

# **Report of the Strategic Director Place to the meeting of Bradford East Area Committee to be held on 9 November 2017.**

---

**T**

## **Subject:**

**NORMAN LANE, BRADFORD, TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER – OBJECTIONS**

## **Summary statement:**

This report considers the objections received to the recently advertised Traffic Regulation Order for Norman Lane, Bradford proposed in association with the provision of a pedestrian refuge island.

## **Wards:**

**4 Bolton and Undercliffe  
10 Eccleshill**

---

Steve Hartley  
Strategic Director Place

## **Portfolio:**

**Regeneration, Planning and Transport**

Report Contact: Andrew Smith  
Principal Engineer  
Phone: (01274) 434674  
E-mail: [andrew.smith@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.smith@bradford.gov.uk)

## **Overview & Scrutiny Area:**

**Environment and Waste Management**

## 1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report considers the objections received to the recently advertised Traffic Regulation Order for Norman Lane, Bradford proposed in association with the provision of a pedestrian refuge island.

## 2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 At its meeting of 11 July 2017 this Area Committee approved as part of its Safer Roads Schemes Programme the provision of a pedestrian refuge island on Norman Lane near to St Francis Church and improvements to the existing zebra crossing near Wayside Crescent. In association with the proposed refuge island a Traffic Regulation Order for No Waiting at Any Time restrictions on a part length of the north side of Norman Lane is proposed to ensure the safe through passage of traffic and to protect sight lines for drivers and pedestrians crossing the road. There are existing waiting restrictions on the south side of Norman Lane at this location.
- 2.2 The location of the proposed refuge island and extent of the proposed waiting restrictions is shown on drawing No. HS/TRSS/103761/CON-1A attached as Appendix 1 to this report.
- 2.3 The Traffic Regulation Order was advertised between 29 September and 20 October 2017. At the same time consultation letters and plans were delivered to residents and businesses affected by the proposals. This has resulted in four objections and one representation regarding the proposals.
- 2.4 A summary of the valid points of objection and corresponding officer comments is tabulated below:

Objectors concerns	Officer comments
<p><u>Objector 1</u></p> <p>Objects on the grounds that there are a number of businesses on Norman Lane and if there are additional double yellow lines they will all struggle even more than they do now for parking space. They are an independent business trying to compete in a competitive market. They are there for the community as a service and also employ local people. If customers struggle to park they may decide to go elsewhere to the detriment of the business and its staff.</p>	<p>The proposed waiting restrictions are the minimum necessary to safely provide a new pedestrian refuge island at this location. The proposed waiting restrictions will only affect 2 parking spaces; some of the proposed lining covers the entrances to St Francis Church and are therefore not viable parking spaces. The new refuge island will be of benefit to pedestrians; helping local people to safely cross the road and access local shops and services on foot.</p>
<p><u>Objector 2</u></p> <p>The proposals will not allow a funeral cortege to park on the road outside St Francis Church.</p> <p>The location of the proposed pedestrian</p>	<p>The proposed refuge island and waiting restrictions would prevent vehicles parking on the road directly outside St Francis church. However there is a car park to the rear of the church and unrestricted parking on other lengths of Norman Lane. Access to the church grounds to the south</p>

<p>refuge island does not provide a sufficient turning circle for funeral/wedding vehicles, horse drawn vehicles or limousines to enter the church grounds to the south of the building without crossing on to the opposite carriageway posing a safety risk.</p> <p>The presence of the refuge island will make access to the church for a funeral cortege more hazardous during hours of darkness.</p>	<p>of the church building would be more difficult for longer wheel based vehicles.</p> <p>The parking restrictions would ensure safety in the vicinity of the refuge island at all times.</p>
<p><u>Objector 3</u></p> <p>Severe difficulties would be faced for funeral corteges if they were unable to park on the road outside St Francis church during the duration of a service.</p>	<p>The proposed refuge island and waiting restrictions would prevent vehicles parking on the road directly outside St Francis church. However there is a car park to the rear of the church and unrestricted parking on other lengths of Norman Lane.</p>
<p><u>Objector 4</u></p> <p>All the businesses in this area have problems with a lack of parking space and the addition of more double yellow lines will impact negatively on these businesses and their customers.</p> <p>There does not appear to be sound justification for the proposed refuge island and associated waiting restrictions; that the proposed refuge island is in the right place and will improve safety is speculative. There is already a refuge at the roundabout and a zebra crossing near Morrisons entrance which adequately serve pedestrian needs. They do not think the location of the refuge is where someone would normally walk or cross the road.</p> <p>They feel there is a constant impingement on parking in the area. A reduction in on-street parking space will increase the abuse of their car park. The reduction in parking space will negatively impact on local residents especially at peak times.</p> <p>The existing bus stop markings are excessively long and cause traffic flow issues and danger to all road users. They suggest moving the bus stop to outside St Francis church, providing a refuge island and thereby take pedestrian activity away from the congested area just off the roundabout.</p>	<p>The proposed waiting restrictions are the minimum necessary to safely provide a new pedestrian refuge island at this location. The proposed waiting restrictions will only affect 2 parking spaces; some of the proposed lining covers the entrances to St Francis Church and are therefore not viable parking spaces.</p> <p>In the 5 years prior to the scheme being programmed there were 8 road casualties on Norman Lane. On a length of road any localised improvements can be of general road safety benefit.</p> <p>The lack of a pedestrian facility may suppress demand for crossing the road.</p> <p>There has been no recent introduction of parking restrictions in this area.</p> <p>As stated above these proposals only affect 2 parking spaces.</p> <p>Bus stop clearways are provided at sufficient length to enable a bus to pull up along side the kerb and pull out again without being obstructed by parked vehicles. The existing bus stop is in a convenient location for access to the local shops and businesses. If the bus stop marking were kept clear of parked vehicles</p>

<p>The proposals are an unjustifiable expense and waste of public money and the impact on customer parking and other points raised outweigh the feasibility of the project.</p>	<p>this should ease traffic flow. There is insufficient road width to accommodate a refuge island and bus stop adjacent to the church. Pedestrian activity is likely to remain concentrated where the shops and other businesses are located. The benefit to pedestrians and general road safety would outweigh the loss of 2 parking spaces.</p>
---	---

- 2.5 A representation has also been received welcoming the proposed refuge island and double yellow lines but hoping that the double yellow lines would be extended further towards Five Lane Ends. Due to the large amount of parking that takes places they fear the obstruction of sight lines, affecting the safety of pedestrians and creating difficulties for turning manoeuvres from driveways.

Officer comments: The proposed waiting restrictions are the minimum necessary to safely provide the new refuge island. If the waiting restrictions are respected there is sufficient length to protect sight lines and turning movements from residential driveways.

- 2.6 It is recommended that due to the disruption that would be caused to the services provided by St Francis church that the proposed refuge island and associated waiting restrictions are not implemented.

### **3.0 OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- 3.1 Local ward members and the emergency services have been consulted on the proposals. No objections have been received.

### **4.0 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE APPRAISAL**

- 4.1 The allocated budget (Safer Roads) for the original scheme is £20,000. If a reduced scheme is implemented, any residual funding could be considered for re-allocation when the next Safer Roads programme report is presented to Area Committee.

### **5.0 RISK MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES**

- 5.1 Implementation of the original proposals would impact on funeral services at St Francis church.

### **6.0 LEGAL APPRAISAL**

- 6.1 The options contained in this report are within the Councils powers as Highway Authority and Traffic Regulation Authority.

## **7.0 OTHER IMPLICATIONS**

### **7.1 EQUALITY & DIVERSITY**

Due regard has been given to Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 when determining the proposals in this report.

### **7.2 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS**

There are no sustainability implications arising from this report.

### **7.3 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS IMPACTS**

There is no impact on the Council's own and the wider District's carbon footprint and emissions from other greenhouse gasses arising from this report.

### **7.4 COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

The introduction of a new pedestrian refuge island and Traffic Regulation Order would be beneficial in terms of road safety.

### **7.5 HUMAN RIGHTS ACT**

None

### **7.6 TRADE UNION**

None

### **7.7 WARD IMPLICATIONS**

Ward Members have been consulted on the proposals.

### **7.8 AREA COMMITTEE WARD PLAN IMPLICATIONS**

None

## **8.0 NOT FOR PUBLICATION DOCUMENTS**

8.1 None

## **9.0 OPTIONS**

9.1 That the objections be upheld and the proposed pedestrian refuge island and associated Traffic Regulation Order be abandoned. That the proposed improvements to the zebra crossing on Norman Lane near Wayside Crescent be implemented.

9.2 That the objections be overruled and the proposal be implemented as advertised.

9.3 Councillors may propose an alternative course of action from that recommended on which they will receive appropriate officer advice.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 10.1 That the objections be upheld and the proposed pedestrian refuge island and associated Traffic Regulation Order be abandoned.
- 10.2 That the proposed improvements to the zebra crossing on Norman Lane near Wayside Crescent be implemented.
- 10.3 That the objectors be informed accordingly.

## **11.0 APPENDICES**

- 11.1 Appendix 1 – Drawing No. HS/TRSS/103761/CON-1A.

## **12.0 BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

- 12.1 City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council File Ref: HS/TRSS/103761.

