

ZERO CARBON HEADINGLEY TRANSPORT SURVEY REPORT



ZCH Transport Group June 2020

Introduction

Zero Carbon Headingley launched this survey on local transport in Headingley in April, publicising it through its own membership, the Headingley Development Trust membership, and on various social media. The aim is to gauge local opinion on possible measures to reduce traffic congestion in the area, and specifically along the A660 corridor.

A total of 286 responses have been received, the vast majority from residents living in LS6 (65%) and LS16 (26%) postcodes.

Summary of Results

Respondants were asked to give their opinion on proposals on a scale of 1 ("do not support") through 3 ("Neutral") to 5 ("fully support"). Eight proposals received very strong support with a mean score of over 4.5 and thirty five proposals had strong support with a mean score of over 4.0. Only one proposal received a negative response (less than 3.0) which was to ban all petrol and diesel vehicles within the outer ring road. A summary of the results follows and a full list of responses is given in the next section.

A Better Environment for Walking

The strongest support for pedestrian improvements are for:

- Higher priority for pedestrians at crossings
- A 20mph speed limit in ALL residential roads
- Removing obstacles to walking on pavements
- Make pavement parking a fixed penalty offence
- Enforce parking restrictions near schools and pedestrian crossings

- Plant more trees and shrubs alongside roads

Safer Cycling

The strongest support is for:

- A parking ban on cycle lanes
- A continuous safe cycle route into Leeds avoiding A660
- Continuous segregated cycle lanes along A660

Reducing the Volume of Traffic

There is very strong support for encouraging greater use of public transport. Specific measures include:

- Strict enforcement of parking ban in bus lanes
- More feeder bus services at local train stations
- New train stations (eg Otley, Pool, Horforth Woodside)
- Park and Ride at Lawnswood

There is less enthusiasm for continuous bus lanes along the A660 by widening the road, but the idea of a tidal bus lane gets strong support.

Introducing a congestion charge for vehicles coming into Leeds has slightly less support (score 3.84) but this is still a positive response.

Respondants Comments

These were many and varied and hard to summarise. However the need to enforce speed limits and parking restrictions is seen as a priority by many. The high cost of public transport is also an issue for many respondents.

Full Survey Results

	Mean Statistic
Making Headingley more attractive to pedestrians	
Q1.1 More priority for pedestrians at existing crossings	4.38
Q1.2 More places for pedestrians to cross	4.13
Q1.3 20mph speed limit on all residential roads	4.36
Q1.4 20mph speed limit on roads where there is significant pedestrian activity (e.g. Headingley Lane, North Lane, Kirkstall Lane, etc.)	4.20
Q1.5 Continue pavements across minor side roads and entrances (so that vehicles have to slow right down and pedestrians have obvious priority)	4.08

Q1.6 Provide wider pavements where this does not cause problems for buses or cyclists	4.21
Q1.7 Remove obstacles to pedestrian movement along pavements	4.38
Q1.8 Make parking on pavements a fixed penalty offence	4.34
Q1.9 Promote periodic street fairs etc. (changing the culture – streets are for people not vehicles)	4.26
Ways to encourage cycling	
Q2.1 Create continuous physically segregated cycle lanes on the A660	4.22
Q2.2 Create continuous safe cycle route into Leeds avoiding the A660	4.39
Q2.3 Provide more cycle parking places at the Arndale Centre	4.25
Q2.4 Strict enforcement of a parking ban in cycle lanes and along cycle routes	4.63

Ways to reduce congestion	
Q3.1 Encourage use of public transport rather than private cars (see detail in section 4)	4.56
Q3.2 Other ways of reducing the volume of traffic through Headingley (see detail in section 5)	4.45
Q3.3 Ban on-street parking near junctions and other pinch-points	4.60
Q3.4 Reduce delays to pedestrians and public transport at junctions by simplifying the traffic movements (e.g. by banning some right turns or creating one-way roads)	4.05
Q3.5 Restrict the size of delivery vehicles	3.79
Q3.6 Ban large vehicles (except buses) during peak periods	4.07

Ways to encourage public transport	
Q4.1 Use local taxes and levies to subsidize bus and rail fares	4.20
Q4.2 Use local taxes and levies to subsidize increased frequency/capacity on local rail services	4.12
Q4.3 Use local taxes and levies to fund evening/ night bus and rail services	4.01
Q4.4 ... by reducing the volume of traffic on the A660 (see detail in (section 5))	4.50
Q4.5 ... by strict enforcement of parking and waiting restrictions in bus lanes	4.73
Q4.6 ... by providing continuous bus lanes on the A660 - widening the road if necessary	3.57
Q4.7 ... by providing continuous bus lanes on the A660 - banning other through traffic at peak times if necessary	3.80

Q4.8 ... by giving buses priority as they approach junctions	4.22
Q4.9 ... by providing a tidal bus lane on the A660 where there is insufficient space for one in each direction	4.08
Q4.10 ... by banning taxis from bus lanes	3.51
Ways to reduce traffic volume	
Q5.1 Provide park and ride in the Lawnswood area	4.36
Q5.2 Provide more parking at suburban stations (e.g. Horsforth, Menston, Ilkley)	4.33
Q5.3 Provide more feeder bus services at suburban stations (e.g. Horsforth, Menston, Ilkley)	4.45
Q5.4 Open new rail stations (e.g. at Horsforth Woodside, in Otley, Pool and Arthington) with feeder bus services and/or on-site parking	4.58

Q5.5 Charge all private vehicles coming in towards Leeds from beyond the outer ring road (funds generated could be used to support public transport)	3.84
Q5.6 Charge more for parking in Leeds City Centre (funds generated could be used to support public transport)	3.66
Other environmental concerns	
Q6.1 Ban all petrol and diesel vehicles (including buses) within the outer ring road	2.80
Q6.2 Charge for use of petrol and diesel vehicles for any journey involving use of roads within the outer ring road	3.16
Q6.3 Ban heavy goods vehicles from roads inside the outer ring road (unless needing access)	4.07

Q6.4 Encourage “final mile” deliveries by electric vehicles or cycle and using local depots	4.24
Q6.5 Plant more trees and shrubs alongside roads	4.54
Q6.6 Enforce parking and waiting restrictions near schools and pedestrian crossings	4.69
Q6.7 Reserve on-street parking for residents and short stay parkers (e.g. max stay 2 hrs)	4.23
Q6.8 Leeds to adopt the international “No deaths on our roads” target, with annual reports on achievement	4.45
Difficult trade-offs	
Q7.1 Should physically segregated lanes be provided for cyclists even if this creates delay to buses?	3.23
Q7.2 Should the needs of pedestrians always get prioritised over those of cyclists?	3.65

Q7.3 Some local businesses and services need parking for their customers/clients. Should provision be made for this?	3.92
Q7.4 Some road closures, banned turns etc. would benefit the community but could disadvantage individual residents or businesses. Should the benefit to the community prevail?	3.76
Q7.5 Loss of healthy mature trees is undesirable but may be unavoidable to achieve other objectives – e.g. a continuous bus lane or cycle route. Should Headingley’s mature trees be considered sacrosanct?	3.28

Q7.6 While electric vehicles may be better for the environment, they do take up road space and parking spaces. Should their manufacture and use be encouraged even when they disadvantage public transport, cyclists or pedestrians?	3.01
--	------