



Report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation)

Date: 28 July 2020

Subject: Temple Newsam Ward TRO - Objection Report

| | |
|--|---|
| Are specific electoral wards affected? If yes, name(s) of ward(s): Temple Newsam | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Has consultation been carried out? | <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 |
| Will the decision be open 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

1. Main issues

- One of the key objectives of the Best Council Plan 2019 – 21 is to ‘promote sustainable and inclusive economic growth’ through delivering key infrastructure projects. The projects within this report address several key concerns relating primarily to address local traffic issues including parking and the provision of a safer environment for the general public, which will contribute towards the Council’s goal to reduce the numbers of people killed or seriously injured on the city’s roads.
- Following approval of a report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) in December 2019, Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restriction) (No.34) Order 2014 Amendment No.1 Order 2019, was advertised and attracted a total of five objections at two locations. On Ring Road Halton Slip Road, four objections were lodged about the proposals. One of those objectors also made a separate objection regarding proposals on Woodland Road.
- The formal public advertisement of the Traffic Restriction Order attracted five objections. This report seeks the approval of the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) to consider and overrule the reported objections to the proposed movement restriction detailed in Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restriction) (No.34) Order 2014 Amendment No.1 Order 2019.

2. Best Council Plan Implications (click [here](#) for the latest version of the Best Council Plan)

The Best Council Plan 2019-2021 outlines how Leeds City Council will achieve the vision to become the best city in the UK. The plan highlights the aim to improve the safety of transport connections. This scheme meets these objectives by delivering a traffic management scheme to assist inter-visibility between drivers and pedestrians, assist driver and pedestrian movements and create a safer environment for all road users.

3. Resource Implications

- The scheme proposals have no implications in terms of resources. All design and works resources have been identified within the 2020/21 works programme.

Recommendations

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

- i) Note the contents of the report;
- ii) Consider and over-rule the five objections raised to Leeds City Council (Waiting Restriction) (No.34) Order 2014 Amendment No.1 2019;
- iii) Request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Waiting Restriction) (No.34) Order 2014 Amendment No.1 2019; and
- iv) Request the City Solicitor to write to the objectors informing them of the decision taken by the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation).

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 Temple Newsam Ward and requests the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) to consider the objections and the Officer's response.
- 1.2. The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to consider and to overrule the objections received and give approval to implement the waiting restriction and seal the Traffic Regulation Order as advertised.

2. Background information

- 2.1. Due to the rising levels of indiscriminate parking experienced on various roads within Temple Newsam, 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 April 2019 and gave authority to advertise and implement a Traffic Regulation Order subject to objections.

2.3. The Traffic Regulation Order was subsequently advertised between 6th December 2019 and 6th January 2020. As a result of the advertisement period, a total of 5 objections were received. These objections are 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 Temple Newsam Ward, the proposals that received objections are detailed on drawings, TM-31-399-12-01b and TM-31-399-12-09.

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

Programme

The scheme proposals are included on the Annual Programme and it is expected that the proposals will be within the 2020/2021 financial year, subject to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) approving the contents of this report and overruling the objections received.

4. Corporate considerations

4.1 Consultation and engagement

4.1.1 Ward Members:

Ward Members were initially consulted by email on 10th July 2019. One response fully supporting the scheme was received from one Councillor. No other comments were received. Following amendments in response to local resident consultation, ward members were notified by email on 12th December 2019. No further comments received.

4.1.2 Local Residents:

The affected residents of all proposed locations were consulted via letter prior to the legal advertisement. Following feedback three locations were removed from the overall scheme. One location was amended, which now has one outstanding objection. One location received four objections. Four locations received no adverse comments.

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 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.

4.2.4 Climate Emergency

It is anticipated that the removal of indiscriminate parking will improve the free flow of two way traffic on most of the affected lengths, and therefore reduce or remove the need for vehicles to stand and wait for gaps in the traffic, reducing emissions in these areas caused by idling traffic

4.3 Resources, procurement and value for money

4.3.1 The estimated total cost to implement the scheme is £17,000, identified as £9,000 design fees, £2,000 legal fees and £6,000 works costs. These are to be funded by the Traffic Management Capital budget.

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

4.4.1 The report is not eligible for call in as the proposals fall below the relevant threshold.

4.5 Risk management

4.5.1 There are no direct risk issues over and above those expected when working in the public highway, generated by the proposals contained within this report.

5. Conclusions

5.1 These proposals are designed to remove indiscriminate parking and improve visibility, whilst maintaining accommodation for local residents where convenient.

5.2 Over-ruling the received objections detailed in Appendix A, in accordance with the recommendations will allow this scheme to progress.

5.3 Provision of these measures will improve safety at key points on various roads within the Temple Newsam 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 the report;
- ii) Consider and over-rule the five objections raised to Leeds City Council (Waiting Restriction) (No.34) Order 2014 Amendment No.1 2019;

- iii) Request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Waiting Restriction) (No.34) Order 2014 Amendment No.1 2019; and
- iv) Request the City Solicitor to write to the objectors informing them of the decision taken by the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation).

7. Background documents

7.1 None.

8. Appendices

8.1 Appendix A – Summary of objections

8.2 Drawing 1 - TM-31-399-12-01b

8.3 Drawing 2 - TM-31-399-12-09

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF OBJECTION TO PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Leeds City Council (Waiting Restriction) (No.34) Order 2014 Amendment No.1 2019 “Temple Newsam Ward TRO”

| SUMMARY OF OBJECTION | HIGHWAYS RESPONSE | OBJECTION NO. COMMENTS WITHIN |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| <p>Although in agreement that Ring Road Slip Road should receive No Waiting at Any Time treatment, there is a desire to extend the restriction, whereas it currently covers up to house No. 2 to further improve visibility.</p> | <p>Restrictions are being introduced for a length of 44.5 metres to improve visibility of traffic. This provides greater than the sufficient length of visibility to northbound traffic on the Ring Road Halton from Hollyshaw Lane without affecting residential parking.</p> | <p>4</p> |
| <p>Although extending restrictions by 20 metres on Green Lane would improve visibility, it would also relocate parked vehicles further up Green Lane, and remove what is effectively working as a traffic calming measure.</p> <p>Also, believes restrictions on Templestowe Crescent should reflect the Highway code and be 15 metres instead of 10 metres</p> <p>Also, that restrictions on Woodland Road/Green Lane junction are a ‘mish mash’, and parking concerns at this junction are a result of irresponsible parking from properties 116 & 131 Woodland Road. Restrictions should be 20 metres if possible, if not 15 metres to reflect the Highway Code.</p> | <p>Whilst we accept there are ad hoc benefits to parked vehicles, designated measures should be considered instead to achieve the same effect whilst improving visibility.</p> <p>Rule 243 of the Highway Code advises motorists should not park within 10 metres, which is the basis used for the extent of the proposed restrictions.</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.

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Directorate: Highways Services | Service area: Traffic Engineering |
| Lead person: Jack Young | Contact number: 0113 3787502 |

1. Title:

Is this a:

Strategy / Policy

Service / Function

Other

Provision of Traffic Regulation Order and works to close a junction

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

The screening focuses on a report to the Highways and Transportation Board, requesting the authority to overrule objections and subsequently introduce a Traffic Regulation Order to implement various restrictions that forms a package of work to improve road safety on various streets within the Temple Newsam Ward

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. Also those areas that impact on or relate to equality: tackling poverty and improving health and well-being. | | |
|---|-----|----|
| Questions | Yes | No |
| Is there an existing or likely differential impact for the different equality characteristics? | X | |
| 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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) <p>Consultation has taken place with Ward Members, the Emergency Services and West Yorkshire Combined Authority. Support was received from one Ward Member. The Emergency Services with exception to the Police have raised no comments. The raised comments from the Police followed the advertisement period and supported comments from one objector in favour of extending the Yellow Line towards house No. 4 to extend visibility.</p> <p>Visibility from the Hollyshaw Lane junction is already greater than the sufficient length to provide safety. From the perspective of accessing and egressing private off-street parking facilities, the appropriate action would be to remove parking from the south side of the access to house No. 4, however the objector does not agree to this and we also do not think it is necessary.</p> |

Consultation has taken place with affected parties via a series of public advertisement notices, advertisement in the Yorkshire Post newspaper and a direct letter. Five objections were raised from four objectors to the public advertisement notices.

- **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 impacts:

- By introducing a length of No Waiting At Any Time, visibility of traffic travelling Northbound on Ring Road Halton will be improved significantly. The introduction of the restriction will also extend the space within the slip road in which the vehicles travelling northbound can utilise for safe exit on to Hollyshaw Lane.

Discontinuing the restrictions at property No. 2 Ring Road Halton allows for residents and visitors, to still maintain access to their properties from road side if required, without causing hindrance to the visibility from the junction with Hollyshaw Lane, or traffic wishing to join the slip road.

Negative impacts:

- 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)

Comments received from members of the public have been duly considered and some additional elements to the scheme have been accommodated.

Post-scheme implementation monitoring of the site will be carried out. Should there be a need for further works to alleviate post-implementation issues then this will be duly considered at the time.

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 |
| | | |
| Date screening completed | | |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 7. Publishing | |
| <p>Though all key decisions are required to give due regard to equality the council only publishes those related to Executive Board, Full Council, Key Delegated Decisions or a Significant Operational Decision.</p> <p>A copy of this equality screening should be attached as an appendix to the decision making report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance Services will publish those relating to Executive Board and Full Council. • The appropriate directorate will publish those relating to Delegated Decisions and Significant Operational Decisions. • A copy of all other equality screenings that are not to be published should be sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk for record. <p>Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached screening was sent:</p> | |
| For Executive Board or Full Council – sent to Governance Services | Date sent: |
| For Delegated Decisions or Significant Operational Decisions – sent to appropriate Directorate | Date sent: |
| All other decisions – sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk | Date sent: |