



Leicester
City Council

ALL WARDS

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE 8th March 2000

HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES AND LINES

Report of the Director of Environment and Development

1. Purpose of the Report

To review the current Highway Improvement Schemes and Improvement Lines and make recommendations for revocation, retention, addition and amendment, for formal resolution of the Council.

2. Recommendations

The Planning and Transportation Committee is recommended to accept the following: -

2.1) Highway Improvement Schemes *(declared within 200 metres of property)*

It is recommended that the Highway Improvement Schemes in **appendix A** are revoked.

It is recommended that the Highway Improvement Schemes in **appendix B** are retained.

It is recommended that the Highway Improvement Schemes in **appendix C**, associated with existing Highway Improvement Lines, are drawn up.

2.2) Highway Improvement Lines *(declared when through property only)*

It is recommended that the Highway Improvement Lines in **appendix D** are revoked.

It is recommended that the Highway Improvement Lines in **appendix E** are retained.

It is recommended that the Highway Improvement Lines in **appendix F** are retained pending a comprehensive review.

2.3) Land and Property Surplus to Highway Requirements

It is recommended that the following parcels of land and property be declared surplus to Highway purposes: -

2.3.1) Birstall Street - adjacent the Durham Ox Public House

2.3.2) 71 Barkby Road

2.3.3) 80-84 Uppingham Road

2.3.4) 4 Hungarton Boulevard

2.3.5) 37 Abbots Road

- 2.3.6) 46 Abbots Road
- 2.3.7) 6 Boundary Road
- 2.3.8) 18 Corporation Road
- 2.3.9) 279 Aylestone Road

2.4) Further Report

Subject to the approval of the above recommendations, because of possible tenant implications, a further report be prepared on the Council owned properties that are no longer required for Highway purposes.

2.5) Comprehensive Transport Corridors Review

In order to enable further Highway Improvement Schemes and Highway Improvement Lines to be modified or revoked, particularly to remove uncertainty on property blight, a comprehensive transport corridors review at an estimated cost of £70000 would have to be undertaken. At present no funding is available for this but this aspect is being given further consideration.

3. Financial Implications

There is no provision in the Traffic Group's base revenue budget for the Transport Corridors Review. As and when this work is progressed, a further report will be brought to Committee identifying funding.

The potential for a blight payment on an Improvement Line can crop up at any time and the revocation recommendations will considerably reduce potential future payments. The streamlining of the lists of Highway Improvement Schemes and Improvement Lines will lead to greater efficiency and effectiveness.

4. Report

Highway Improvement Schemes are proposals for the construction of new roads and the alteration of existing roads, whether for general traffic, public transport, cycling or walking and many are declared on Local Land Charge Searches for property within 200 metres. The elements of a Highway Improvement Scheme that affect individual property should be declared as Highway Improvement Lines and are only declared on Searches for the individual property concerned.

There are currently around 100 Highway Improvement Schemes and Highway Improvement Lines declared on Local Land Charge Searches, with around 75 of these within the previously adopted City of Leicester Local Plan. It is extremely important to properly consider Highway Improvement Schemes and Highway Improvement Lines as they affect the potential for development and property values and can cause blight. There is a presumption that only those schemes which have a reasonable chance of proceeding in a finite time period (10-15 years, or greater in order to safeguard routes) should be retained. Conversely, it would be very difficult to resurrect improvement lines once revoked.

In considering the Evesham Road/Saffron Lane Link, Members should take into account the petition with 118 signatures that was presented to Council on 27th May 1999. This stated: - "We call upon Leicester City Council to remove the Evesham Road/West Link Road from the Local Leicester Draft Plan when the appropriate department reviews the Local Plan." The scheme is recommended

for retention as it is within an important public transport corridor. Although it is unlikely that the scheme will be implemented in its current form, a public transport scheme may be appropriate using parts of the reservation. A detailed engineering study is required in order to reformulate the scheme and before any parts of the scheme can be revoked.

The revocation of part of the Glen Parva Bypass scheme will need to tie in with a similar resolution of the Leicestershire County Council as the scheme traverses both Authorities. The section between Soar Valley Way and Lutterworth Road should be retained pending an investigation for use as a possible new Public Highway in connection with a potential Park and Ride site that may be included in the Central Leicestershire Local Transport Plan. The properties 53-55 Lutterworth Road and 59-61 Lutterworth Road will need to be retained pending an appraisal of the Public Highway requirements for the future development of the adjacent vacant land as a Park and Ride site or otherwise.

The opportunity to carry out this whole exercise follows on the City Council becoming the Highway Authority on 1st April 1997. Highway Improvement Schemes and Improvement Lines were formally inherited from the County Council. There are currently no formal links between schemes and lines and as a new Highway Authority this is a good opportunity to review and amend. The wisdom of an Improvement Line without an Improvement Scheme is questionable. The recommendations in this report are based on the assumption that each Improvement Line to be retained, unless subject to a comprehensive review, should be linked to an Improvement Scheme, although it is not essential. Following the comprehensive review, Improvement Schemes will need to be formulated so as to link with the Improvement Lines that are to be retained.

Certain parcels of land and property have been identified that are not associated with any Improvement Lines and are surplus to Highway requirements, at Birstall Street adjacent the Durham Ox Public House, 71 Barkby Road, 80-84 Uppingham Road, 279 Aylestone Road and 6 Boundary Road. Three other properties are now surplus to Highway requirements following the implementation of works - 4 Hungarton Boulevard and 37 & 46 Abbots Road. The Highway Improvement Line affecting 18 Corporation Road was revoked on 17th November 1999 and the garden land owned by the Council is now surplus to Highway requirements. All this property should be formerly declared surplus to Highway requirements.

Where properties have been acquired in advance of highway proposals, in many cases short term commercial and residential lettings have been created. If these recommendations are approved, the Councils position will need to be safeguarded to ensure that secure residential tenancies are not created. Some lettings are to elderly persons who have been in occupation for many years. There will be policy implications for Members to consider.

The results of this report are able to feed into the current reviews of the City of Leicester Local Plan and the Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Structure Plan and complement the work of those projects. It should be emphasised that any delay in the decision-making process on Highway Improvement Schemes and Highway Improvement Lines will have implications for the preparation of the

revised City of Leicester Local Plan, the Deposit Draft of which is due to go to the Committee by June 2000. All of the schemes have been reviewed within current policies with emphasis on sustainability, safety, environmental improvement and amenity, and realism for progress. Opportunities for improvements to walking, cycling and public transport have been particularly considered. A number of Improvement Lines are recommended to be retained pending a comprehensive review. This review could result in Improvement Schemes linked to amended Improvement Lines on an integrated basis.

The review would be based on the transport corridors as follows: -

Radial Transport Corridors

Narborough Road
Hinckley Road/Glenfield
Groby Road/Anstey
Hamilton/Uppingham Road
Birstall/Beaumont Leys
Aylestone/Blaby
Welford Road
London Road
Evington/Stoughton

Orbital Transport Corridors

Outer Ring Road (ODDR) including Coleman Road, Troon Way & EDDR

There would be advantages of all being reviewed together to ensure integration and avoid overlap between corridors and financial & staff resource economies. It would also enable early refinement of the lists of Improvement Schemes and Improvement Lines and so enable the cases of blight to be clarified. This would be a major benefit to members of our community adversely affected by the uncertainty. A financial allocation of £70000 would be required to carry out the review. It should be noted that the Committee has recently considered the review of part of the ODDR/EDDR orbital corridor in connection with the Victoria Road East Extension. This work is additional but complementary to the comprehensive corridor review.

In the Appendix, each scheme is grouped according to the recommended course of action and listed in reference number/letter order with the reasons for each recommendation.

5. Equal Opportunities Implications

In selecting Schemes and Lines for retention, there has been an emphasis on those that will have positive equal opportunity outcomes, with help to people with disabilities, the elderly, those on low incomes and benefit, by way of improved walking, public transport and safety.

6. Policy Implications

The recommendations are in line with current Council policies including the Leicester and Central Leicestershire Transport Policy.

7. Legal Implications

There is a statutory duty to declare most Improvement Schemes on Local Land Charge Searches for an individual property situated within 200 metres of the boundary of the Improvement Scheme. There is a statutory duty to declare Improvement Lines on searches for the individual property through which the Improvement Line passes.

8. Sustainable and Environmental Implications

In selecting Schemes and Lines for retention, there has also been an emphasis on those that will have positive environmental outcomes with improved walking, public transport and safety, protection of amenity land and environmental improvement. The review framework has broadly been in accordance with the environmental policy aims of the City Council and EMAS procedures. More detailed comments and 'Sustainability Checklists' will be appropriate at later stages for some schemes.

9. Crime and Disorder Implications

No Crime and Disorder Act implications are seen to arise from this report.

10. Consultations

Ward Councillors have been advised as appropriate. The Town Clerk, Arts and Leisure Services, Education, Housing and Social Services Departments have been consulted.

11. Background Papers - Local Government Act 1972

Documents and Plans are in Traffic Group File No 4573.

12. Officer to Contact

Garry Scott, Traffic Group, Extn 6526

APPENDIX - HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES

(Ward letters in brackets after reference letter)

APPENDIX A - Highway Improvement Schemes recommended to be revoked: -

<u>REFERENCE LETTER</u>	<u>LOCATION/NAME</u>	<u>REASONS</u>
A. (AY)	Part Glen Parva Bypass foreseen (as structure plan)	No requirement for improvements (Jointly with County Council)
B. (BL)	Anstey Lane	No requirement for improvements foreseen (as structure plan)
C. (NB,NP)	Ratby Lane (as structure plan)	No requirement for improvements (With County Council) foreseen
E. (SA)	Ravensbridge Drive	No requirement for improvements foreseen (as structure plan)
H. (HU)	Hungarton Boulevard Improvement (Widening)	Proposals already implemented A46/A47 stage 2
I. (TC)	Colchester Road Improvement (Widening)	Proposals already implemented A46/A47 stage 2
K. (64) (AY)	Lutterworth Road/Middleton Street Junction Improvement	No land requirement for improvements foreseen
L. (61) (EK,ST)	London Road/Stoughton Road Junction Improvement	No requirement for improvements foreseen
M. (LA)	Catherine Street/Ulverscroft Road Junction Improvement	No requirement for improvements foreseen
N. (LA,WY)	Humberstone Road/Dysart Way Junction Improvement	No requirement for improvements foreseen
Q. (NP)	St Oswalds Road Footway	Improvements already carried out

APPENDIX B - Highway Improvement Schemes recommended to be retained: -

D. (78) (AY,RF)	Evesham Road/Saffron Lane Link LRT / Public Transport improvements, cycling and walking
F. (58) (AB,BE)	Abbey Lane/Loughborough Road To retain option of road scheme or for Link (identified in structure plan) walking, cycling, buses or LRT
G. (WH)	Victoria Road East Extension To allow industrial development to occur
J. (CH,EV,ST)	Wakerley Road/Evington Lane Improvement Improvements required for public transport, cycling and walking
P. (MM)	Greengate Lane Footway Improvements required for walking, cycling and highway safety
O. (WY)	Humberstone Gate Widening Improvements required for public transport, cycling and walking
R. (NB)	Braunstone Way Widening Transport improvements may be required in the long term

S. (NB) due	ODDR/Hinckley Road Junction	Transport improvements required to development at Thorpe Astley
T. (BL,NP)	ODDR/Groby Road Junction	Transport improvements may be required in the long term

<u>REFERENCE LETTER</u>	<u>LOCATION/NAME</u>	<u>REASONS</u>
U. (RM)	ODDR/Melton Road Junction	Transport improvements may be required in the long term
V. (EM,SF)	ODDR/Saffron Lane Junction	Transport improvements may be required in the long term
W. (54) (RM)	Watermead Way	Transport improvements may be required in the long term
X. (CO,EV) scheme or for Y.12.(74). (LA,WH)	Eastern District Distributor Road (identified in structure plan) Tailby Avenue/Catherine Street	To retain option of road walking, cycling, buses or LRT Improvements required for public transport, cycling and walking
Z. (AY) with poss development	Part Glen Parva Bypass between Soar Valley Way-Lutterworth Rd	May be required in connection Park & Ride /residential

APPENDIX C - Highway Improvement Schemes recommended to be added: -
(Highway Improvement Line Number in brackets) (Ward letters in brackets)

Y.3. (16) (RM)	Troon Way Improvement	LRT / Public Transport improvements;
Y.4. (38) (AB)	Bath Lane Improvement	environmental and amenity To remove pinchpoint and provide wider footways - building back.
	already set	

APPENDIX - HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT LINES

(Ward letters in brackets after reference number)

APPENDIX D - Highway Improvement Lines recommended to be revoked: -

<u>REFERENCE NUMBER</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>REASONS</u>
1. (AY)	Aylestone Road (Raw Dykes area)	Alternative proposals already implemented
3. (SF)	Saffron Lane	Alternative proposals already implemented
4. (NP)	Dominion Road	Increased road width not required
5. (WP)	Perth Avenue	Improvement Line not required to carry out improvements
6. (WP)	Piper Way	Improvement Line not required to carry out improvements
7. (WP)	Piper Way	Improvement Line not required to carry out improvements
10. (NB)	Hinckley Road	Alternative proposals already implemented
12. (RF) out realistic	Narborough Road/ Imperial Avenue	Cycle improvements already carried and further improvements not
14. (BE, RM)	Loughborough Road East side	Increased road width not required
15. (BE, RM) route;	Loughborough Road/ Thurcaston Road	Thurcaston Rd no longer through capacity increase contrary to policy
17. (ST)	Mayfield Road	Increased road width not required
18. (LA) improvements	Martin Street	No requirement for any foreseen
19. (AB) improvements	Hildyard Road	No requirement for any foreseen
28. (CA)	Waterloo Way	Increased road width not required
29. (WY)	Kent Street	Possible joint environmental improvement with adjacent land owner
31. (CA)	Gateway Street	No requirement for any widening foreseen
30. (CA)	Bonnars Lane	Improvement not realistic

34. (CA)	Oxford Street	Capacity increase contrary to policy
35. (CA)	Walnut Street	Improvements already carried out
36. (AB,WY)	Belgrave Gate	Capacity increase contrary to policy
37. (WY)	St. Matthew's Way	Increased road width not required

<u>REFERENCE NUMBER</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>REASONS</u>
39. (AB)	Bay Street	Redevelopment and improvements already carried out
40. (AB)	Bay Street	Redevelopment and improvements already carried out
41. (CA)	Belvoir Street	Not a realistic proposal
42. (AB)	Burleys Way	Lay-by not required
48. (AB)	Gas Street]
carry] Additional land not required to
49. (AB)	Navigation Street] out improvements
50. (WY)	Halford Street	Not a realistic proposal
53. (SA)	West Bridge Stage 3/ Soar Lane Link	Improvement Line not required and would adversely affect Forestway
Park		
56. (CH,CO, carry	Wakerley Road/Stoughton Drive/	Additional land not required to
EV, ST)	Broad Avenue	out improvements
61. (EK,ST)	London Road/Stoughton Road	No Improvement Line found - see Improvement Schemes
62. (CA)	Freemen's Common Link Road	Redevelopment and improvements already carried out
63. (WC)	Narborough Road/ Upperton Road	Improvements already carried out
64. (AY)	Lutterworth Road/Middleton Street	No land requirement for improvements foreseen
65. (RF)	Narborough Road/ Fullhurst Avenue	Junction improvement not required
66. (AB,SA)	St. Margaret's Way/	Redevelopment and improvements Devonshire Road already carried
out		
67. (CW)	Uppingham Road/ St. Barnabas Road	Capacity increase contrary to policy not good value
and		
69. (WY)	Rutland Street	Increased road width not required

70. (AB)	Freeschool Lane	Redevelopment and improvements already carried out
71. (AB)	Soar Lane	No requirement for any widening foreseen
72. (AB)	Blackbird Road	Improvements already carried out
75. (SA)	Ravensbridge Drive	No requirement for improvements foreseen (as structure plan)
76. (WY)	Belgrave Gate	No requirement for any widening foreseen
77. (BE)	Melton Road	No requirement for any widening foreseen

APPENDIX E - Highway Improvement Lines recommended to be retained: -

<u>REFERENCE NUMBER</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>REASONS</u>
16. (RM) improvements;	Troon Way	LRT / Public Transport environmental and amenity
38. (AB) wider	Bath Lane	To remove pinchpoint and provide footways - building already set back
68. (ST)	London Road/Mayfield Road	Improvements for cycling & walking

APPENDIX F - Highway Improvement Lines recommended to be retained pending a comprehensive review: -

<u>REFERENCE NUMBER</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>REASONS</u>
2. (CA)	Raw Dykes Road	Reconsider in relation to possible redevelopment
8. (NB)	Hinckley Road	Public Transport improvements
9. (NB)	Hinckley Road	Public Transport improvements
11. (NB) improvements	Hockley Farm Road	Footway and carriageway
13. (LA) improvements	Belgrave Road	LRT / Public Transport
20. (CW) review	Forest Road	May be required as part of a wider strategic transport network

21. (CW)	Forest Road	May be required as part of a wider strategic transport network
review		
22. (WY)	Sparkenhoe Street]
]
23. (SH,WY)	St. Peter's Road] High accident rate and
] some works in hand -
24. (SH,WY)	St. Peter's Road] one comprehensive study
] required
25. (SH,WY)	St. Stephen's Road]
]
26. (SH,WY)	St. Stephen's Road]
27. (WY)	Conduit Street	A lesser scheme is required with
modest		junction improvements
32. (CA)	Jarrom Street] A lesser scheme is required
allowing]
] for buses, cycles and walking
33. (CA)	Jarrom Street]

<u>REFERENCE NUMBER</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>REASONS</u>
43. (CA)	Calais Hill]
] The lines in this area need revising
on		
44. (CA)	Calais Street] a comprehensive basis, allowing
for]
] potential redevelopment and
45. (CA)	Dover Street] development that has already
occurred]
]
46. (CA)	Dover Street]
]
47. (AB)	Cumberland Street	Consider in relation to possible redevelopment
]
51. (AB)	Mansfield Street] Improvements required for walking,
] cycling and bus use
52. (AB)	Mansfield Street]
]
54. (RM)	Watermead Way Dualling	Transport improvements will be required in the long term
]
55. (CO)	Coleman Road/Uppingham Road	May be required as part of a strategic transport network
wider review]

- | | | |
|----------------|---|---|
| 57. (CO,HU,TC) | | Uppingham Road/Scraptoft Lane |
| | May be required as part of a wider transport network review | strategic |
| 58. (AB,BE) | Abbey Lane/Beaumont Leys | Requirement for transport improvements |
| 59. (CW,WH) | Lane/Corporation Road
Humberstone Road | (identified in structure plan)
Improvements required for public transport, cycling and walking |
| 60. (LA,WY) | Dysart Way | Improvements required for walking, cycling and public transport, but small parcel of land on Birstall Street be disposed of as it is not required |
| 73. (AB) | Northgate Street | Improvements required for public transport, cycling and walking |
| 74. (LA,WH) | Tailby Avenue/Catherine Street | Improvements required for public transport, cycling and walking |
| 78. (AY) | Aylestone Road/Boundary Road | LRT / Public Transport improvements, cycling and walking |