

Delegated Decision Notice

This form is the written record of a key, significant operational or administrative decision taken by an officer.

Decision type	<input type="checkbox"/> Key Decision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Significant Operational Decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Administrative Decision
Approximate value	<input type="checkbox"/> Below £500,000 <input type="checkbox"/> £500,000 to £1,000,000 <input type="checkbox"/> over £1,000,000	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> below £25,000 <input type="checkbox"/> £25,000 to £100,000 <input type="checkbox"/> £100,000 to £500,000 <input type="checkbox"/> Over £500,000	<input type="checkbox"/> below £25,000 <input type="checkbox"/> £25,000 to £100,000
Director¹	Director of City Development		
Contact person:	Morgan Tatchell-Evans	Telephone number: 0113 3783655	
Subject²:	Leeds Public Transport Investment Programme (LPTIP); A647 Bus Priority Corridor, Calverley and Farsley, Bramley and Stanningley and Armley Wards, Traffic Regulation Order Objection report		
Decision details³:	<p>What decision has been taken? (Set out all necessary decisions to be taken by the decision taker including decisions in relation to exempt information, exemption from call in etc.) The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Noted the contents of the report; b) Considerd and over-ruled objections 2 to 14 as described in Appendix A of the report, which have been raised to (i) Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Movement Restriction) (No.M14) Order 2012 Amendment No.1 Order 2021, & (ii) Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restriction (No. W3) Order 2021 ; c) Partially upheld objection 1 as described in Appendix A of the report, which has been raised to (ii) Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restriction (No. W3) Order 2021, to the effect that an amendment be made to the proposed TRO, as described in Appendix A of the report. d) Requested the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement (i) Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Movement Restriction) (No.M14) Order 2012 Amendment No.1 Order 2021, & (ii) Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restriction (No. W3) Order 2021, as amended in response to objection 1 and as detailed in Appendix A of the report; e) Requested the City Solicitor to write to the objectors informing them of 		

¹ Give title of Director with delegated responsibility for function to which decision relates.

² If the decision is key and has appeared on the list of forthcoming key decisions, the title of the decision should be the same as that used in the list

³ Simply refer to supporting report where used as these matters have been set out in detail.

the decision taken by the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation).

A brief statement of the reasons for the decision

(Include any significant financial, procurement, legal or equalities implications, having consulted with Finance, PACS, Legal, HR and Equality colleagues as appropriate)
In October 2019, the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) gave approval to advertise the draft Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) required to implement the A647 Bus Priority Corridor scheme. The TRO to which this decision pertains was included in this approval, and has now been advertised. The proposed TROs will help to improve bus journey times and reliability, and also help to ensure that the Thornbury Barracks, Dawsons Corner and Stanningley Road / Hough Lane can operate more effectively for all vehicles. The TROs around the Thornbury Barracks junction will also help to ensure that this junction can operate safely. Whilst it is acknowledged that the TROs have some localised disbenefits in terms of reduction in availability of waiting and loading at the kerbside, it is noted that there are suitable alternative parking locations available (including off-street parking in most instances), and that most of the proposed restrictions will operate during the peak periods. It will not be possible to deliver the full benefits of the LPTIP A647 Bus Priority Corridor scheme without the implementation of the proposed TROs.

Brief details of any alternative options considered and rejected by the decision maker at the time of making the decision

The option to introduce a westbound bus lane was considered, but was rejected because traffic modelling undertaken as part of the design process for the Dawsons Corner junction improvement scheme showed that the westbound bus lane would have caused queues on the westbound carriageway to stretch from Thornbury Barracks to Dawsons Corner, interfering with the operation of the Dawsons Corner junction. This would have increased journey times both for buses and general traffic.

The option to implement the waiting and loading restrictions without the eastbound bus lane was considered, but was rejected as the benefit for bus users would have been reduced.

The option to make the proposed bus lane and waiting and loading restrictions on Bradford Road 24 hour was considered, but was rejected in response to comments from stakeholders regarding the need for waiting and loading

	provision on Bradford Road.
Affected wards:	Calverley and Farsley; Bramley and Stanningley; Armley
Details of consultation undertaken⁴:	Executive Member Councillor Helen Hayden 17/01/22
	Ward Councillors Local Ward Members (Calverley and Farsley; Bramley and Stanningley; Armley) briefed November 2020
	Others Public consultation Phase 1: Spring 2018 Public consultation Phase 2: November 2018 First Bus: December 2018 Emergency services: June 2019 Local residents: August 2021
Implementation	Officer accountable, and proposed timescales for implementation Officer accountable: Morgan Tatchell-Evans TRO to be made, sealed and implemented during 2022.
List of Forthcoming Key Decisions⁵	Date Added to List:-
	If Special Urgency or General Exception a brief statement of the reason why it is impracticable to delay the decision
	If Special Urgency Relevant Scrutiny Chair(s) approval Signature _____ Date _____
Publication of report⁶	If not published for 5 clear working days prior to decision being taken the reason why not possible:
	If published late relevant Executive member's approval Signature _____ Date _____

⁴ Include details of any interest disclosed by an elected Member on consultation and the date of any relevant dispensation given.

⁵ See Executive and Decision Making Procedure Rule 2.4 - 2.6. Complete this section for key decisions only

⁶ See Executive and Decision Making Procedure Rule 3.1. Complete this section for key decisions only

Call In	Is the decision available ⁷ for call-in?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	If exempt from call-in, the reason why call-in would prejudice the interests of the council or the public:		
Approval of Decision	Authorised decision maker ⁸ Gary Bartlett, Chief Officer, Highways & Transportation		
	Signature	Date: 14/12/21	
	<i>G J Bartlett</i>		

⁷ See Executive and Decision Making Procedure Rule 5.1. Significant operational decisions taken by officers are never available for call in. Key decisions are always available for call in unless they have been exempted from call in under rule 5.1.3.

⁸ Give the post title and name of the officer with appropriate delegated authority to take the decision.