



**CABINET
HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE**

WARDS AFFECTED:
Eyres Monsell
Freemen
Aylestone

24 January 2006

11 January 2006

Pork Pie & Attlee Way/Glenhills Way Improvement

Report of the Corporate Director Regeneration and Culture

1 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 This report brings to Members revised proposals for the Pork Pie junction and Glenhills Way. These proposals are designed to improve bus journey times and road safety, while reducing congestion by better traffic management.

2. Summary

- 2.1 This scheme is intended to reduce delays to buses passing through the Pork Pie junction and the surrounding area, provide better facilities for cyclists and pedestrians, and improve road safety. The scheme will also reduce congestion suffered by all traffic using the junction, and eliminate rat-running in Sharpland and Glenhills Boulevard.
- 2.2 Two rounds of public consultation have taken place. 75% respondents to a questionnaire distributed during the second round of consultations were in favour a scheme being built, although opinion concerning the suitability of the proposals was more divided, with 51% in favour and 41% against. Changes have been made to try to address the concerns raised during consultation, as set out in Sections 4 and 5 of the supporting information.
- 2.3 Our proposal to widen Glenhills Way has been the subject of a petition submitted by Councillor Porter. While officers appreciate the anxiety this proposal has raised with some local residents, it is our professional judgement that Glenhills Way needs to be widened to prevent traffic heading towards Lutterworth Road queuing back through the Pork Pie junction at busy times, and to enable the new traffic signals and pedestrian crossings to function successfully.
- 2.4 Members have the difficult task of balancing local concerns with the wider concerns of the better functioning of the road network and the benefit to the many local residents and visitors who journey across the roundabout and Glenhills Way, especially older people, women and children, who are more likely to travel by bus and walk or cycle.
- 2.5 Although the Pork Pie scheme has been previously approved by Council, because of the local concerns, because we have made modifications, and

because of changes to the Council's financial circumstances, it would be prudent to ask Council to reaffirm its earlier decision.

3. Recommendations

Cabinet is recommended to:

1. Recommend Council to reaffirm its earlier decision of November 2003 that the Pork Pie scheme, including the revisions made in the light of consultation, be constructed in 2006, to be principally funded from the Integrated Transport block within the Single Capital Pot.
2. Recommend Council to approve expenditure of £3.737 million, as set out in the table at paragraph 4.1 below.
3. Authorise Prudential borrowing of up to £850k. This amount will then be repaid from the 2007/8 LTP 2 settlement.

Highways and Transportation Scrutiny Committee is recommended to:

1. Scrutinise the decision of Cabinet.

4 Financial & Legal Implications

Financial Implications

- 4.1 Costs and funding over three years are set out in the table below.

	2005/6	2006/7	2007/8	TOTAL
COSTS	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's
Statutory Undertakers & Advanced works	315.0	0.0	0.0	315.0
Scheme costs	0.0	2,762.0	0.0	2,762.0
Highways maintenance & City Academy	7.0	653.0	0.0	660.0
TOTAL COSTS	£322.0	£3,415.0	£0.0	£3,737.0
FUNDING				
Integrated Transport	315.0	2,012.0	850.0	3,177.0
Prudential Borrowing	0	850.0	(850.0)	0.0
Highways Maintenance (revenue budget)	0.0	468.0	0	468.0
Developer Funding	7.0	85.0	0	92.0
	£322.0	£3,415.0	£0.0	£3,737.0

- 4.2 In 2006/7 £2,012k is available for this work, in order to complete the scheme by November 2006 and avoid the Christmas moratorium, which would cost us £60k. We intend to use prudential borrowing to finance expenditure of £850k and repay this from the 2007/8 settlement. We estimate that the interest will be £27k.

- 4.3 The integration of the capital infrastructure works, highways maintenance and works for the City Academy will result in less disruption in the long term and efficiency savings in the order of £100,000.

*Martin Judson, Head of Finance R&C
18th November, 2005.*

Legal Implications

- 4.4 The reconstruction of the roads will involve the City Council in some Part 1 claims. An allowance for the cost of this is included with the estimate.
- 4.5 The Council will have a statutory duty to provide noise insulation to all eligible properties. An allowance for this is included with the estimate.

Peter Nicholls, Service Director, Legal Services, 22 November 2005

5 Report Author

Mike Pepper
Head of Transport Development
2150
Mike.Pepper@leicester.gov.uk

DECISION STATUS

Key Decision	Yes
Reason	Capital expenditure over £1 million Policy and Budget framework
Appeared in Forward Plan	Yes
Executive or Council Decision	Executive and Council



WARDS AFFECTED:
Eyres Monsell
Freemen
Aylestone

**CABINET
HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE**

24 January 2006

11 January 2006

Pork Pie & Attlee Way/Glenhills Way Improvement

Report of the Corporate Director Regeneration and Culture

Report

1. Background

- 1.1 In 2000, the First bus company commissioned consultants Oscar Faber to examine locations on routes 26 and 54 where buses suffered from congestion, with a view to persuading the City to invest in improvements to speed up bus services and improve reliability. Along with other factors, greater reliability and reduced travel time for buses can increase the number of passengers. Oscar Faber identified the Pork Pie island as the biggest single problem for buses on route 26 outside the City Centre. First also identified Glenhills Way as a problem location, and Oscar Faber recommended that all these problems should be dealt with together. Recent research for the second Local Transport Plan (LTP2) confirmed that Pork Pie Island causes some of the longest delays to buses and general traffic in the City. For instance, between 8-9am, the journey takes an average of 341 seconds inbound, rising to 512 seconds between 8-8.30am. This compares with 272 seconds at Aylestone Road/ Middleton Street, 295 seconds at Groby Road/Fosse Road North and 416 seconds at Lutterworth Road/Soar Valley Way. The long delays on each of these routes contributes to the determination of which Quality Bus Corridor schemes will be delivered during the LTP2 period (2006-2011).
- 1.2 Pork Pie Island was one of only eight locations in the City where Arriva Midlands identified infrastructure requirements that would improve their bus service performance. Another such location was Aylestone Drive/Glenhills Way, and improvements at this junction are also planned as part of this scheme. In total, around 31 buses per hour on seven different inbound routes would benefit from journey time improvements as a result of this scheme.
- 1.3 Because of the problems in this area, in November 2001 officers asked consultants White Young Green to investigate further and make proposals for the design and supervision of possible construction works.
- 1.4 Because of the Local Transport Plan strategy, the brief given to White Young Green by the Council was to take a holistic view of potential improvements with particular regard to safety. This wider remit also enabled the

consideration of a 75 name petition requesting traffic calming measures along Glenhills Boulevard (Glenhills Way, even numbers) presented by Cllr Dunphy to the City Council on 27th September 2001. This resulted in the final scheme design providing improvements for local residents and all road users, and making negotiating the Pork Pie junction and Glenhills Way easier and safer. A key element of the brief was to ensure that the junction remained capacity neutral – this meant that traffic travelling through the junction would neither gain nor be adversely affected by the new signal controlled pedestrian or cyclist facilities at the junction.

- 1.5 Accident statistics for the three years to 31st December 2004 showed that there had been 16 accidents involving 17 casualties (an average of 5.33 per year). This put Pork Pie Island 5th in the local safety scheme priority list. Three out of the top four other schemes already had had work planned, or recently completed. Of the 17 casualties, 5 were cyclists, 3 were children and 1 was an OAP. Similar three year data at Glenhills Way showed that there had been 14 accidents involving 34 casualties (an average of 11.33 per year). Of the casualties, car drivers and passengers were the majority. There were two clusters of crashes at the junctions of Aylestone Drive and Pasley Road. There was also a scattered pattern of crashes between Aylestone Drive and Sturdee Road.

2. Description of the scheme

2.1 The scheme designed by White Young Green, including amendments incorporated following consultation, consists of:

- A traffic signal controlled roundabout in place of the existing Pork Pie Roundabout.
- Bus and cycle lanes, together with an additional toucan crossing on Saffron Lane.
- Bus and cycle lanes on Glenhills Way/Boulevard, together with an additional toucan crossing on Glenhills Way.
- An extra lane in the direction of Lutterworth Road on Glenhills Way, achieved by widening Glenhills Way on its northern side
- Traffic signals at Sturdee Road, Aylestone Road and Pasley Road on Glenhills Way, with a bus-only right turn from Pasley Road into Glenhills Way.
- The elimination of 'rat running' on the adjoining slip-roads and estate roads.
- Each of the arms on the roundabout and the traffic-signal controlled junctions will have both pedestrian and cycling facilities, including advanced cycle stop lines.
- All pedestrian/cycling facilities will connect by means of footpaths/cycleways to the existing footways and cycleways.
- Highway maintenance work on Saffron Lane between the Pork Pie island and the city boundary will be included in the construction contract.

Appendix A details general arrangement plans of the proposed works.

3. Public consultation

3.1 We originally consulted on this scheme in 2002. Some residents living in houses facing on to the Outer Ring Road were concerned about the implications of the proposed widening of much of Glenhills Way, which is needed to make the scheme function effectively.

3.2 Because of these concerns, we agreed not to proceed with the scheme construction at that time. However, in November 2003, Cabinet reconsidered the future of the Pork Pie scheme, and decided that it should be scheduled for completion in 2006.

3.3 Consultants White Young Green were asked earlier this year to reconsider their earlier design in the light of the comments made during the earlier round of consultations, and a further set of public consultation was carried out in September this year.

3.4 The consultation took the form of a 1400+ letter drop and three local exhibitions in each of the three wards affected. The result of the returns from the consultation (with about 95% of the attendees at the exhibitions responding) was: -

3.5 Do you think the scheme is necessary?

Yes	No	No Comment
53	14	4
74.7%	19.7%	5.6%

3.6 Do you think the proposals are acceptable?

Yes	No	No Comment
36	29	6
50.7%	40.9%	8.5%

3.7 The number of returns represents 5% of the letters sent.

3.8 75% of respondents were in favour of junction improvement works at the roundabout, although opinion concerning the suitability of the proposals was divided. Some of those who did not accept the proposals required additional works be done such as a noise/sight barrier along Glenhills Boulevard, and others wanted aspects of the scheme altered such as the access arrangements to parts of Glenhills Boulevard.

3.9 Of the 29 responses who did not consider the scheme proposals acceptable, approximately 31% were against the scheme on all grounds. The revised proposals presented here meet the requirements of around 65% of the objectors, predominantly by providing a noise bund and planting, and moving the crossings on Saffron Lane. 20% of people respondents asked for the landscaping, but also asked for other changes, some of which we have not been able to implement. The final design proposed takes on board about 75% of the objections from respondents who otherwise thought the scheme was necessary.

- 3.10 Details of the resident requested changes we have incorporated are included in Sections 4 and 5.
- 3.11 In addition to the responses to the consultation, the Council received a petition containing 350 signatures from 230 separate addresses stating “We the undersigned object to the proposed Road Widening. I/We support measures from Leicester City Council to reduce traffic volumes on this road. I/We call on all Councillors to stop the proposal and invest the funds in residents’ requests.”

4. Modifications made

4.1 As a result of the various representations made during both rounds of consultations, and, in the light of new traffic counts, a number of changes have been made to the scheme, of which the most significant are:

- The design of the Pork Pie island itself has been altered. Instead of a “hamburger” roundabout, as originally proposed, we now intend to provide a conventional signalised roundabout. The reasons behind this change are twofold: -
 1. We were concerned about safety at the roundabout if the traffic lights failed.
 2. The most recent junction count figures showed a change that has allowed us to improve the original design.
- The proposed arrangements for Glenhills Boulevard South, designed to prevent rat-running, have been modified to address the requests of the residents along that stretch of road, as far as practically possible.
- We propose to reduce the width of a length of road widening outside numbers 15 to 27 Glenhills Boulevard. As a result it is possible to save about 12 mature trees that would otherwise have been removed.
- Modifications to prevent rat-running in Sharpland have been included in the scheme. This addition to the scheme is in response to residents’ requests.
- Mounding and shrubs will be included along the north side of Glenhills Way to reduce noise and visual impact. This is in response to worries expressed by residents caused by the proposed widening of the road on that side.
- We will plant 150 semi-mature trees along both sides of Glenhills Way. This is to replace approximately 50 trees that are either dead, damaged or would have to be moved. We are taking the opportunity to fill in gaps in the existing tree line on the north side and to provide trees on the south side where there are none.
- A U-turn facility has been provided at the junction of Glenhills Way and Aylestone Drive. This is in response to motorists/residents who expressed concern at not being allowed to make a right turn out of Pasley Road.

This allows them to travel left out of Pasley Rd to Aylestone Road, do a U-turn and travel east as they originally wished.

- 4.2 However, it has not proved possible to design the scheme without most of the widening on Glenhills Way, and, although steps have been taken to minimise its impact on local residents, there are still objections from some local people to this element of the scheme.
- 4.3 Part of the widening involves increasing the eastbound carriageway of Glenhills Way from three lanes to four on the approach to the roundabout. This extra lane is required to provide a bus lane on the approach, and two 'straight on' lanes at the roundabout. The extra lane at the roundabout is required to allow more cars to travel through the green stage of the traffic lights, directly compensating for the throughput lost as a result of the introduction of a "red stage" to allow pedestrians and cyclists to cross safely.
- 4.4 In addition, the widening further west along the north side of Glenhills Way, provides enough space on the south side (westbound) to provide an additional lane from the roundabout, increasing vehicle storage space. As detailed in White Young Green's report of November 2005, this is necessary, as queuing to exit the roundabout towards Lutterworth Road often results in traffic from other arms of the junction not being able to enter it, thus reducing the efficiency and safety of the junction. The provision of two of the three proposed new pedestrian and cycling crossing points over Glenhills Way is also only made possible (without adversely affecting the operation of the Roundabout) by this extra vehicle storage space.

5. The Issues raised during consultations

Issue raised during consultation	Outcome
Don't like the proposal to widen Glenhills Way to cater for extra westbound lane from Pork Pie Island	The investigations showed that the main problem of congestion at Pork Pie in the westbound direction was caused by the inability of traffic during peak periods to clear away from the roundabout quickly enough in the one lane that currently exists. Observations showed stationary vehicles blocking the circulatory carriageway of the junction itself for much of the peak period, leading to queues of around 750m on Attlee Way. Without the extra storage capacity, the new pedestrian and cycling facilities and benefits to bus passengers could not be provided without adding to congestion. Consequently, no significant benefit would arise from the scheme.
Don't like the proposal to widen Glenhills Way to cater for eastbound bus lane outside 15-27 Glenhills Boulevard on the approach to Pork Pie Island	After further consideration, it has been decided that much of this widening is not necessary to the success of the scheme proposal, and it has been significantly reduced.
Upset about the loss of trees to the	The reduction in widening described above will

Issue raised during consultation	Outcome
north-west of the Pork Pie island and in other locations	cut that loss by 12 trees. Furthermore an additional 100 semi-mature trees, planted at various locations within the scheme, will result in a substantial net increase in the number of trees.
Residents in Sharpland complained about the volume of rat-running traffic	The revised scheme includes measures to both eliminate rat-running and help address the parking issues.
Objection to the proposal to ban the right turn out of Pasley Road, except for buses	Whilst alternative provision for car drivers wishing to travel from Eyres Monsell to the Pork Pie island was already available via the junction of Sturdee Road and Saffron Lane, an amendment to the scheme has been made, so that drivers will also be able to get from Pasley Road to Pork Pie by turning left and making a U-turn at Aylestone Drive.
Some of the residents of Glenhills Boulevard South were unhappy with the changes proposed to their access and egress arrangements	The design has now been changed to provide local residents with the best possible routes in and without reinstating the current rat-run.
Concerns about worsening air pollution	In general, levels of nitrogen dioxide fall off rapidly from the carriageway until they reach the prevailing urban background level at, say 10 metres. Extensive experience in Leicester shows that, even where levels of nitrogen dioxide exceed the annual mean limit at roadside monitoring sites this level is not exceeded at the facade of properties further than 10m from the road. There are no properties with a façade as close as 10m to the scheme. From first principles, any improvement in traffic flow will tend to reduce emissions.
Concerns about increased noise pollution	The landscaping works along the north side of Glenhills Way is expected to reduce the level of noise and visual impact of the scheme. This scheme will not result in the widened Glenhills Way being any closer to existing properties on Glenhills Boulevard South. The new road surfacing should also reduce existing noise levels. A noise assessment will be carried out and all eligible houses offered noise insulation. The installation of this will be done early in the construction period.
Will the City Council offer compensation for any blight caused as a result of this proposal?	There will be no blight: The only compensation that is available is that set out in Part 1 of the land compensation act. This covers homeowners against injurious affection, loss of value of property etc. The Council do not offer this compensation as a statutory duty; instead

Issue raised during consultation	Outcome
	it is up to the property owner to make a claim if they can justify it. Residents will probably be approached (approximately 1 year after completion) by agents who will offer to act for them if they think they have a case. The reasonable costs of these agents would be paid for by the City Council.
Concerns about loss of business during construction phase	If businesses are disrupted by major road works they may be entitled to a reduction in their business rates. This would be the decision of the Inland Revenue. Businesses can only make individual applications for reduced rates for 'a physical change in the locality' causing 'material change in circumstances which the business believes affect the value of the property'. It is essential that applications for temporary reductions in rating assessments be made whilst the road/bridge works are in progress. The Legal Section of the City Council has not found any other legislation that provides for compensation in these circumstances.
How many additional vehicles will use this route off peak as a result of this scheme	As the scheme is designed to be capacity neutral, it is not anticipated to generate additional vehicle movements
What is the cost/benefit of the scheme?	A cost benefit analyses (COBA) done in 2003, on the previous proposals, indicated that the scheme should pay for itself in 2 years. It is expected that this would still be true for the current proposals.

6 Financial & Legal Implications

Financial Implications

6.1 Costs and funding over three years are set out in the table below.

	2005/6	2006/7	2007/8	TOTAL
COSTS	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's
Statutory Undertakers & Advanced works	315.0	0.0	0.0	315.0
Scheme costs	0.0	2,762.0	0.0	2,762.0
Highways maintenance & City Academy	7.0	653.0	0.0	660.0
TOTAL COSTS	£322.0	£3,415.0	£0.0	£3,737.0
FUNDING				
Integrated Transport	315.0	2,012.0	850.0	3,177.0
Prudential Borrowing	0	850.0	(850.0)	0.0
Highways Maintenance (revenue budget)	0.0	468.0	0	468.0
Developer Funding	7.0	85.0	0	92.0
	£322.0	£3,415.0	£0.0	£3,737.0

6.2 In 2006/7 £2,012k is available for Pork Pie, in order to complete the scheme by November 2006 and avoid the Christmas moratorium, which would cost us £60k, it is intended to use Prudential borrowing to finance expenditure of £850k and repay this from the 2007/8 settlement. Interest on this is estimated to be £27k.

6.3 The integration of the capital infrastructure works, highways maintenance and works for the City Academy will result in less disruption in the long term and efficiency savings in the order of £100,000.

*Martin Judson, Head of Finance R&C
18th November, 2005.*

Legal Implications

6.4 The reconstruction of the roads will involve the City Council in some Part 1 claims. An allowance for the cost of this is included with the estimate.

6.5 The Council will have a statutory duty to provide noise insulation to all eligible properties. An allowance for this is included with the estimate.

Peter Nicholls, Service Director, Legal Services, 22 November 2005

7 Other Implications

OTHER IMPLICATIONS	YES/NO	PARAGRAPH REFERENCES WITHIN SUPPORTING PAPERS
Equal Opportunities	Yes	The contractor will be encouraged to use local labour and suppliers.
Policy	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council's Public Transport Strategy • The Council's Cycling Policy • The Council's Pedestrian Policy • The Council's Strategy to reduce the number of road casualties.
Sustainable and Environmental	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The outcome of the scheme will reduce the noise levels for a large number of residents on Sharpland and Glenhills Boulevard north. • It will enhance the surrounds with many additional trees, shrubs and bushes which do not currently exist. • It will reduce the visual impact for a large number of residents on Sharpland and Glenhills Boulevard north. • The pollution levels will not be worse than currently experienced by houses along the route of Glenhills Way.
Crime and Disorder		Improvement to pedestrian and cycling safety by improvements to lighting.
Human Rights Act	N/A	
Older People on Low Income	N/A	

7.1 Risk Assessment Matrix

	Risk	Likelihood L/M/H	Severity Impact L/M/H	Control Actions (if necessary/or appropriate)
1	The scheme may cost more than estimated	M	M	A project management structure, with both a project director and project manager, is in place
2	The scheme is not approved, affecting LTP2 targets to be met and consequently having an impact on the CPA 'environmental block' score.	L	H	A robust value for money scheme is presented incorporating comments from public consultation. Other schemes could be brought forward but contributions to LTP2 targets may be reduced

L - Low
 M - Medium
 H - High

L - Low
 M - Medium
 H - High

8 Background Papers – Local Government Act 1972

Report to Cabinet - – November 2003

- Consultation Report - September 2005
- Petition from Cllr Porter – October 2005

9 Consultations

Consultee	Date Consulted
Pedestrian Officer	On going
Cycling Officer	On going
Public Transport Co-Ordinator	On going
DDA Officer	On going
Ward Councillors	On going
ATC	On going
Traffic Management Officers	On going
Police	On going
Fire	Oct 2005
Ambulance	Oct 2005
Householders and businesses within 200m of the works	Sept/Oct 2005
Highways Maintenance	On going
Trees And Woodlands Section	On going
Ecology Officer	On going
City Landscape Services	On going
Traffic Impact Team	On going
TRO Team	On going
Statutory Undertakers	On going
Street Lighting Section	On going

10 Report Author

Mike Pepper
Head of Transport Development
2150
Mike.Pepper@leicester.gov.uk

DECISION STATUS

Key Decision	Yes
Reason	Capital expenditure over £1 million Policy and budget framework
Appeared in Forward Plan	Yes
Executive or Council Decision	Council