

# A659 Harewood Road: Police camera hard standing, footway link, traffic island widening & bus stop relocation

Date: 29/08/2024

Report of: Traffic Engineering Manager

Report to: Chief Officer Highways & Transportation

Will the decision be open for call in?  Yes  No

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?  Yes  No

## Brief summary

This report details proposals to introduce a Police hard-standing area for the purposes of enforcing the speed limit along the A659 Harewood Road as it passes into and through Collingham.

In addition to this proposed work, Leeds City Council have been asked to undertake improvement works to assist pedestrians in the area accessing local bus stops, by the widening of an existing traffic island and the introduction of a new section of footway.

The opportunity has also been taken to consider and consult upon the relocation of the existing bus stop to a point between the boundary of two properties following representations from a local resident.

This report summarises the consultation exercise undertaken with residents over the hard standing provision for speed camera enforcement hardstanding, footway provision and traffic island works and the potential relocation of a bus stop.

<u>Camera Hard Standing works</u>	<u>Footpath provision &amp; Island works</u>	<u>Relocation of Bus Stop</u>
Support 6	Support 6	Support 1
Against 2	Against 2	Against 5
		Indifferent/no opposition 2

## Recommendations

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

1. Note the contents of this report and consider the representations made to the proposals, alongside the recommendations of highways officers and, further, taking into account the comments made over-rule the objections to the proposed works on Harewood Road
2. Approve the following works and actions and for correspondence to be sent to the residents informing them of the decision taken:
  - i. Approve the provision of a police camera enforcement hard standing area in the verge on the southern side of the A659 Harewood Road, to the east of the farm field access and opposite the property known as Greenway.
  - ii. Approve the provision of a new footway link between the existing bus stop opposite Langwith Gates to the existing traffic island.
  - iii. Approve the widening of the existing traffic island to accommodate safer pedestrian movements to the new footway link.
  - iv. NOT APPROVE the relocation of the bus stop.

### **What is this report about?**

- 1 This report details the results of the consultation exercise associated with the planned hard standing/layby provision and associated works on the A659 Harewood Road.
- 2 These proposals include;
  - a) The provision of a police camera enforcement hard standing area in the verge on the southern side of the A659 Harewood Road, to the east of the farm field access and opposite the property known as Greenway.
  - b) The provision of a new footway link between the existing bus stop opposite Langwith Gates to the existing traffic island.
  - c) Widening of the existing traffic island to accommodate safer pedestrian movements to the new footway link.
  - d) The potential relocation of the bus stop on the A659 from its current position to the boundary of Langwith Gates with Meadow Brow.

### **Why is the proposal being put forward?**

- 3 As part of the City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement (CRSTS) funding agreement between Central Government and the West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA), which was approved in April 2023, funds were allocated for the introduction of hard standings for police camera enforcement, in areas where the requirements for such had met thresholds for enhanced enforcement.
- 4 Following complaints from local Ward Members, the Parish Council and local residents of excessive traffic speeds on the A659 Harewood Road, within the 30mph built-up area, a speed camera review was undertaken.
- 5 This assessment was reviewed against the latest West Yorkshire Camera Partnership deployment criteria, which identified that the site met the requirements for enhanced mobile police enforcement provision.

- 6 Meetings were subsequently held on site with the Camera Partnership, the Police and the Traffic Engineering Manager to identify suitable and appropriate locations for a mobile enforcement vehicle to be deployed. One location was identified near to the school, which would be safely accommodated within the limits of the carriageway, within an existing hatched area. The second location, which this report relates to, requires the construction of a hard standing.
- 7 The latter location was preferred as it provided the best visibility to adequately enforce the speed limit change on entry to Collingham.
- 8 Through initial consultation with Ward Members, requests were made to consider a widening of the existing traffic island in the vicinity and the introduction of a new section of footway to link this island with the nearby bus stop, located approx. 15m east of Langwith Drive as part of the works to be undertaken. This was to primarily assist pedestrians, in particular local children who make use of the school service at this stop and already use the island and verge to traverse to it. This island at the present time does not comply to current design standards and a wider provision would ensure this was Equalities Act compliant.

#### Potential bus stop relocation:

- 9 The proposal to relocate the outbound from Collingham bus stop follows representations from the adjacent property owner since the bus stop was installed on 6<sup>th</sup> July 2022. The representations centre around there being no consultations when the bus stop was originally relocated to its current position and privacy intrusion when buses, particularly double decker buses, use the stop. Whilst there is screening to the front of the property, and the property is set back, the buses are visible from the garden and the property. The property owner wishes to overcome this privacy intrusion by having the bus stop relocated away from his property.
- 10 The current bus service pattern is the X99 bus which is an hourly service and the 923 bus service which runs an infrequent service seven times a day through Collingham between 7am to 7pm. There is also a School service to the Grammar School at Leeds (GSAL) run in the AM and PM peak periods to serve pupils living in the village.
- 11 The request is to relocate the bus stop entirely away from the extents of the property boundaries, further along the road.
- 12 There have been a significant number of phone calls and several site visits undertaken to listen to the representations made and to review the situation. These culminated in a letter being issued to the owner dated 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2022 confirming the current location is in a satisfactory position with no other complaints received but does set out a possible alternative location, subject to consultations with local representatives and property owners impacted by the alternative location
- 13 Officers involved in the original consultation process confirm a letter and plan was circulated to direct frontages. Unfortunately, there is no paper trail of this and no correspondence on file suggesting other property owners received the documentation. Measures have been taken to ensure accurate records are kept in future. The property owner disputes there was any consultations and questions the reasoning behind the location of the bus stop outside his property.

- 14 The property owner has stated further legal action will be considered if the bus stop is not relocated. The location on the boundary between the owner and his neighbour, approximately 35m away, is a compromise, which the property owner is prepared to accept although the clearly stated preference is completely away from his property. Other locations have been considered but they would result in the bus stop either being too close to another bus stop and/or directly outside another property.
- 15 The alternative location consulted upon with local residents has culminated in representations from several parties including local ward members, the neighbour, the Parish Council and other residents.
- 16 The legal position is that the Highway Authority does have permitted rights to install bus stops where it sees fit on the public highway; there are no statutory consultation procedures involved. Evolved processes however means it is normal practice for adjoining properties to be notified of such changes allowing opportunity for representations to be made before installation. In this instance, it is most unfortunate there is a lack of evidence relating to the initial consultations.
- 17 The opportunity has therefore been taken to include this possible relocation as part of this consultation exercise with a view to including this work in the overall package of works if deemed appropriate and acceptable through the consultations
- 18 Consultation on the package of works was undertaken with the local Ward Members, the local Parish Council, and the residents on 31<sup>st</sup> July 2023 for a period of 28 days. Through this consultation, representations were received from the Ward members, Parish Council and residents affected.

**Wards Affected: Harewood**

Have ward members been consulted?

Yes

No

**What impact will this proposal have?**

- 19 Introduction of the hard standing will allow enhanced enforcement of the existing speed limits along the A659 Harewood Road, ensuring compliance with the existing speed limit and improving the overall safety for road users on the public highway.
- 20 Introduction of the widened traffic island and footway improvements will improve the crossing ability and safe passage of pedestrians in the area, in particular those with vulnerable characteristics.
- 21 Relocation of the bus stop will help to alleviate the concerns of a local resident over their privacy but lead to adverse comment and feedback from other parties.
- 22 The proposals will see a small reduction in verge and an increased distance for pedestrians to walk by approx. 35m.

**What consultation and engagement has taken place?**

- 23 The Harewood Ward Members were consulted and briefed on the scheme upon its initial proposal, and dialogue has continued with them throughout the development of the scheme. As a result of this, the Ward Members are in support of the introduction of the hard standing, improved crossing facilities and the extension of the footway provision, which is felt as

necessary for this school bus service in the area and to ensure compliance with the speed limit which is a persistent complaint they receive.

- 24 However, they oppose any further relocation of the existing bus stop facilities, they do not share the concerns of the local resident and feel this would be an inefficient use of public funds and introduce a greater distance for pedestrians to travel with little to no benefit.
- 25 Emergency Services and the bus operators have been consulted on the scheme, and no adverse comments were received in response to the consultation.
- 26 The Parish Council has also been involved with discussions regarding the proposals for some time and were formally consulted as part of the consultation undertaken from 31<sup>st</sup> July to 31<sup>st</sup> August. The Parish Council is in support of the introduction of the hard standing, improved crossing facilities, additional footway provision and oppose any further relocation of the existing bus stop facilities for similar grounds to the Ward Members.
- 27 Residents were consulted directly via hand delivered letters on the 31 July on the proposals. Details of their representations on the proposals are summarised in Appendix B. In summary, broadly the residents support the hard standing, island works, and footway works, with two dissenting voices on any works near their properties. Opinions on the relocation of the bus stop were mixed. In total, 6 representations from residents were received, the content of which is listed in Appendix B alongside the Highway Authority's response on the points raised.

### **What are the resource implications?**

- 28 These works were approved in a previous report dated April 2023 and there are no further resource implications above and beyond those highlighted there.

### **What are the legal implications?**

- 29 The recommendations set out in this report require the decision maker to consider the objections received during the consultation undertaken before considering whether the works can proceed.
- 30 All work proposed lies within the framework of highways legislation and national and local standards for design where applicable. All other relevant legislation has also been taken into consideration, including duties under the Equality Act.
- 31 This report is not eligible for call-in, as it does not require a decision to be made on the spending of LCC funds.

### **What are the key risks and how are they being managed?**

- 32 Failure to approve the recommendations detailed within this report will prevent the provision of speed enforcement in this area and the ability to improve pedestrian provision for residents who use the existing bus stop provisions.
- 33 The scheme is anticipated to be completed in the financial year 2024/25. Failure to do so may result in an underspend on the CRSTS budget for camera works.

### **Does this proposal support the council's 3 Key Pillars?**

Inclusive Growth

Health and Wellbeing

Climate Emergency

34 The scheme will assist in avoiding danger to persons and traffic using these roads and aid in facilitating the safe passage and access of traffic for businesses and residents, assisting in the health and wellbeing of those in the area.

### **Options, timescales and measuring success.**

#### **a) What other options were considered?**

35 Consideration was given to alternate locations for the hard-standing, however these were ruled out in discussions with the Police, with the location chosen affording the best visibility for the Police to undertake enforcement in both directions.

36 Consideration has been given to the retention of the existing bus stop location and the alternative site suggested by the resident. This has been assessed on site with respect to sightlines afforded for public service vehicles, motorists passing any public service vehicles, driveways etc and it was determined both locations offered similar benefits. Given that both sites are viable this was agreed to be consulted upon to ensure all local opinions were considered and put to the community to ensure their views are considered, with a decision made as part of this process.

37 The recommendation is not to incur further expenditure to relocate this bus stop given the lack of additional benefits over and above that which the current site offers and the feedback received from other parties,

#### **b) How will success be measured?**

38 An improvement of the traffic speeds on the A659 Harewood Road.

#### **c) What is the timetable for implementation?**

39 Subject to resolving the objections, it is anticipated to be completed late in the financial year of 2024/2025

### **Appendices**

40 Appendix A: EDCI Screening

41 Appendix B: Objection Summary

42 Appendix C: Drawing 1318-LCC-15-XX-DR-TM-01\_02

## Appendix A:

### 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.

<b>Directorate: City Development</b>	<b>Service area: Traffic Management</b>
<b>Lead person: Christopher Procter</b>	<b>Contact number: 0113 378 7501</b>

<p><b>1. Title: Harewood Road Police Camera hard Standing &amp; bus Stop relocation</b></p> <p>Is this a:</p> <p> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy / Policy</b>                                  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Service / Function</b>                                  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other</b> </p> <p><b>If other, please specify.</b></p>
--

<p><b>2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening</b></p> <p>The screening focuses on a report to the Highways and Transportation Board requesting authority to introduce various highway improvement measures around the Harewood Ward.</p> <p>The scheme proposes to introduce a package of works within the Harewood Ward to improve road safety buy the introduction of a hard standing to allow enhance enforcement of the speed limits by the Police, additional crossing facilities, additional footway link from the aforementioned crossing facilities to a nearby bus stop.</p>
---

### 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 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"><li>• Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation, and harassment</li><li>• Advancing equality of opportunity</li><li>• Fostering good relations</li></ul>		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)



Consultation on the proposals has also taken place with the following stakeholders:

- Local Ward Members
- Emergency Services (Police, West Yorkshire Fire and Ambulances Services)
- West Yorkshire Combined Authority
- Residents and businesses

The Local Ward Members support the proposals.

- **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)

Scheme features:

The positive impacts of the scheme have been identified as follows:

- Control by way of enforcement of the speed limits, potentially seeing a reduction in mean speeds in the area.
- Improvement of crossing facilities to local bus stops, which predominantly service local schools.
- Improved footway provision to the bus stops, negating the need for pedestrians to make use of the verges in the area to access the stops, something which previously will have detrimentally affected those with mobility issues.
- Relocation of the bus stop will alleviate the concerns of local residents whose quality of life has been impacted

The negative impacts of the scheme have been identified as follows:

- The proposals will remove some existing green space (highways verge).
- Relocation of the bus stop will require pedestrians travelling from west to east to traverse a greater distance (approx. 35m) to the bus stop, this would impact on those with mobility issues.

- **Actions**

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

Impact of the police enforcement to levels of noncompliance with the speed limit will be assessed and shared with the local community.

**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

N/A

(Include name and job title)	
------------------------------	--

**6. Governance, ownership, and approval**

Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening

<b>Name</b>	<b>Job title</b>	<b>Date</b>
Nick Hunt	Traffic Engineering Manager	28/11/2023

**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

<b>Date screening completed</b>	
<b>Date sent to Equality Team</b>	
<b>Date published</b> (To be completed by the Equality Team)	

## Appendix B:

### List of comments to the proposals

Respondent	Summary of comments	Police Bay	Pedestrian works	bus stop relocation	Highways Comments
		For (✓) Against (X) Unknown or indifferent (~)			
1	<p>Supports the first three measures – Hard standing for speed enforcement, widening the island, and introducing the footway.</p> <p>Does not support the moving of the bus stop. This is too close to an existing stop and further away for residents at the top of the village. Does not believe the current site is detrimental to anyone and is not a good use of public funds.</p>	✓	✓	X	<p><i>If the bus stop is to be relocated from its current location, it is not considered it would inconvenience patrons of the stop any further than its current location.</i></p>
2	<p>The Layby/hard standing is welcome as speeding is a serious concern.</p> <p>The widening of the island is welcome to assist crossing the carriageway.</p> <p>The pathway is essential as there is no current path and wet conditions create an unsafe environment. Concerned over moving the bus stop again as what is to stop further requests for this to be moved further from the end of the village.</p>	✓	✓	~	<p><i>If the bus stop is agreed to be relocated, should future requests be received by the City Council they will be considered on their own merits.</i></p>
3	<p>Supports, the Hard standing, widened island and footway provision. They live nearby and their children will be using the stop from September, so they have safety concerns.</p> <p>They do not support relocating the bus stop. They do not think the existing spot is of concern and it is a waste of funds to move this further.</p>	✓	✓	X	<p><i>Officer comment – thank your comments on the proposals and support of the measures proposed.</i></p>
4	<p>Oppose all plans for the area outside their home. They have concerns over the existing island as drivers have overtaken on the wrong side. The farmer's access is regularly used by the farm and as an unauthorised</p>	X	X	~	<p><i>Motorists who actively choose to overtake on the wrong side of the carriageway past a traffic island are committing several motoring offences and should be reported to the Police. As Highway Authority we need to act in the</i></p>

<p>stopping/meeting point for other vehicles. The junction of Langwith Drive and Harewood Road is in too close proximity. The owner claims that they are already dealing with existing hazards and passengers waiting for the bus on the stop on the northern side near their home.</p> <p>The owner believes that the addition of a Police hard standing will exacerbate these issues and the layby will be used by passing traffic as a stopping area. The owner does not wish for any vehicles to be parked outside of their home, Police or otherwise.</p> <p>Widening the island will create another hazard near their home.</p> <p>The owner concedes the benefits of speed enforcement but believe that they should be kept away from their home. They are concerned of people parked in the layby being able to see into their home.</p>		<p><i>interests of all with regard safety and should preclude works based on criminality to the detriment of other road users. Dangerous driving can only be tackled by the Police and It is strongly recommended that the owner reports these concerns to the Police, as without the intelligence and reports of criminality they cannot undertake appropriate action.</i></p> <p><i>Leeds City Council have not received any reports or complaints from the farm owners over vehicles parked in their access, nor have onsite observation witnessed this. Any vehicle should park in a manner that does not affect the access requirements of other road users onto or off the public highway and if a driver does, then this should be reported to the Police by those directly affected.</i></p> <p><i>There is an existing island located at this point that already takes into consideration its proximity to a junction and will remain in situ regardless of the proposals here. This was itself introduced to prevent over taking manoeuvres through this area and provide a shielded are for right turning traffic into Langwith Drive following collisions involving overtaking manoeuvres. Any changes will take into consideration the turning manoeuvres into and out of this junction. A widened traffic island will not prove to be a hazard, it will be more visible and provide safe crossing opportunities for local children and residents using the local bus service.</i></p> <p><i>Bus Stop facilities provided along Harewood Road are for the benefit of residents in the area and predominantly serve as local school bus stops. Any anti-social behaviour associated with the bus stop near to your home should be reported to the Police.</i></p> <p><i>A Police Layby provided in this area will be protected by way of a Traffic Regulation order, restricting this layby for the sole use of Police vehicles. Should police vehicles be present in this area, this would also deter criminal driving behaviour which has been described and should improve the overall safety of the area and not provide any detrimental effect.</i></p>
--	--	--

					<i>The Police themselves have requested the location near to your home as this offers the greatest sight lines for them to undertake speed enforcement.</i>
5	<p>Supports the efforts to reduce speed on Harewood Road. Supports the widening of the island and footway provision to the existing bus stop and this should be completed with some urgency.</p> <p>They do not support the relocation of the bus stop; this moves it away from the end of the village who this stop serves and would be a waste of funding. The money would be better served installing a shelter surrounding the bus stop in its current position.</p>	✓	✓	X	<i>The Parish Council in conjunction with the west Yorkshire combined authority, have been exploring a shelter in this area. Any such introduction would be handled separately from these proposals and would need to be in keeping with the local area and taking into consideration local resident comments arising from any consultation.</i>
6	<p>Layby for the Police Enforcement – does not support this as other general vehicles travelling on Harewood Road would misuse this area for breaks.</p> <p>The believe that no enforcement will be undertaken of this layby. People parking here would create noise nuisance, antisocial behaviour and even criminal activity in the area.</p> <p>Police can use existing areas along the road.</p> <p>Widening of the island – There is no need to widen this, very few people cross the road and those that do, do so at their own convenience.</p> <p>Introduce a footway provision – They do not feel that this is long enough and should extend between Bluecoat Court and Hilcrest on the southern side of the road. However, they</p>	X	X	✓	<p><i>A Police Layby provided in this area will be protected by way of a Traffic Regulation order, restricting this layby for the sole use of Police vehicles. Police only parking bays have exceptionally good compliance nationally, in part due to the potential for blocking a police vehicle from its use and having to explain this to officers.</i></p> <p><i>The Police have requested a specific bay to allow camera vehicles to park, in a location that they deem offers them the best sightlines to enforce the speed limit and tackle any motorists exceeding this.</i></p> <p><i>Leeds City Council have been requested to aid in crossing the road here by local residents, as those who make use of the existing facilities find it difficult to cross. The existing pedestrian island does not conform to current design standards and it is considered appropriate to support this request as part of these work, which will in turn provide a provide safe crossing points for members of the public on the highway.</i></p> <p><i>Leeds City Council welcomes comments for further footway provision in this area. At present the proposals are to link the existing island to the bus stop (in its present location or proposed), if this is</i></p>

	<p>would prefer that green belt land be retained in any provision.</p> <p>A further relocation of the bus stop - They had previously objected to the bus stop on privacy grounds. They feel that the existing location allows passengers to see their home and affects the life of those who live their because of it. In short, they support the relocation.</p>				<p><i>well received, we can review further footway provision with colleagues in transport policy.</i></p>
Parish Council	<p>The Parish Council supports the Police bay, widening and footway provision. They do not support the bus stop relocation to appease concerns of a resident and believe it to be a waste of funding.</p>	✓	✓	✗	<p><i>Leeds City Council appreciates the comments with regards to the bus stop relocation, this would be funded via existing budgets for footway provision/police camera hard standings.</i></p>
Ward Members	<p>The Ward Members support the Police bay/enforcement, the Traffic island crossing point and footway provision. They do not support further relocation of the bus stop.</p>	✓	✓	✗	<p><i>Leeds City Council appreciates the comments with regards to the bus stop relocation, this would be funded via existing budgets for footway provision/police camera hard standings.</i></p>
Recommendations	<p><i>Reflecting on the comments made by the various members of the public; it is obvious that there is strong local support for measures to improve enforcement of the speed limits, better provide safe crossing opportunities and additional footway measures to assist members of the public accessing the bus stop facilities. Whilst there are some concerns over non-police vehicles making use of the bay, this can be combatted with effective enforcement. As such it is our recommendation to proceed with the police hard standing, footway and Island works as proposed.</i></p> <p><i>With regards to the bus stop location, both the existing site and proposed relocation point for this stop offer the same road safety benefits, are not too dissimilar in location to be detrimental to pedestrians to access, especially when considering the footway proposals. Sightlines/visibility at both locations are comparable, with the existing location offering marginally better visibility. From an engineering perspective both sites are relatively equal.</i></p> <p><i>There are strong feelings from some residents that this should be relocated to an alternate location, however this is not widely supported, by residents, the Parish Council of Collingham and by the Harewood Ward members, who oppose any further changes.</i></p> <p><i>It should also be considered that in the current financial climate, when the council needs to ensure that money is spent wisely, and in the absence of any road safety benefit over and above the existing location, would expenditure in this instance be warranted.</i></p> <p><i>As such considering all the above, we would not recommend relocating the bus stop again given the opposition and no further road safety benefits over the existing location.</i></p>				