

Appendix A – List of objections received and Leeds City Council response

Details of the Objection:	Highways Response
<p>Objection One</p> <p>Objector states they have been using Warren Lane for approximately ten years for recreational activities and notes that pre-2020 no such issue was prevalent, but that following the Covid-19 pandemic, people’s requirement to outside space changed the use in this area.</p> <p>Objector states that the problem is only prevalent for around ten days per year.</p> <p>Objector states that many elderly and disabled people use the lane to park, to access green space.</p> <p>Objector states that local residents exaggerate the issues seen on site and have undertaken in dubious activities such as placing of boulders upon the highway to restrict viable parking areas, approaching members of the public claiming to issue fines or call the Police.</p>	<p>Leeds City Council acknowledges that prior to the Covid-19 pandemic, there have been limited concerns raised with respect to Warren Lane and agree that the requirement for outdoor activities within district boundaries, when crossing into different ‘tiers’ was forbidden, helped drive the popularity of this area as a place to park and visit.</p> <p>Leeds City Council believes the problem at its worst took place with more regularity than that claimed by the objector, although a precise number cannot be arrived at. However, the Council is still duty-bound to resolve the problems seen, whether they occur on a small or a large percentage of the year and believe that the waiting restrictions chosen best resolve the issues seen and have been shown over the last 12 months to have had the desired impact of reducing obstructive parking practices and maintaining access along Warren Lane.</p> <p>Leeds City Council does not wish to remove access to any point on the Highway, particularly when it encourages active lifestyle choices. However, when it has been evidenced that parking of any type causes obstruction and results in public safety concerns, then as the Highway Authority we are duty bound by law to intervene to ensure that the adequate free flow of the public highway is maintained.</p> <p>Leeds City Council cannot comment on some of the activities noted except to say it does not support them and nor does it support the introduction of boulders upon the verge that is adopted highway. Only measures introduced by Leeds City Council, that meet national guidance and criteria for street furniture should be introduced. Any other measure introduced that causes</p>

<p>Objector requests clarity on whether the newly constructed parking area by the steps to Arthington Viaduct is a parking area or a passing place.</p> <p>Objector states that a summer time restriction would be more appropriate and would resolve the genuine issue caused here.</p>	<p>damage or injury to person or property may result in a Civil case against the person who introduced that feature. Any such feature should be removed from the public highway.</p> <p>The newly created parking area falls outside the public highway and so is not within the clearway order introduced. Leeds City Council does not encourage parking within this layby as it serves as access for Network Rail service vehicles to the Arthington Viaduct.</p> <p>Leeds City Council has been in receipt of evidence of parking at times of the year other than summer, meaning that the introduction of a summer time only restriction would not provide the resolution desired and would result in obstructive parking practices being undertaken during those non-restricted times.</p>
<p>Objection Two</p> <p>Objector states that the problem is only in place during summer months and hotter days and that the restrictions do not need to be as inhibitive as those proposed.</p> <p>Objector states that they have been using the footpath along the River Wharfe for the last three years, which has been important to their personal mental health. Objector states that the measures proposed make this footpath inaccessible and punishes the many because of the thoughtless action of the few.</p>	<p>Leeds City Council has been in receipt of evidence of parking at times of the year other than summer, meaning that the introduction of a summer time only restriction would not provide the resolution desired and would result in obstructive parking practices being undertaken during those non-restricted times.</p> <p>Leeds City Council acknowledges that the recreational use of the River Wharfe in this area is of benefit to individuals and the Council does not introduce measures lightly where it impacts upon active lifestyles. However, the highway infrastructure in this area is not sufficient to support the level and type of parking that is frequently recorded and due to the continuous obstructive parking as the Highway Authority we are duty bound by law to intervene to ensure the safe passage of the public highway can be maintained.</p>

Objector asks whether the measures are to make additional revenue, or to ensure only those who can afford to live on Warren Lane have access to the River footpath.

Objector states that Leeds City Council's Best Council Plan 2021-2025 focusses on "Tackling Poverty and Reducing Inequalities" but by introducing this scheme the Council increases inequality by only allowing residents of Warren Lane to access the river and denying those in poverty such access.

Objector states that the Best Council Plan Health & Wellbeing states that the Council will focus on reducing health inequalities and supporting healthy, physically active lifestyles but that this scheme also does the opposite of that.

Objector states that if the Council permitted parking for a small number of cars, it would allow parking for all and continue to support healthy lifestyles, improve mental health and wellbeing, support families, help young people into adulthood, encourage physical activity as well as supporting older people who utilise Warren Lane for physical activity.

Objector states that many people use the River to manage their health, wellbeing and sanity and that Leeds City Council should not remove this provision.

Leeds City Council has sought to intervene on Warren Lane to ensure the safe passage of traffic on the public highway, following persistent concerns raised regarding obstructive parking practices.

Leeds City Council is not denying access to the River Wharfe as a result of this scheme, with foot access still available. Additionally, a small amount of on-street parking remains at the southern end of Warren Lane, for those who are able to utilise this. The Council only seeks to intervene here to reduce the risk to public safety via the obstructive parking practices that have been recorded on Warren Lane.

Leeds City Council is not denying access to the River Wharfe as a result of this scheme, with foot access still available. Additionally, a small amount of on-street parking remains at the southern end of Warren Lane, for those who are able to utilise this. The Council only seeks to intervene here to reduce the risk to public safety via the obstructive parking practices that have been recorded on Warren Lane.

A small amount of on-street parking remains at the southern end of Warren Lane that is not subject to any parking restrictions, however the remainder of the Lane is restricted in either 'No waiting at any time' or 'Clearway' form to ensure that the carriageway remains passable to the varying types of vehicles that require use of it.

Leeds City Council does not wish to restrict access to such a provision that appears to offer such benefit to residents. However the highway infrastructure in this area is not sufficient to support the level and type of parking that is frequently recorded and due to the continuous obstructive parking as the Highway Authority we are duty bound by law to intervene to ensure the safe passage of the public highway can be maintained.