



Report to Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation)

Date: 18 May 2021

Subject: Micklefield Lane, Springfield Road and Bradford Road – Guiseley and Rawdon TRO – Objection Report

Are specific electoral wards affected? If yes, name(s) of ward(s): Guiseley and Rawdon	<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

- As a result of recommendations from councillors, members of the public, and observations by Traffic Management Engineers several areas of on-street parking on several lengths of public highway in the Guiseley and Rawdon ward have begun to cause issues for accessibility and the free flow of traffic.
- As per the details contained within the initial report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) date 16 April 2020, a scheme has been proposed and subsequently advertised to introduce a Traffic Regulation Order relating to parking restrictions on several lengths of highway including Micklefield Lane, Bradford Road and Springfield Road all within the Guiseley & Rawdon ward, as seen the on associated drawing TM.14.591.CON.
- The formal public advertisement of the Traffic Regulation Order attracted three objections. This report seeks the approval of the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) to consider and overrule the reported objections to the proposed parking restrictions detailed in Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.25) 2014, Amendment Order No.2 2020.

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

The Best Council Plan 2020-2025 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. The proposals contained in this report contribute to the Leeds vision, particularly introducing Sustainable Infrastructure, promoting Health and Wellbeing as well as being a Child Friendly and Age Friendly City.. 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 2021/22 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 objections raised to Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.25) 2014, Amendment Order No.2 2020;
- iii) Request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.25) 2014, Amendment Order No.2 2020; and
- iv) Request the City Solicitor to write to the objector informing them of the decision taken by the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation).

1. Purpose of this report

- 1.1 This report details three objections received to elements of the proposed Traffic Regulation Order that forms a package of measures in the Guiseley and Rawdon ward, specifically those on Micklefield Lane, Bradford Road and Springfield Road, to maintain acceptable free flow of traffic and prevent obstructive parking practices which currently occur.
- 1.2 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to consider and to over-rule the objections received and give approval to implement the waiting restrictions and the seal the Traffic Regulation Order as advertised

2. Background information

- 2.1 As detailed in the original report presented 16 April 2020, this scheme seeks to introduce parking restrictions to resolve concerns related to parking taking place at several locations in the Guiseley and Rawdon ward. Officer investigations showed that frequent parking was occurring on lengths of highway in a manner that restricted the free flow of traffic and restricted access to private premises.
- 2.2 The proposals in the area were proposed following correspondence officers held with Councillors and members of the public. This lead to increasing the length of Bradford Road to be covered by the new parking restriction.

- 2.3 The proposals were formally advertised between 30th October and 27th November 2020, attracting a total of 3 objections.

3. Main issues

- 3.1 The proposals advertised seek to introduce a 'No waiting at any time' restriction to replace a keep clear H bar marking on Micklefield Lane, Rawdon that is routinely ignored. As the H bar marking itself is not enforceable, this resultant parking restricts accessibility and visibility for users of the private off-street parking provision the marking seeks to protect. An upgrade of the measure as proposed will ensure this accessibility and visibility is protected.
- 3.2 Lengths of 'No waiting at any time' are also proposed at certain points on Springfield Road and Well Lane, Guiseley to restrict parking to one side of the road. The roads in question are narrow and parking on both sides of the carriageway subsequently restricts traffic flow. The other side of the carriageway to the proposed measures does not have houses fronting onto it.
- 3.3 Lengths of 'No waiting at any time' on the eastern edge of Bradford Road alongside pedestrian carriageway refuges to prevent obstructive parking in the vicinity of these, as well as 'No waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6pm' to prevent parking that is preventing access to private properties.
- 3.4 Appendix A of this report, the objection summary table, details the objectors concerns and Highways' response.

3.5 Programme

The scheme proposals are included on the Annual Programme and it is expected that the proposals will be within the 2021/2022 financial year, subject to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) approving the contents of this report.

4. Corporate considerations

4.1 Consultation and engagement

- 4.1.1 Ward Members were consulted via email on 4th May 2020, expressing their support for the scheme.
- 4.1.2 Emergency Services were consulted via email on 4th May 2020. No adverse comments were received.
- 4.1.3 West Yorkshire Combined Authority were consulted via email on 4th May 2020. No adverse comments were received.
- 4.1.4 Local residents were consulted via letter on 12th June 2020 with a majority of respondents offering support for the proposals and subsequently it was determined to proceed with the proposals.

4.2 Equality and diversity / cohesion and integration

- 4.2.1 A full Equality, Diversity/ Cohesion and Integration Screening (Appendix B) has been carried out on the proposals and was detailed in the initial report date 29th April 2021. The screening process identified the following impacts:

Positive impacts:

- By removing obstructive parking on Bradford Road, Micklefield Lane and Springfield Road, road users will find the route easier to use. Additionally residents will find their private driveways easier to access which will be beneficial to elderly residents and those generally with reduced mobility.
- By removing obstructive parking on Micklefield Lane, access to the parking at the rear of the properties will be made easier as the turning into the access route will be clear and the sight lines for vehicles leaving it will be unobstructed.
- By removing obstructive parking on Springfield Road and Well Lane, the road will be unobstructed for emergency vehicles.

Negative impacts:

- Current parking practices on Bradford Road related to all-day commuter parking will be displaced to a new location and subsequent issues may arise resulting from this. Furthermore, by freeing up carriageway space, the speed of passing vehicles may increase. Both matters shall be monitored following introduction of the scheme and further work can be considered to tackle resultant issues where determined necessary.
- Residents who currently choose to ignore the Keep Clear H Bar markings and park on this section of highway will have to find another place to park. This could put an additional strain on the limited parking on Micklefield Lane and adjacent roads, though this could be a maximum of two displaced vehicles, and potentially mean that residents with restricted mobility issues may have to travel further from their houses to find an available place to park. The situation will be monitored.
- Residents of Springfield Road and Well Lane feel that the current parking practices are related to all-day commuter parking and that this will be displaced to a new location and subsequent issues may arise resulting from this. While little evidence of this has been found by engineers undertaking surveys of the parking the vehicles currently parking in this area will be displaced to a nearby street. Furthermore, by freeing up carriageway space, the speed of passing vehicles may increase. Both matters shall be monitored following introduction of the scheme and further work can be considered to tackle resultant issues where determined necessary.

4.3 Council policies and the Best Council Plan

- 4.3.1 The Best City ambition is to improve life for the people of Leeds and make our city a better place. Measures to improve the highway network will contribute to making the road safer and easier to use, which contributes to the Best City for Communities.
- 4.3.2 The proposals contained in this report are in accordance with Plan Objective: Delivering Accessibility. The proposals also follow core strategy approaches A1 and

A2 in that the scheme will improve physical accessibility and improve the highway for pedestrians.

4.3.3 Climate Emergency

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 from idling traffic.

4.4 Resources, procurement and value for money

4.4.1 The estimated total cost to implement the wider scheme is £15,000, broken down as £5,000 works costs and £10,000 design costs.

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

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

4.6 Risk management

4.6.1 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. The introduction of the scheme will mitigate existing risks caused by poor parking practices on the carriageway.

5. Conclusions

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

5.2 Provision of these measures will improve free flow of traffic, maintain accessibility to private premises and remove obstruction parking practices on lengths of public highway around the Guiseley and Rawdon ward. The measures will therefore allow for a more appropriate and fair use of the highway in this area.

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 objections raised to Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.25) 2014, Amendment Order No.2 2020;
- iii) Request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.25) 2014, Amendment Order No.2 2020; and
- iv) Request the City Solicitor to write to the objector 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 objection to proposed TRO
- 8.2 Appendix B – EDCI Screening
- 8.3 Appendix C - TM.14.591.01.Bradford Road
- 8.4 Appendix D - TM.14.591.01.Micklefield Lane
- 8.5 Appendix E - TM.14.591.01.Springfield Road

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF OBJECTION TO PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restrictions) (No.25) Order 2014 Amendment Order (No.2) 2020

SUMMARY OF OBJECTION	HIGHWAYS RESPONSE
<p>Objection No.1 (To proposed ‘no waiting at any time, Micklefield Lane – Rawdon.)</p> <p>The Objector states that the current keep clear H bar on Micklefield Lane is excessively long and impacts loading/unloading on the road.</p> <p>The Objector notes that Micklefield Lane is part of the Little London Conservation area and the double yellow lines will not be in keeping with the aesthetic style.</p> <p>The Objector asserts that if they cannot park where the current keep clear H bar markings are they will be forced to park in a location that is unsafe and could endanger their two young children.</p>	<p>The length of the H bar has been determined to prevent parking alongside where traffic stacks to turn right from Micklefield Lane onto Apperley Lane. This is to prevent an unsafe obstruction of the highway. In addition it keeps the line of sight clear for vehicles leaving the access to parking at the rear of the houses. It is necessary for vehicles to safely manoeuvre in and out of the access that the sight lines are clear.</p> <p>In other areas of conservation narrower, less obtrusive double yellow lines have been used and it has been agreed that they are appropriate for use here. Being a conservation area does not remove the need of a safe and free flow of traffic.</p> <p>The current keep clear H bar marking is in place to prevent parking in this location as it is not a suitable place to park. Parking on the H bar is detrimental to the safety of road users and people getting in or out of a car parked there. Other appropriate on-street parking exists in the immediate vicinity that would not subsequently restrict accessibility and visibility to off-street parking provision. Additionally the Objector has off street parking to the rear of their property.</p>
<p>Objection No.2 (To proposed ‘no waiting at any time’ and ‘no waiting Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm, Bradford Road, Guiseley.)</p> <p>The Objector claims that the introduction of the new restrictions will push vehicles parked by visitors and staff at Farnells Garage further up the Bradford Road and obstruct the access to her father’s property.</p>	<p>It is likely that the current parking on Bradford Road will be displaced but that it is unlikely to move further South on Bradford Road but instead move to one of the off-street car parks closer to the car showroom, as well as encouraging the staff at the car showroom to use internal provision for visitor and staff parking, or relocate to a closer side street where it will not make passing the pedestrian refuges on Bradford Road a hazard.</p> <p>The No Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6pm has been proposed at the request of residents made during the consultation process. This request has been listened to and incorporated into the scheme.</p> <p>The “No Waiting at Anytime” restriction has been proposed in the interest of safety so that vehicles can pass the pedestrian islands without having to manoeuvre sharply around parked vehicles. This</p>

	<p>applies especially to larger vehicles making deliveries to the garage and shops.</p>
<p>Objection No.3 (To proposed 'no waiting at any time' on Springfield Road and Well Lane, Guiseley.)</p> <p>The Objector states that the proposed restriction on Springfield Road and Well Lane will displace parking from there and onto Wells Road that they attest is "at capacity". They enquire to the possibility of permit parking.</p>	<p>The proposed restrictions limit the parking to one side of Springfield Road and Well Lane. This is in the interest of safety, maintaining enough width of the carriageway to allow vehicles to safely pass, which would not be possible with parking on both sides of the road.</p> <p>There are not a large number of vehicles that park on the side of the road that does not have house fronting onto it, however when they do it can result in there not being enough width of carriageway left for traffic to pass. This small number of vehicles being displaced onto another street will not cause a significant additional burden. Furthermore, recent parking surveys undertaken by the engineer for the ward found that there was no need for a permit parking scheme to be put in place as there were unused parking spaces available.</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: Joseph Selman	Contact number: (0113) 3780071

1. Title: Micklefield Lane, Springfield Road and Bradford Road – Guiseley and Rawdon TRO – Objection Report

Is this a:

Strategy / Policy

Service / Function

Other

Provision of Traffic Regulation Order

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 introduce a Traffic Regulation Order relating to parking restrictions on several lengths of highway including Micklefield Lane, Bradford Road and Springfield Road all within the Guiseley & Rawdon ward, to maintain free flow of traffic along the carriageway.

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**.

<p>4. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration</p>
<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"> • 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) Consultation has taken place with Ward Members, the Emergency Services and West Yorkshire Combined Authority. Support was received from the Ward Members and WYCA, West Yorks Fire and Rescue raised no objections. Consultation will take place either directly with affected parties or via a series of public advertisement notices, advertisement in the Yorkshire Post newspaper and a Section 90c Notice. All comments received from the consultation will be duly considered prior to scheme implementation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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)

Bradford Road

Positive impacts:

- By removing obstructive parking on Bradford Road, road users will find the route easier to use. Additionally residents will find their private driveways easier to access which will be beneficial to elderly residents and those generally with reduced mobility.

Negative impacts:

- Current parking practices on Bradford Road related to all-day commuter parking will be displaced to a new location and subsequent issues may arise resulting from this. Furthermore, by freeing up carriageway space, the speed of passing vehicles may increase. Both matters shall be monitored following introduction of the scheme and further work can be considered to tackle resultant issues where determined necessary.

Micklefield Lane

Positive impacts:

- By removing obstructive parking on Micklefield Lane, road users will find the route easier to use. Access to the parking at the rear of the properties will be made easier as the turning into the access route will be clear and the sight lines for vehicles leaving it will be unobstructed.

Negative impacts:

- Residents who currently choose to ignore the Keep Clear H Bar markings and park on this section of highway will have to find another place to park. This could put an additional strain on the limited parking on Micklefield Lane and adjacent roads, though this could be a maximum of two displaced vehicles, and potentially mean that residents with restricted mobility issues may have to travel further from their houses to find an available place to park. The situation will be monitored.

Springfield Road and Well Lane

Positive impacts:

- By removing obstructive parking on Springfield Road and Well Lane, road users will find the route easier to use. The road will be unobstructed for emergency vehicles.

Negative impacts:

- Residents of Springfield Road and Well Lane feel that the current parking practices are related to all-day commuter parking and that this will be displaced to a new location and subsequent issues may arise resulting from this. While little evidence of this has been found by engineers undertaking surveys of the

parking the vehicles currently parking in this area will be displaced to a nearby street. Furthermore, by freeing up carriageway space, the speed of passing vehicles may increase. Both matters shall be monitored following introduction of the scheme and further work can be considered to tackle resultant issues where determined necessary.

• **Actions**

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

Comments received from members of the public towards the proposals will be duly considered in the design process. Should there be a comment raised that we feel requires accommodation within the scheme and is safe and reasonable to do so, then it shall be done.

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
Nick Borrás	Principal Engineer	29/04/2021
Date screening completed		29/04/2021

7. Publishing

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**.

A copy of this equality screening should be attached as an appendix to the decision making report:

- 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.

Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached screening was sent:

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: