

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	August 2019
Date sent to Equality Team	March 2019
Date published (To be completed by the Equality Team)	