Transforming Cities Schemes – Connected Leicester

EDTT Scrutiny

Date of meeting: 4th March 2021

Lead director/officer: Andrew L Smith/Barry Pritchard

Useful information

- Ward(s) affected: ALL
- Report author: Satbir Kaur
- Author contact details: Satbir.kaur@leicester.gov.uk
- Report version number: v1.2

1. Summary

- 1.1. The Transforming Cities Fund (TCF) programme aim is to deliver a transformational programme of public, sustainable and active transport schemes to support city economic growth and climate emergency actions. The programme aims to provide improved choices for commuters to travel by bus, cycle and walking as attractive alternatives to car use.
- 1.2. The scheme proposals being presented for discussion are:
 - Connected Neighbourhoods Beaumont Leys
 - Anstey Lane
 - Abbey Park Road

2. Recommended actions/decision

2.1 Scrutiny commission members are requested to note the officer comments made in response to issues raised by them at the recent informal commission briefing. Further comments can be made at the Scrutiny meeting and these can be considered as the schemes are developed in detail prior to scheme delivery.

3. Scrutiny / stakeholder engagement

- 3.1 A separate pre meeting was held with scrutiny members on 18th February 2021 to enable clear understanding by scrutiny members and discussion on each of the scheme proposals. Councillors were asked if they required hard copies of the scheme plans before the meeting and these were sent out to those who requested them.
- 3.2 Stakeholder engagement for Connected Neighbourhoods, Beaumont Leys with Babington Academy, ward councillors and local residents was carried out January 2021, with no adverse comments. Public engagement is expected to be carried out from March 2021 for Anstey Lane South and Summer 2021 for Anstey Lane North and Abbey Park Road.

4. Background and options with supporting evidence See section 5

5. Detailed report

Scrutiny members requested the details of the new schemes be discussed in a separate session to enable clear understanding by scrutiny members and discussion on each of the scheme proposals. This session was held on 18th February 2021 where plans were shared and discussed. A copy of the presentation is attached as Appendix 1 for information.

A summary of the questions and officer responses are shown in table 5.1 below:

Table 5.1		
	Councillor question/comments	Officer response
1.	Anstey Lane North; Cllr Bhatia expressed his delight and support of the new proposed green route along Anstey Lane instead of Calver Hey Road. Cllr Fonseca asked for further detail on the pink and blue routes which were discounted. Cllr Fonseca was also in support of the new route once the other routes were explained.	The blue and pink routes go through residential streets such as Darenth Drive/through the pedestrian subway and onto a footpath on the Outer Ring Road. These options were discounted due to issue with steep ramps on the subway. The green route is the best route as it links to existing facilities and the proposed new crossing is in a well-used section of the route.
2.	Anstey Lane South – Buckminster Road experimental closure: concerns raised about impact on local residents. Cllr Waddington's view was the closure would be highly unpopular with residents. This view was supported by Cllr Bhatia and Cllr Valand. Cllr Bhatia suggested an alternative cycle route along Brading Road to link up with the facilities provided on Groby Road. Also concern raised about loss of access to shops for customers. Cllr Waddington felt widening the footway by reducing the grass verges would be a good option as there are currently issues with damage from parked cars. Also wishes to see plans for A50 to understand tie in and how a cycle lane can be provided on Woodgate which has some narrow sections. Cllr Fonseca asked how long the experiment would be in place. Raised concern 18- months is a long time, especially as the proposals are not consulted upon before they are implemented.	Officers to investigate the alternative route of routing cyclists along Brading Road and report findings back to the 4th March meeting. The shops generate additional traffic, reducing access for general traffic would be a benefit to local residents. Officers anticipate bringing the A50 scheme proposals , including for Woodgate, to the meeting in May 2021. Officers explained the closure could be put in as an experimental order to see what the effects are. The order can be in place for up to 18 months, objections can be raised during the first 6 months to allow for the proposals to be amended or withdrawn. The order can be withdrawn at any time and the closure removed or made permanent after 6 months.

3.	Abbey Park Road: Cllr Bhatia stated this was welcome news and long overdue as there were discussions at EDTT meetings 4 or 5 years ago about the need for a footbridge over the river parallel to the road bridge. Cllr Waddington asked when local consultation would take place. Cllr Valand attended the site visit and felt the scheme was good news for the City.	Officers stated some engagement on the bridge proposals had already taken place; a site visit with the City Mayor and ward councillors took place last autumn and there was support from all who attended. Public consultation will commence in Summer 2021 as the scheme is not on site until early 2022. Officers to feedback responses from future engagement with ward councillors.
4.	Cllr Fonseca asked when they would see some investment in the east of the city as current investment is focussed on the west only.	TCF funding was required by DfT to be targeted at supporting existing major urban growth areas which for Leicester largely focussed on the north/west/south sides of the city. The TCF schemes include improvements to Melton Road/Belgrave Road/Belgrave Gate north building on the previous improvements at Belgrave Circle. TCF corridor schemes will also support people commuting from the east, particularly from Belgrave, Rushey Mead, Hamilton and north Evington to the industrial areas at Beaumont Leys and other parts of the city. The TCF funded Bikeshare scheme includes docking stations across the central area of the city including to the east of the city. Potential future opportunities to the east of the city will be considered as part of new programmes such as the Active Travel Fund for cycling and walking and also as part of the emerging Local Transport Plan.

6. Financial, legal, equalities, climate emergency and other implications

6.1 Financial implications

The authority has been awarded £32.5m DfT funding towards a £71m TCF Programme. The costings for the three schemes are as follows: David Hall, Accountant, Ext 37 4086

6.2 Legal implications

n/a

6.3 Equalities implications

An Equality Impact Assessment is being produced for each scheme as part of the design process.

6.4 Climate Emergency implications

UK government figures show that transport was responsible for around 25% of all carbon emissions in Leicester. Following the council's declaration of a climate emergency in 2019 tackling these emissions is a vital part of our ambition for Leicester to reach carbon neutrality.

The TCF programme is a key part of the council's work to tackle emissions from transport through enabling sustainable transport options including walking, cycling and public transport. Sustainability comments have been provided on the road layouts of some of the TCF schemes, including on the need to consider sustainable construction materials and processes and the need for wider work to improve sustainable transport opportunities in the city to ensure delivery of the intended benefits.

Aidan Davis, Sustainability Officer, Ext 37 2284

6.5 Other implications (You will need to have considered other implications in preparing this report. Please indicate which ones apply?)

None.

7. Background information and other papers:

None

8. Summary of appendices:

Appendix 1 – TCF EDTT pre meet 18th February 2021 v1.3 (PowerPoint presentation)

9. Is this a private report (If so, please indicate the reasons and state why it is not in the public interest to be dealt with publicly)?

No

10. Is this a "key decision"? If so, why?

No