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Executive Summary

The Leeds Station Southern Entrance (LSSE) is a proposed passenger access to provide a new direct pedestrian link between Leeds City Station and developments to the south of the railway viaduct, via Granary Wharf, Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street. It comprises a concourse deck situated over the River Aire within an enclosed building which provides pedestrian access via stairs, escalators and lifts to the western footbridge and upper concourse within the station. The building is to be supported on piers within the river and has link bridges to either bank and also to Dark Neville Street within the railway viaduct structure itself.

Mott MacDonald has been commissioned by Metro to provide planning advice and Transport Works Act Order (TWAO) documentation for the LSSE scheme. Mott MacDonald has also been commissioned to undertake a Traffic, Access and Urban Realm brief to develop a preferred option for urban realm improvements and traffic and access proposals to complement LSSE.

The operational assumptions for vehicular traffic and pedestrians on Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street are crucial to the case for the LSSE scheme; as the function of these streets and balance of pedestrians and vehicles will be significantly changed. This is important as part of any future representations or Public Inquiry in order to demonstrate that traffic and access (including pedestrians) links to LSSE and associated issues have been adequately considered in the TWA Order application process.

A preliminary scheme design (to Network Rail GRIP 4 stage) was developed by consultants AECOM and was reviewed as part of the Traffic, Access and Urban Realm brief. This preliminary scheme design included very limited proposals for improving pedestrian links to LSSE through enhancements to the eastern footway on Little Neville Street. As LSSE is to be a pedestrian entrance, any pedestrian links to it will be important in making it an attractive new facility for users by incorporating improvements in lighting, journey ambiance, urban realm and personal safety for these areas into the delivery of LSSE.

The traffic, access and urban realm proposals are an integral component of the LSSE scheme; this report provides a summary of that component, including an overview of key issues and the rationale behind the option selected. The proposed scheme outlined here, was selected by agreement between Leeds City Council (LCC), Network Rail and Metro after an initial selection exercise was concluded. The selection of this option and the specific details agreed was confirmed by Metro on 27th February 2012.

The selected option for Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street establishes a Pedestrian Zone on Little Neville Street and a segregated footway, providing a direct link between the LSSE eastern ramp on Dark Neville Street and the northern end of Little Neville Street.

The proposals also include improvements at the Neville Street / Dark Neville Street junction to formalise the existing two way access and provide footway build outs to narrow the entrance to reduce the pedestrian crossing distances. A form of access control (the form of which and its constraints are to be determined) is to be implemented at the northern end of Little Neville Street and the eastern end of Dark Neville Street.

The scheme also includes urban realm improvements on Little Neville Street, including the raising of the carriageway, gulleys and covers to provide low level kerb upstands to footway level and the resurfacing of the street with a mixture of sandstone setts and sprayed tar covered with (buff) stone chips finishes. The scheme proposals will also recover and reuse the existing black basalt setts from Little Neville Street to dress the edges of the Blue Apartments and Hilton Hotel buildings which are considered to be of historic value. Semi-mature tree planting (with uplighters and protective bollards to be installed) will also be provided to maximise the immediate impact of the changes.
A turning head will be provided at the northern end of Little Neville Street, although the turning head itself will not be formally laid out, but implied by the layout of the positioning of street furniture and planting. A loading bay designated for the use of the Hilton Hotel will be provided and a raised crossing table provided at the Little Neville Street / Neville Street junction, with traffic exiting Little Neville Street restricted to ahead movements only (i.e. directed to Sovereign Street, with no left or right turning permitted).

Although other options were considered in the initial development stages, the final proposal presented here provides an improved public realm for LSSE and other users, but balances this against the needs of existing users, residents and businesses using Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street.

The scheme uses a mixture of cost-efficient and high quality materials and finishes, used as appropriate, to maximise the urban realm benefits. The estimated cost for the (traffic access and urban realm) scheme is in the region of £321,000 (Q2 2012 prices), this costing is for the selected layout, preferred materials and finishes.

In addition to the costing of the preferred implementation of the scheme, alternative materials and finishes have been considered (for the same arrangement) to provide a cost range for comparison. This ranges from a minimum quality level to the highest possible specification, resulting in an estimated cost range of £253,000 to £420,000 (Q2 2012 prices).
1. Introduction

The Leeds Station Southern Entrance (LSSE) is a proposed passenger access to provide a new direct pedestrian link between Leeds City Station and developments to the south of the railway viaduct, via Granary Wharf, Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street. It comprises a concourse deck situated over the River Aire within an enclosed building which provides pedestrian access via stairs, escalators and lifts to the western footbridge and upper concourse within the station. The building is to be supported on piers within the river and has link bridges to either bank and also to Dark Neville Street within the railway viaduct structure itself.

Metro and Network Rail are together seeking powers for the LSSE scheme under sections 1(a) and Section 3(1)(b) of the Transport and Works Act Order (TWAO) process. In June 2011, the Department for Transport (DfT) confirmed that in order to authorise the construction and maintenance of the scheme, an application could be submitted for an order under the Transport and Works Act 1992 (“the 1992 Act”). Accordingly, an application has been prepared to be submitted to the Secretary of State for an order under sections 1 and 3 of the 1992 Act.

An order is required under sections 1 and 3 of the 1992 Act to authorise:-

a) the construction and maintenance of a new station entrance at Leeds Railway Station;

b) the carrying out of works in the Aire and Calder Navigation adjacent to the southern boundary of Leeds Railway Station and associated with a) above;

c) the carrying out of other works and the exercise of powers required in connection with or ancillary to the matters set out in items a) and b) above; and

d) the acquisition of land and rights over land required in connection with items a), b) and c) above.

The application is being promoted jointly by Metro and Network Rail Infrastructure Limited. In addition, a request for a direction as to deemed planning permission will also be submitted to the Secretary of State under section 90(2A) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. An application for conservation area consent is also being submitted in respect of works proposed to be undertaken at Water Lane, Leeds as part of the overall scheme. It is intended that an application for an order will be submitted to the Secretary of State in Spring 2012.

Consideration of the measures for pedestrians on Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street is crucial to the justification of the LSSE scheme as the function of these streets and balance of pedestrians and vehicles will be significantly changed with the implementation of LSSE. This will be important as part of any future representations or Public Inquiry to demonstrate that pedestrian links to LSSE and associated issues have been adequately considered in the TWA application preparation.

A preliminary scheme design (to Network Rail GRIP 4 stage) was developed by consultants AECOM and was reviewed as part of the Traffic, Access and Urban Realm brief. This preliminary scheme design included very limited proposals for improving pedestrian links to LSSE through enhancements to the eastern footway on Little Neville Street. As LSSE is to be a pedestrian entrance, any pedestrian links to LSSE will be important in making it an attractive new facility for users by incorporating improvements in lighting, journey ambiance, urban realm and personal safety for these areas into the delivery of LSSE.

A previous Transport Statement was produced to accompany the planning application which was granted approval in May 2010. The previous Transport Statement was produced by AECOM in September 2009.
As part of Mott MacDonald’s role as TWAO advisor the existing Transport Statement has been updated to adequately include the themes and level of detail normally be expected for a TWAO scheme of this type.

1.1 Structure of this Report

Following this section there are a further three sections which are outlined below, together with a summary of their content:

Section 2: Development Considerations

This section provides an overview of the scheme context, including the site location the details from the initial design and requirements considered in the option development. It also provides a preliminary assessment of the existing conditions and pedestrian and vehicle activity in the context of the LSSE proposals.

Section 3: Scheme Constraints and Opportunities

Section 3 summarises the constraints and opportunities identified during the, including the conditions in the planning permission for the scheme granted in 2010, other ongoing and development proposals in the immediate area, heritage considerations and access control measures likely to be required for successful implementation of the proposals.

Section 4: Proposed Scheme (Traffic, Access and Urban Realm Scheme)

This section provides an overview of the proposed scheme for the traffic, access and urban realm for LSSE, Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street. The design and its implications are discussed in detail, with the issues around rejected alternative component options summarised. Capital costings are also provided, based on the preferred scheme arrangements and materials selection. Additional costing scenarios varying the extent and quality of materials used are also developed to provide an indicative range of costs for the scheme.

Appendices

Appendix A – includes the traffic option development plans
Appendix B – presents the proposed scheme drawing
Appendix C – includes the record of the meeting with Leeds City Council on 17\textsuperscript{th} January 2012
Appendix D – includes a copy of the Leeds City Council Highways Board paper on the proposals
Appendix E – contains the drawing of the proposed (Leeds City Council) junction changes at the Neville Street / Sovereign Street and Little Neville Street junction as part of a separate scheme
Appendix F – includes the drawing of the proposed Hilton Hotel car park layout from the planning application
Appendix G – Alternative Options Drawings (Rejected)
2. Development Considerations

2.1 User Hierarchy Considerations

A user hierarchy below was used to assist the decision making process for the selection of the proposed scheme for its proposals for both Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street. The function of these streets will change when LSSE opens, with the emphasis of Little Neville Street in particular changing from one of traffic access to one more dominated by pedestrian usage. The suggested user hierarchy below would help accommodate this shift in role, with the highest given more highway space and priority:

1. Pedestrians (highest)
2. Cyclists
3. Residents and employees of properties on Little Neville Street
4. Loading and servicing of adjacent buildings
5. General traffic should it be permitted (lowest)

Information has been provided by LCC on the appropriateness of the user hierarchy described above and its use on Little Neville Street. Appendix C of the Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3) includes details of the proposed (and currently draft) user hierarchy to be applied to the ‘key route network’ in West Yorkshire. This document contains the following statement; “For those roads and streets not identified as part of a key route, the hierarchy for considering different road user groups identified in Manual for Streets will apply.”

It has been established that Little Neville Street is not on the list of ‘key routes’. However the following statement from LTP3 Appendix C is appropriate in using any hierarchy;

“The user hierarchy is deployed to ensure: that the needs and safety of each group of road users are considered in a common sequence when a scheme is being prepared; that each group of users is given proper consideration, in line with LTP3 strategy and local planning objectives; and that trade-offs between groups are considered in a transparent manner. This approach does not mean that users at the top of the list will always receive the most beneficial treatment at any given location. The order of consideration will be determined by the location of a proposed improvement on the key route networks as defined earlier. Nevertheless, all schemes should be designed to the appropriate design standards, taking account of all relevant user groups, and in particular vulnerable users.”

Additionally the Leeds Street Design Guide (SDG) states the following;

“A street caters for the movement of pedestrians and cyclists, vehicular traffic, servicing and access arrangements as well as less dynamic functions such as occasional car parking and landscape features. Well designed streets should accommodate all functions and purposes (including provision for utility services, street lighting and drainage), and their inter-relationship should be considered from the outset. However the emphasis should be on people movement based on the following hierarchy of consideration, with the needs of the disabled, the elderly, and children to be taken into account for all modes:

1. Pedestrians
2. Cyclists
3. Public Transport Users
4. Specialist Service Vehicles (e.g. Emergency services, waste, etc)
5. Other motor traffic.”
It can therefore be seen that the proposed user hierarchy is appropriate for Little Neville Street but it should be borne in mind that any design must provide for essential functions and demonstrate that all users of Little Neville Street have been considered.

## 2.2 Site Location

### 2.2.1 Wider Context

![Figure 2.1: LSSE Strategic Schematic](source)

The proposed LSSE scheme is to be located over the River Aire (Aire & Calder Navigation) to the south of Leeds City Station. The structure is to be joined to the existing station viaduct and connected via wings to the east and west banks of the river and via a new footbridge to Dark Neville Street.

### 2.2.2 Local Streets

Little Neville Street is an adopted highway under the control of the local highway authority (Leeds City Council). Little Neville Street connects to Neville Street at its eastern end, and Dark Neville Street at its northern end. It provides pedestrian access, including to a footbridge over the River Aire, the UKI building, Blue Apartments building and Dark Neville Street via an arch in the railway viaduct. Vehicular access is provided to an underground car park (UKI building), the Blue Apartments and the rear of the Hilton Hotel.
There are 5 pay and display car parking spaces in Little Neville Street and it is understood that these are well used by disabled users.

Figure 2.2: LSSE and Little Neville Street Environs

Dark Neville Street is a private road situated within the railway station undercroft and is owned by Network Rail. It has gates at its connection with Little Neville Street although it is understood that these are not generally closed. At its west end it crosses the River Aire on a bridge although this has a weight restriction of 3 tonnes and appears to be currently closed to all vehicular traffic. At its east end it connects with Neville Street and is the minor arm of a priority T-junction. Dark Neville Street is primarily used to access the car parking spaces in the arches within the undercroft, situated to either side of the road.

From on-site observations it would appear that Little Neville Street is used in conjunction with Dark Neville Street as a loop route for some vehicles. It is noted that Dark Neville Street could be closed (for example at the gates to Little Neville Street) to pedestrians and vehicles by the owner Network Rail.

2.3 Existing GRIP4 LSSE Proposals

A preliminary scheme design (to Network Rail GRIP 4 stage) was produced by consultants AECOM and has been reviewed as part of the Traffic, Access and Urban Realm brief.

The previous Transport Statement (AECOM) contains a’ Proposed Improvements’ chapter which discusses options for a vehicular drop-off area for passengers on Little Neville Street. Such a drop-off area would
require traffic to be routed in a loop via Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street as turning vehicles around in the highway at this location after the available space is reduced by the drop-off facility would be difficult. The drop-off proposals have been reviewed in conjunction with the scheme Promoters and are not considered to be appropriate in the context of the current scheme for the following reasons:

- The previous (and now updated) pedestrian flow modelling indicates that of the 20,000 passengers expected to use LSSE on a daily basis, a large proportion will traverse Dark Neville Street. The drop-off facility would significantly increase the number of vehicles on Dark Neville Street and is likely to lead to queuing traffic and congestion. This would result in an increased likelihood of conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles albeit in a low speed environment.

- Traffic congestion on Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street may result in pedestrian intimidation in what would be a car dominated environment with vehicles jostling to drop off passengers. There is concern about the attractiveness of the LSSE access routes to pedestrians, and this may negatively impact on the number of users.

- Queuing vehicles on Dark Neville Street in proximity to large numbers of pedestrians may be a concern given the confined nature of the road in the undercroft, and potential for worsening of air quality in that locality.

- Queuing vehicles on Dark Neville Street may block access to the car parking within the undercroft and this may lead to concerns from Network Rail (infrastructure owner) over possible impacts on their attractiveness to users and long term revenue potential.

- Queuing vehicles on Little Neville Street may block access to the UKI car park and the Blue Apartments, potentially leading to objections and increased scheme delivery risk.

- A large through movement of vehicles on Dark Neville Street from a drop-off facility on Little Neville Street may compromise on the viability of any future retail aspirations on Dark Neville Street.

- A dedicated vehicular drop-off facility exists on the north side of the station, at Princes Square located only a few minutes away for vehicles travelling from the south.

It was therefore recommended that a vehicular drop-off facility should not be provided for LSSE and that control measures should be taken to prevent pick up and drop offs occurring on Little Neville Street or Dark Neville Street.

### 2.4 Design Elements Adopted and Rejected

#### 2.4.1 LCC Scheme at Neville Street / Little Neville Street junction

LSSE is likely to increase the number of pedestrians wishing to cross Neville Street, in particular towards Sovereign Street and the Asda headquarters building. Updated pedestrian flow modelling would be useful to better quantify the level of demand for an additional crossing. However, a junction improvement scheme to provide an additional signalised pedestrian crossing over Neville Street, at its junction with Little Neville Street and Sovereign Street, is currently under development by Leeds City Council (LCC). It is likely that the LCC proposals could also be developed to make Little Neville Street less attractive to general traffic through prohibited movements at its junction with Neville Street. The proposed LCC measures for the junction are included in Appendix E.
2.4.2 Taxi Provision

It is envisaged that taxis would want to gain access to Little Neville Street to pick up and drop off passengers. Due to the large number of taxis on New Station Street, taxi drivers may see Little Neville Street as a convenient location to pick up a fare where they do not have to join the back of a long queue, as they do on New Station Street.

There are very limited opportunities (due to space constraints) to provide a taxi rank on Little Neville Street. Therefore any such facility would require careful vehicle management by a marshal to help avoid congestion. Given the limited room for vehicle storage and turnaround (should access to the Dark Arches (Dark Neville Street) be blocked as part of local traffic management) it is suggested that a taxi rank is not appropriate for LSSE.

If a taxi rank were provided it is likely that passengers on many of the southern platforms would follow taxi signs directing them to use LSSE when they could equally well use the taxi rank at the main entrance, adding to congestion in the station and on Little Neville Street. LSSE is intended to be a pedestrian access point and not an alternative route to a further taxi rank.

2.5 Existing Conditions

2.5.1 Route alongside the Hilton Hotel

A narrow alleyway is located between the Hilton Hotel and the railway viaduct and runs between Little Neville Street and Neville Street. This alleyway is currently used for parking (assumed to be associated with the Hilton Hotel), refuse storage and refuse compactors. There are also fire exits opening onto the alleyway from the Hilton Hotel and the rear of the railway viaduct arches.

The use of this alleyway has been considered as a possible additional pedestrian route to LSSE from Neville Street. However this route is generally unpleasant, being confined by tall buildings on either side, populated with refuse collection bins and partially oversailed by concrete balconies which appear to be in a poor state of repair and on occasion drip water into the alleyway. Substantial and costly improvements may be needed to sufficiently improve this route for formal pedestrian usage. Using the CPO powers within the TWAO to acquire this land from the Hilton Hotel may adversely affect their building management and parking for which re-provision in the immediate vicinity may be required.

Alternative pedestrian routes exist via Dark Neville Street and Little Neville Street and it is proposed to enhance these (as part of LSSE) to provide more emphasis on walking routes. Given the alternatives available, cost and likely operational issues for the Hilton Hotel, it is not recommended that land between the hotel and railway viaduct should be acquired for use as a pedestrian route.

2.5.2 Parking on Little Neville Street

There are currently five formal pay and display parking spaces on Little Neville Street operated by LCC. These are likely to be lost as a result of LSSE scheme proposals. In discussions LCC has indicated that it would not object to this. If the LCC view changes or it becomes an issue during public consultation, re-
provision of the parking spaces may be possible within an arch off Dark Neville Street although this would need to be agreed with Network Rail.

2.5.3 Granary Wharf

The western bank of the river and the area between the River Aire, the Leeds and Liverpool Canal and the station viaduct has recently been redeveloped as Granary Wharf. This development includes three large buildings, Watermans Place, the DoubleTree formerly the Mint Hotel) and Candle House, and usage of some of the railway viaduct arches for retail purposes.

The Watermans Place development is located on the west bank of the River Aire and is the closest building on Granary Wharf to the proposed location of LSSE. Watermans Place includes apartments and also several cafes, restaurants and commercial properties on the ground floor. The DoubleTree (Mint) Hotel is located to the west of Watermans Place, across the Graving Dock. The third building on the Granary Wharf development is Candle House which is located to the west of the Mint Hotel and has 160 residential apartments. A public house (The Hop) is located in two arches of the station viaduct and a restaurant (Wasabi Tepanyaki) is located in two arches to the west of the public house. These two properties have an area to the front of the viaduct which is reserved for tables and alfresco drinking and dining.

The Granary Wharf area is a pedestrianised area with servicing and loading to the properties via Wharf Approach. There is currently no right of way through the Granary Wharf area except for access to the parking areas under the station for the Doubletree Hotel and the residential developments. However as the area is currently a pedestrianised and pedestrian dominated space it is considered that no further improvements works are required to improve the pedestrian link to the western wing of LSSE.

2.5.4 Wharf Approach / Canal Wharf

Wharf Approach and Canal Wharf are adopted highways under the control of the local highway authority (Leeds City Council) and provide pedestrian and vehicular links to Granary Wharf from Water Lane and Holbeck Urban Village on the south side of the Leeds and Liverpool Canal.

A Grade II listed bridge over the canal provides access from Wharf Approach to Granary Wharf and is pedestrianised with pedestrian only areas demarked on either side of the bridge adjacent to the bridge parapets. A sign on the bridge states that it has a 5 tonne weight restriction but it is understood that the bridge was strengthened as part of the Granary Wharf development to accommodate construction traffic although the new weight restriction it is not currently known.

2.5.5 Vehicle Usage on Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street

Traffic flows were observed on Little Neville Street on Wednesday 7

th

December 2011 during the AM and PM peak periods. These flows are shown in Figure 2.3 below.
Figure 2.3: Observed Traffic Flows AM - PM Peak December 2011

**AM Peak 08:00 to 09:00**

**PM Peak 17:00 to 18:00**

- Dark Arches - Undercroft Car Park
- Little Neville Street
- UKI Underground Car Park

Source: Metro
The following figures provide a graphical analysis of the vehicle types, type of trip, direction of travel and the parking that was observed taking place on Little Neville Street. The figures shown are the total flows for the period 07:00 to 18:00 on Wednesday 7th December 2011.

**Figure 2.4:** Observed Traffic Flows - Vehicle Type (07:00 to 18:00)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Type</th>
<th>Flow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGV</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGV</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Metro

**Figure 2.5:** Observed Traffic Flows - Type of Trip (07:00 to 18:00)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Trip</th>
<th>Flow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive through only</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver / Loading</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Metro

**Figure 2.6:** Observed Traffic Flows - Direction of Travel (07:00 to 18:00)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Flow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DNS to LNS</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNS to DNS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Metro

**Figure 2.7:** Observed Traffic Flows - Parking (07:00 to 18:00)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Method</th>
<th>Flow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using Dark Arches car park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using UKI underground car park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Metro

The results show that the predominant vehicle traffic is the car, of which the greater proportion is accessing parking in the area, in particular at the UKI Building. There is also a balance of traffic flows in both directions between Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street, and the total flows recorded are considered low when compared to the flows on Neville Street.

### 2.5.6 Pedestrian Usage on Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street

Pedestrian flows were observed on Dark Neville Street on the 15th, 16th and 17th December 2011 during the AM and PM peak periods and inter-peak periods. Figure 2.8 below provides a graphical analysis of the flows for the three time periods. The AM peak period was surveyed on 15th December, the inter-peak period on 17th December and the PM peak period was surveyed on 16th December 2011.
In addition to the observed pedestrian flows in Figure 2.8 above; the consultant Hyder have undertaken future year modelling assessments for LSSE which assumed that 90% of LSSE users will route to/from LSSE via the link bridges, with the remaining 10% using the back entrance onto Dark Neville Street. The percentage split of pedestrians using the ramps or the stairs to gain access/egress to Dark Neville Street has not been indicated.

Based on these Hyder entry/exit distributions for Leeds City Station and the assumed distribution of pedestrians generates the forecast pedestrian flows for the LSSE exits shown in Table 2.1. This indicates that the forecast usage of Dark Neville Street and Little Neville Street would grow significantly and highlights the importance of consideration of the traffic, access and urban realm issues at these locations.

### Table 2.1: LSSE Flow Total Entry/Exit Passenger Distribution by Accesses (2029)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>West</th>
<th></th>
<th>East</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enter</td>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>Enter</td>
<td>Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark Neville Street</td>
<td>AM Peak Period</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM Peak Period</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granary Wharf</td>
<td>AM Peak Period</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>2,048</td>
<td>1,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM Peak Period</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>3,199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hyder - Pedestrian Modelling and Assessment 2012
2.6 Public Realm – Existing Conditions and Opportunities with LSSE

This section identifies the key issues with the existing public realm as well as identifying opportunities which have informed the development of the public realm design option.

2.6.1 Current Public Realm Issues

A brief analysis of the existing urban space at Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street reveals the following issues:

- highly constrained footpath space and poor walking surface on the existing basalt setts
- carriageway levels – high kerbs make access for all users challenging
- poor quality lighting for evening use and low perception of personal safety
- surfacing - a plethora of surfacing types create a lack of visual coherence
- poor quality rear elevation to the Hilton Hotel

There are, however a number of positive attributes to the space:

- despite new buildings, the street retains the scale of an historic street
- a gateway to Granary Wharf over the new footbridge
- some apparently historic materials (basalt setts) remain

Many of these issues can be seen on the existing site photographs.

2.6.2 Public Realm Issues and Opportunities with LSSE

There are predicted to be around 20,000 pedestrian movements per day through the Southern Entrance which amounts to more than one pedestrian every second passing through the space at peak times. If the LSSE proposal went ahead without improvements to the public realm, passengers exiting the station would be faced with arriving in a space that is visually confusing, is difficult to orientate within, looks uncared for and would be forced on to narrow footways by service vehicles making complex manoeuvres. This would not give an appropriate impression of Leeds or the new landmark southern entrance facility.
If the public realm were to be improved there are several opportunities for bringing benefits to this area of Leeds:

- creation of an attractive, safe link to key areas such as Neville Street and Holbeck Urban Village
- opportunities to re-balance Little Neville Street in favour of the pedestrian while maintaining service vehicle access
- opportunities to reference historic and new high quality materials at Granary Wharf (sandstone & granite) to create a public realm that sits well with the contemporary character of the new LSSE building
- opportunities to improve the rear façade of The Hilton Hotel bringing benefit both to the space and The Hilton, works to this end should seek separate funding/sponsorship

The illustration below shows some of the existing challenges with the space as well as the potential to create greatly improved links to key areas of the city.

Figure 2.9: LSSE Site Context
2.6.3 LCC’s Ten Urban Design Principles

The preferred option proposals discussed in section 4 sit well with many of Leeds City Council’s Urban Design Principles. For example:

1. **Investing effectively - good design is good business:**
   - The proposed LSSE will bring more people to the area and the public realm works will improve impressions of this part of Leeds while providing a robust yet adaptable design solution. The increased footfall should improve the viability of businesses in Dark Neville Street and the surrounding areas.

2. **Involving the community – make places for (and by) people:**
   - Public consultation has not yet been part of the public realm element of LSSE but the public realm caters for all and provides a people focussed space.

3. **Regenerating throughout Leeds – close the gap and move forward:**
   - The design will bring more life to this corner of Leeds and improve the quality of this mixed use area of Leeds.

4. **Delivering sustainable solutions – provide for future generations:**
   - The design specifies British sandstone and the intent would be to source other materials locally. The design is simple and timeless with materials that are high quality and repairable reducing the need for expensive refurbishments. The design is aims to improve the experience of people using public transport.

5. **Creating excellent new places – taking a visionary approach:**
   - A design that is simple, clean lined and high quality and will undoubtedly change perceptions of these streets creating somewhere that is attractive, vibrant and safe.

6. **Improving existing identity – analyse and enhance the existing character:**
   - The space responds and respects the existing street character and takes account of new movement patterns as a result of LSSE.

7. **Connecting places – create visual and physical links:**
   - The design very much responds to peoples’ movement, guiding them through and connecting to parts of Leeds well beyond the project boundary.
3. Scheme Constraints and Opportunities

3.1 Overview

In the development of the proposed scheme for Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street a number of constraints and opportunities were identified. These included the conditions in the planning permission for the scheme granted in 2010, other ongoing and development proposals in the immediate area, heritage considerations and access control measures likely to be required for successful implementation of the proposals. These issues are summarised in this section.

3.1.1 Current Planning permission

A grant of full planning permission for LSSE was given on 13th May 2010. This planning permission includes several conditions related to access to LSSE by pedestrians and any improvement works on Little Neville Street. The planning permission expires in May 2013 if the development is not begun by that time. As this is likely to be the case the TWAO will include for deemed planning consent for the scheme, however it is likely that similar conditions to those shown below will be included. The relevant conditions are provided in full below;

17) Unless otherwise agreed in writing, prior to the first use of the station access, details of the provision of the following shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority;
   a) Provision of pedestrian signage to the southern access from agreed routes
   b) Enhancements to CCTV coverage in Granary Wharf
   c) Provision of extra litter bins in Granary Wharf.
   Works in connection with the above shall be carried out prior to the first use of the station access, and retained as such thereafter.
   In the interests of pedestrian connectivity, community safety, amenity and visual amenity.

It is accepted that new pedestrian signage will be required to the LSSE along the main pedestrian routes, namely Dark Neville Street, Little Neville Street, Granary Wharf and Neville Street. Conditions b and c may equally apply to Little Neville Street, particularly in the light of providing a public realm space. Therefore the provision of CCTV and litter bins should be included in the final design.

18) Prior to the commencement of works, and unless otherwise agreed in writing, details of the arrangements for the provision of the following off-site highways works as indicated on AECOM drawing no. 60092600/705 revision A shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
   a) Dropped kerbs at appropriate locations to ease mobility impaired transit from Neville Street to the entrance
   b) Re-painting of double yellow lines along Little Neville Street and the lay-by
   c) Re-surfacing of the pavement on Little Neville Street where required
   d) Removal of steel gates at the arch entrance to Dark Neville Street (non-dedication plate or lockable bollards to be provided)
   e) Improvements to the footway, lighting and CCTV coverage along Dark Neville Street as far as the arch exit to Little Neville Street.
   In the interests of community safety, visual amenity and vehicular and pedestrian safety.

The scheme is designed along ‘shared space’ principles with a minimal upstand of 30mm and flush crossings and dropped kerbs are to be provided where appropriate. It is proposed that a Pedestrian Zone is implemented on Little Neville Street and therefore the double yellow lines will no longer be necessary.
Additionally it is proposed that all of Little Neville Street is re-surfaced rather than simply the pavement indicated on the plan referenced in the conditions.

The final form of the access control proposed between Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street required by Network Rail is to be considered and confirmed in the final design stages. This may take the form of bollards as suggested in the conditions or a similar arrangement which will permit authorised access between Little Neville Street and Dark Neville. The requirements for improvements to lighting and CCTV along Dark Neville Street from LSSE to Neville Street, which should also include Little Neville Street will also need to be incorporated into the final design.

19) Prior to the commencement of development, details of facilities to be provided for the parking of cycles which belong to members of the public shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the method of securing the cycles and their location within the site. The approved facilities shall then be provided on site prior to the building being brought into use and thereafter retained on site.

In order to meet the aims of the Transport Policy as incorporated in the Leeds Unitary Development Plan.

Cycle parking facilities are currently provided on the western river bank where the western wing will tie in. It is proposed that these cycle parking facilities are relocated within the Granary Wharf development and that there may be potential to provide additional facilities in the improved public realm area on Little Neville Street.

3.1.2 Hilton Hotel

The Hilton Hotel has planning consent to convert and existing but unused casino area on the basement level into a car park (proposals shown in Appendix F). The consent is to provide 25 spaces with entry to the car park via the front of the building and the existing car park access, and egress via the alleyway between the Hotel and the rail station viaduct. The Transport Statement associated with the planning consent predicts that there will be five vehicle movements in the AM peak and one vehicle movement in the PM peak from the car park onto Little Neville Street via the alleyway. Therefore the design needs to accommodate these vehicles movements and the movement from the car park onto Little Neville Street.

Additionally it is understood that should the scheme proceed some cowling would be removed from the building and louvers replaced along the Little Neville Street elevation so helping to improve the appearance of the street.

3.1.3 Future redevelopment

It is understood that there may be an opportunity in the future to redevelop Dark Neville Street and convert the arches, currently utilised for parking, to retail use. At present it is understood that this is a long term aspiration of Network Rail. It is likely that if redevelopment does occur then general vehicle movements along Dark Neville Street may be restricted, therefore any design proposed as part of LSSE needs to be flexible so that redevelopment on Dark Neville Street could take place in the future. The design proposed maintains the existing access arrangements and is capable of further expansion of the urban realm should this be required at a later date.
3.1.4  **Evening activity and passive surveillance**

It has been advised that although Leeds City Station is open 24 hours, the operating hours for LSSE may be limited with LSSE closing in the late evening; with access to the station then reverting to the entrances / exits on New Station Street and Wellington Street. The current conditions on Dark Neville Street, including the limited lighting and passive surveillance during the evening may be of concern to passengers and are included in the planning conditions.

Options including further safety and security improvements along Dark Neville Street have been recommended; these improvements might include: additional lighting, signage, tactile paving and delineators for assisting blind and visually impaired users. These improvements are to be considered at the detailed design stage as part of the package of works on Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street as supplementary mitigation.

3.1.5  **Raising level of road and impact on car park ramp and joining Neville Street**

The proposed improvements on Little Neville Street follow ‘Shared Space’ principles and include minimal (30mm) kerb upstands between any footway and carriageway levels. The footway level on the south side of Little Neville Street appears to be currently set by the height of the basement for the UKi Partnerships building, which is below. Therefore it will not be possible to lower the footway level in this area and the minimal upstand is to be achieved by raising the level of the carriageway. This will be more difficult on the east to west leg of Little Neville Street due the large existing level difference.

Raising the level of the carriageway will have an impact on the ramped access into the UKi Partnerships car park. The ramp will need to extend further into Little Neville Street to maintain the same gradient. It is considered that this issue can be resolved as the footway on the south side of the east to west leg of Little Neville Street is to be widened and this will create the additional space to extend the ramp.

3.1.6  **Granite Cobble Setts on Little Neville Street**

The southern half of Little Neville Street is surfaced with granite cobble setts. The Leeds City Council Heritage Officer is of the opinion that the setts may have significance and therefore resurfacing over them is not an option. This has provided the opportunity to consider re-use of the setts within the proposed design, where they are used to delineate the edge of carriageway and footways around the existing buildings.

3.1.7  **Access Control Measures for Dark Neville Street**

After consultation with Network Rail on their requirements for Dark Neville Street (which is in private ownership, owned by Network Rail); it has been agreed that access control measures will be provided on Dark Neville Street at its junction with Neville Street; to only allow access for authorised vehicles to the parking under the rail station.

Additionally it is proposed that access control measures will also be provided at the northern end of Little Neville Street in the arch linking through to Dark Neville Street. In exceptional circumstances this will allow large servicing vehicles through access between Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street.

The combination of these two access controls will exclude any unauthorised vehicles from accessing Dark Neville Street or Little Neville Street and will strongly discourage any drop off or pick up related activity. It
is considered that these measures will consolidate and regulate the existing activity on these roads and reduce any unnecessary vehicle movements.

The exact form of the access control measure has not been specified at this stage, but is to be confirmed at the detailed design stage. It may take the form of a physical barrier such as an automatic arm combined with a key pad or swipe card facility.

Whatever form the access control measure takes it is envisioned that a parking attendant from the underground parking area, members of British Transport Police or other authorised attendants would be able to override the system to allow access for emergency vehicles. Additionally if servicing or delivery vehicles require access they would be provided with the means to gain entry or an attendant will be able to allow access. It is envisioned that staff at the Hilton Hotel, UKi Partnerships, the Golf Bar and residents of the Blue Apartments will have access to both barriers.
4. Proposed Scheme

4.1 Proposed Layout

The section provides an overview of the proposed scheme for the traffic, access and urban realm for LSSE, Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street. The arrangement for the proposed scheme is shown in Figure 4.1 below, incorporating both the LSSE traffic, access and urban realm proposals and the Leeds City Council proposals for the Neville Street, Little Neville Street and Sovereign Street junction.

The design and its implications are discussed in detail in the following sections, with the issues around rejected alternative components summarised. Capital costings are also provided, based on the preferred scheme arrangements and materials selection. Additional costing scenarios varying the extent and quality of materials used are also developed to provide an indicative range of costs for the scheme.

Figure 4.1: Proposed Scheme

The proposed arrangement includes the following elements:

- **Dark Neville Street segregated footway** – a sprayed tar & (buff) stone chips treated designated footway demarked by thermoplastic white lining to provide a direct link between the LSSE eastern ramp in Dark Neville Street and the northern end of Little Neville Street.
The Leeds Railway Station (Southern Entrance) Order
Traffic, Access & Urban Realm

- **Neville Street / Dark Neville Street junction** – will be developed to formalise the existing two way access and provide footway build outs to narrow the entrance to reduce the pedestrian crossing distance. This also provides a sheltered route for pedestrians on the south side of Dark Neville Street away from the main traffic flows. A form of access control (the form and constraints) is to be determined at the detailed design stage.

- **Little Neville Street / Dark Neville Street junction** – a form of access control (the form and constraints) is to be determined at the detailed design stage.

- **Little Neville Street** – replacement powder coated contemporary tapered LED lighting columns along full length. Carriageway, gulleys and covers to be raised to provide 30mm upstand to new silver grey granite kerbs at existing footpath level. Black basalt setts recovered from Little Neville Street to dress edge of Blue Apartments and Hilton Hotel buildings. Semi-mature tree planting (with uplighters and protective bollards to be installed).

- **Little Neville Street (north-south section)** – footways and carriageways laid out using sandstone setts paving. Turning head to be provided at the northern end to permit provided and demarked by street furniture and tree planting only.

- **Little Neville Street (east-west section)** – Carriageway and footways on southern half of Little Neville Street to be treated with tar spray and (buff) stone chips.

- **Little Neville Street (east-west section, south side)** – painted stainless steel 1.1m high bollards for the protection of UKi Partnerships basement/cellars.

- **Little Neville Street (east-west section, north side)** – designated loading bay for the Hilton Hotel.

- **Little Neville Street / Neville Street junction** – raised crossing table flush with adjoining footways to provide flush crossing point, to be treated with sandstone sett paving. Traffic exiting leaving Little Neville Street restricted to ahead to Sovereign Street only (no left or right turning permitted).

- **Neville Street** – additional and amended street signage for revised junction layout and access arrangements.

- **Hilton Hotel rear façade** – opportunity for artwork/cladding to be pursued as part of other schemes. Existing ramped door access re-faced in facing brick with sandstone coping and 1.1m high painted railing top.

### 4.2 Proposed Traffic and Access Arrangements

#### 4.2.1 Operation of the Local Highway Network

The through movement of unauthorised vehicles between Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street is proposed to be blocked by the provision of a physical means of access control (the details of which are to be determined at the detailed design stage). Little Neville Street is proposed to be converted to a ‘Pedestrian Zone’ with pedestrian friendly surface style treatment. It is considered that there will be a slight reduction to current traffic flows on Little Neville Street due to the proposed changes and as a result of the proposed access control measures on Dark Neville Street.

In addition to this, it is also proposed that access to Dark Neville Street from its junction with Neville Street will also be restricted by physical measures in order restrict traffic to authorised vehicles to reduce or avoid safety and environmental impacts of the introduction of LSSE.
4.2.2 Little Neville Street

Little Neville Street will remain as two-way operation and become a ‘Pedestrian Zone’ with a prohibition of driving (motor vehicles only) with specified exemptions to permit access to the users of the UKI underground car park, the Blue Apartments, the Hilton Hotel and general service access. Vehicular access onto Dark Neville Street from Little Neville Street and vice-versa will be blocked via physical means of access control (exact details to be determined).

This is to prevent the through movement between these two roads which would facilitate a drop-off / pick-up movement which is to be discouraged. It is also to prevent access and egress to the car parking spaces within the station undercroft via Little Neville Street in order to reduce potential conflicts in the ‘Pedestrian Zone’. This access control barrier should not impede the movement of pedestrians or cyclists.

A turning head will be provided on Little Neville Street in the immediate vicinity of the Railway Viaduct. It would not be delineated by a kerb, but by street furniture, bollards and trees. This would mean that during general operation the turning head space would be part of the wider public realm improvements.

It has been agreed with Leeds City Council that Little Neville Street will be designated as a ‘Pedestrian Zone’ with an exception for access to off-street properties and for loading by goods vehicles restricted to outside of the peak periods. This will reflect to drivers of vehicles passing through Little Neville Street that the space is pedestrian dominated and that vehicles should proceed with caution. Providing multiple access deterrents such as a ‘Pedestrian Zone’, signage and pedestrian friendly surface and layout, would all help reinforce the message to vehicle drivers that unauthorised users should not be on Little Neville Street and that authorised users should proceed with caution.

The Pedestrian Zone will include prohibition of driving except for access to off-street premises and for loading by goods vehicles between specified times on Little Neville Street. The Pedestrian Zone will operate between 7am and 10pm and loading activities at the proposed loading bay on the east-west section of Little Neville Street will be restricted between 7am and 10am and 4pm and 7pm.

In addition the Pedestrian Zone will not include any yellow lining on street, the requirement for which is negated but the ‘No Parking At any time’ plate on the Pedestrian Zone sign. An advance warning sign to the Pedestrian Zone may be provided on Dark Neville Street to provide advance warning to drivers turning into Dark Neville Street from Neville Street.

4.2.3 Little Neville Street – Alternative Options Considered

Alternatives forms of access control were also considered, the merits and disadvantages of these alternatives are outlined below:

- **Bollards (only)**: the use of bollards (lock down type to minimise potential maintenance liability) situated at the north end of Little Neville Street adjacent to the railway viaduct was considered as a means to provide the access control identified. This form of bollard could be dropped to allow access for emergency and maintenance vehicles or to help provide an exit route if a large vehicle becomes stranded on Little Neville Street.

  Bollards would not prevent vehicles from accessing Little Neville Street, dropping off passengers and attempting to turnaround within the highway. If a turning head was also provided this would encourage
vehicles to drop-off passengers and the turn-back manoeuvre would in itself cause greater levels of congestion both on Little Neville Street and onto Neville Street and disrupt traffic on the City Centre Loop which may in turn lead to wider highway network effects. Little Neville Street would then be a car dominated environment and may not be attractive to pedestrians.

Access to the UKI car park and Blue Apartments may also be disrupted by traffic congestion and was considered potentially give rise to scheme objections and increased delivery risk for the overall LSSE scheme.

- **Bollards and TROs**: the use of bollards (lock down type to minimise potential maintenance liability) situated at the north end of Little Neville Street, enhanced through the use of Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) comprising of:
  - ‘No Waiting No Loading at any time’ TRO restrictions along the length of Little Neville Street in conjunction with a ‘Loading Bay’ TRO to serve the Hilton Hotel if required
  - ‘No Waiting No Loading within prescribed hours’ TRO restrictions (for example 7am to 7pm) along the length of Little Neville Street.
  - A Pedestrian Zone would be created on Little Neville Street, except for access to off-street premises. The definition of this would require careful consideration to prevent LSSE being included within the permitted access and this should be discussed with the highway authority.
  - Highly visible signage at the entrance to Little Neville Street making it clear that only vehicles accessing the properties on Neville Street are permitted to use it, for example the UKi Partnerships car park.
  - A change in surface type along Little Neville Street to help change the perception to a shared space environment and discourage vehicles from using the street

Although the combination of signage, possible change in surface type, and new TROs would reduce the potential for vehicular drop-off but would not prevent it. In addition enforcement of the TROs would be a resource commitment from LCC and concerted efforts may be required at peak times to discourage inappropriate activities to maintain a quality urban environment which is attractive to passengers. The residual risk from the potential level of use of Little Neville Street (and contravention of TROs) is a risk on the project and may manifest itself as an objection at Public Inquiry.

- **Protected Pedestrianised Area (Bollards and TROs)**: the provision of a protected pedestrianised area utilising bollards at the north end of Little Neville Street, TRO restrictions and a further set of bollards on Little Neville Street. The TRO restrictions along Little Neville Street would be as per the scenario above, except between the 2 sets of bollards where a ‘Prohibition of Driving’ would apply. These complementary TROs would be required to minimise congestion issues.

The bollards proposed in this scenario would prevent any vehicle from being in proximity to LSSE (the nearest point being near the existing footbridge) and this is likely to discourage drop-off. Also the turnaround for vehicles would be difficult and would discourage users, as it may be quicker (particularly at peek periods) to travel to the existing drop-off facility at the north end of the station.

As with other options considered the TRO enforcement would require a resource commitment from LCC and concerted efforts may be required at times to discourage inappropriate activities to maintain a quality urban environment which is attractive to passengers.

With this arrangement contravention is less likely, providing excellent opportunities for urban realm improvements and changing the focus of Little Neville Street from vehicles to pedestrians. However the
balance of needs of existing users and urban realm benefits of this arrangement is not balanced. The use of turning head is constrained and would negatively impact the residents, businesses and servicing arrangements in the immediate area. This was considered likely to give rise to objections from affected parties which could be sustained through a Public Inquiry and would be a risk to delivery of the scheme.

- **One-way routing – Dark Neville Street-Little Neville Street Loop:** this variant considered the conversion of Little Neville Street to form a one way loop via Dark Neville Street. This would allow servicing and essential access to off street premises and the undercroft parking on Dark Neville Street but restrict access to Dark Neville Street in order to prevent potentially large numbers of vehicles using it to drop off passengers at LSSE.

A barrier could be provided at the eastern end of Dark Neville Street to limit access to authorised users only for the purposes of access to car parking spaces in the undercroft or permitted users from Little Neville Street. Whether or not barrier control was implemented on Dark Neville Street this variant includes barrier control at the north end of Little Neville Street to allow access only on a permit basis to authorised off-street premises and for essential servicing.

This arrangement would restrict the numbers of vehicles permitted to traverse Little Neville Street; and provided numbers were sufficiently low, the carriageway could be included within a shared space area potentially extending for the length of the street. This arrangement may also negate the need for loading and parking TRO and its consequential enforcement.

The barrier control would need to be of a type that minimised delay to authorised users entering the restricted area so as to reduce any blocking back onto Neville Street. The ongoing maintenance liability of this arrangement was noted; although this may be offset to some extent by the reduced need for TRO enforcement.

The arrangement also allows any large servicing vehicle to be accommodated (except 16.5m HGVs), and would remove the need to provide a turnaround facility and allow the space to be used for public realm improvements.

Although the option appears to offer a satisfactory solution, the one-way routing requires the continual availability of Dark Neville Street to allow traffic to exit Little Neville Street. Dark Neville Street is a private road and access could be terminated by Network Rail without the agreement of Metro, this would then compromise the LSSE scheme with this urban realm layout.

To protect against this, rights would need to be sought (in the TWAO) for vehicles (description to be determined) to be permitted along Dark Neville Street, however it is understood that obtaining these rights for third parties raise concerns as they may potentially interfere with existing access rights and may impact on the abilities of Network Rail to maintain their infrastructure.

- **Full Closure:** Full closure of Little Neville Street to vehicles was not considered to be feasible as:
  - access is required to the underground car park for UKi Partnerships
  - servicing / loading is required for the Hilton Hotel and the Blue Apartments building.
  - additionally the Hilton Hotel has planning permission for a new underground car park with an access on to Little Neville Street via a narrow alley between the Hotel building and the railway viaduct.
Closure of the full length Little Neville Street to vehicular traffic was considered to be likely to give rise to objections from affected parties which could be sustained through a Public Inquiry and would be a risk to delivery of the scheme.

4.2.4 Dark Neville Street

Currently vehicles are free to use Dark Neville Street as an access route to Little Neville Street albeit via a private road (owned by Network Rail). It is predicted (in the ‘Pedestrian Modelling and Assessment’ report) that the LSSE will accommodate 9,000 to 10,000 pedestrians in a three hour peak period by 2029, with a large proportion using Dark Neville Street. This represents a significant increase in the number of pedestrians on Dark Neville Street and there is concern that mixing this number of pedestrians with the current parking access may lead to road safety issues and/or congestion issues.

The future function of the street will become predominantly pedestrian dominated (section between LSSE and Little Neville Street) when LSSE is implemented due to the large flows of pedestrians. The current road surface effectively operates as a ‘shared space’ as there are currently no kerbs; however the function of the street is currently vehicle dominated with little to no provision for pedestrians.

Unless access controls are implemented to restrict vehicular access along Dark Neville Street it is likely that significant numbers of vehicles would use the route for vehicular drop off at LSSE resulting in safety implications, environmental impacts and congestion. Network Rail has agreed to the principle of some form of access control along Dark Neville Street although the details and implementation will be resolved at a later stage. Any access control measure on Dark Neville Street would need to set back from the junction with Neville Street so that a large vehicle could safely wait at the access control measure without extending back into Neville Street.

It is proposed that a 3m wide, pedestrian route / ‘safe space’ is provided along the south side of Dark Neville Street connecting LSSE with Little Neville Street. It is recommended (although not provided for in the current promoted scheme) that this demarcated pedestrian route is extended along the south side of Dark Neville Street between Little Neville Street and Neville Street.

4.2.5 Dark Neville Street – Alternative Options Considered

Alternatives for Dark Neville Street were also considered, ranging from conversion to shared space, a pedestrian route and full closure. The merits and disadvantages of these alternatives are outlined below:

- **Shared Space**

  Provision of a formal shared space solution to manage the interaction of the pedestrians and vehicles was considered. The current road surface effectively operates as a shared space as there are currently no kerbs; however the function of the street is currently vehicle dominated with little to no provision for pedestrians.

  This conflicts with the future function of the street as a pedestrian dominated environment. Careful consideration would need to be given to the urban design of Dark Neville Street and how a shared space scheme could deliver equitable use of the street for the users. It is likely that requisite improvements would include: additional lighting, signage, safe pedestrian areas, tactile paving and delineators for assist disabled users.
The extent of the area to be converted to a fully treated shared space setting was far larger than for other solutions considered and with the high quality aspirations of the scheme was considered likely to be cost prohibitive.

Also the LSSE scheme MSBC predicts that it will accommodate 10,000 to 20,000 pedestrians per day with a large proportion using Dark Neville Street. The mixing of this significantly higher level of pedestrian numbers on Dark Neville Street and the current vehicle parking and servicing access movements in an enclosed and fully developed shared space environment would require extensive mitigation against the significant road safety issues and/or congestion issues which remain.

- **Segregated pedestrian route**
  The arches on either side of Dark Neville Street are currently used by a private car parking company, with the arches on the south side being less extensive as those on the northern side. The southern arches have the potential for between 2 and 10 vehicles per arch, depending upon the size of the arch.

  The entrance/exit to LSSE on Dark Neville Street is on the south side of the street and it is believed that pedestrians would access LSSE predominantly from the south side of the street.

  One of the main safety concerns is the interaction between pedestrians walking along the south side of Dark Neville Street and vehicles turning into and out of the arches on the south side of the street. The provision of a segregated pedestrian route by the closure of the arches on the south side of Dark Neville Street would remove this potential conflict. It would then be possible to demarcate a pedestrian route along Dark Neville Street connecting LSSE with Neville Street.

  Access to the parking arches on the north side of the road would be maintained by providing a two way access route on the northern side of Dark Neville Street. Alternatively given the low traffic volumes from the southern arches and low level of interaction with pedestrians is low, vehicle access for parking could be maintained if the safety concerns were address appropriately.

  In effect the proposed scheme provides a partial application of the segregated route, providing a route between the LSSE ramp and the northern end of Little Neville Street. However a full application of the route to connect to Neville Street would potentially conflict with the access arrangements for the parking in the southern arches.

- **Full Closure**
  Consideration was also given to the scenario whereby the safety and possible congestion concerns between LSSE pedestrians and parking vehicles could not be adequately addressed by the use of shared space or segregated routes. The full closure of Dark Neville Street to all traffic apart from servicing traffic was considered.

  Given the volume of parking on the northern side of Dark Neville Street, and the potential revenue for Network Rail, it is likely that access (via whatever route) to this area of car parking would need to be maintained to minimise the potential revenue loss to Network Rail from closure of Dark Neville Street.

  In order to maintain the access to the parking arches on the northern side of Dark Neville Street, use the servicing access on the west side of Neville Street to the north of Dark Neville Street was considered. On inspection all of the parking arches appear to be blocked at a point before they meet the servicing access from Neville Street. Further investigation would be required to establish if the blocked access
could be reinstated and access provided but together with the urban realm improvements and modifications to Little Neville Street, this solution was thought to be cost prohibitive.

4.2.6 LCC Scheme at Neville Street / Little Neville Street junction

A junction improvement scheme to provide signalised pedestrian crossing facilities over Neville Street at its junction with Little Neville Street and Sovereign Street is under development by Leeds City Council (LCC). This scheme also includes for a prescribed ahead only movement on Little Neville Street onto Sovereign Street which would make Little Neville Street less attractive to general traffic as they would have to take a convoluted route to proceed in a southerly direction.

4.2.7 Car Park Facilities and Capacity

There are currently five formal pay and display parking spaces on Little Neville Street operated by LCC. These parking spaces will be lost as a result of LSSE scheme proposals. Discussions have taken place with the local highway authority, LCC, and they have indicated that they would not object to the loss of these spaces. If the LCC view changes or it becomes an issue during public consultation, re-provision of the parking spaces may be possible within an arch off Dark Neville Street.

4.2.8 Drop-off and Pick-up Area

A vehicular drop-off facility is not provided for LSSE in the current scheme and control measures are to be taken to prevent any drop off / pick up activity in the vicinity of the entrance. Also control of drop-offs and pick-ups is to be pursued further afield with the introduction of Traffic Regulation Orders on Canal Wharf and Wharf Approach to limit waiting and loading.

4.2.9 Loading and Servicing

The maintenance of the LSSE will be via both the local road network and the River Aire. General cleaning requirements, including window cleaning of the glazed front of the LSSE will be via Dark Neville Street. It is understood that a small mobile platform will be employed, which will be positioned on the balcony on the front of the station entrance. This will then be used to clean the glazing.

Servicing on Little Neville Street will be during specified hours as set out in the Traffic Regulation Order for the ‘Pedestrian Zone’.

4.3 Proposed Scheme Public Realm Concept

The overall concept of the proposals is to produce a scheme that places the pedestrian at the heart of the public space, uses simple uncluttered design with high quality detailing and materials that will stand the test of time.

4.3.1 Paving

Paving materials have been selected to be physically robust to withstand vehicle movements and turning manoeuvres. Their colour, buff/sandstone, has been selected to provide a warm, mid-tone, welcoming feel to the space. They have also been selected as being widely available and simply replaced/repaired as required to ensure an acceptable lifespan. All paving is to be installed on a full carriageway construction.
4.3.2 Street Furniture

Street furniture in this space is unlikely to be used for long – it is not a space to dwell in but an active, transition space. The street furniture proposed would have clean simple lines, be straightforward to maintain and serve the double purpose of visually defining traffic movement for pedestrians and vehicles.
4.3.3 Street Lighting

Street lighting is crucial to the space being adopted and used by people on winter mornings and for those leaving or arriving at the station later in the evening. The proposal is to use contemporary pedestrian level lighting (6-8m high maximum) with white light for good colour rendition and improved perceptions of safety. Lighting would essentially replace the existing columns with new.
4.3.4 Planting

Semi-mature tree planting with uplighters are proposed for a number of purposes but in particular for humanising and softening the space. Other key benefits brought by the tree planting are:
- the planting layout subtly informs a key pedestrian movement through the space
- trees appear in the forefront of people’s view as they leave LSSE drawing attention away from the rear of the Hilton – planting has been reduced close to the façade so as not to be jeopardised should The Hilton choose to re-develop
- visually narrow the street with the potential to slow and calm traffic movements
- bring seasonal variation and contribute to biodiversity
- high quality detailing of tree pit to ensure longevity
4.3.5 Signs

Some minimal signage is suggested at the decision point between Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street to orientate travellers arriving here. It is envisaged that these directional signs would be provided by Network Rail but sign design should be clear, contemporary and in keeping with LSSE and the public realm street furniture.

Source: www.woodhouse.co.uk/geo-signage-fingerpost.html  
Source: www.woodhouse.co.uk/geo-signage-fingerpost.html
4.3.6 Hilton Hotel Building Facade

The rear elevation and north elevation present a real challenge for this open space. The scale of the façade is such that it cannot avoid impacting on the space. The Hilton may choose to redevelop the site in the future but even if they do not there are opportunities to work in conjunction with the Hilton for their benefit as well as that of the space.

As LSSE comes into use there will be massively increased visibility for The Hilton in this prime City Centre location. With this potential market in mind, it may be feasible to encourage The Hilton to contribute to façade improvements. These could be the form of an artwork or wrap/cladding-architecture that both promotes The Hilton and animates the space day and night.

Photo 4.13: ‘Light’ Neville Street

Source: www.maap.org.uk/?page_id=8

Photo 4.14: Millennium Stadium, Cardiff

Source: destinations.hilton.co.uk/sisp/index.htm?fx=destination&loc_id=131927

4.3.7 Selected Materials and Finishes

In order to meet these aspirations the proposed treatment scheme uses a mix of cost efficient and high quality materials to maximise the urban realm benefits in the areas where they are most needed (an overall ‘medium’ quality level). The areas in which specific materials and street furniture types and their application are provided below:

- Dark Neville Street
  - footpath to be surfaced in tar spray and natural stone (buff) chips
  - flush granite kerb/trim along southern edge of Dark Neville Street
  - the form of physical control on both the entrance to Dark Neville Street and to Little Neville Street is to be confirmed at a later design stage

- Little Neville Street
  - black basalt setts laid in a diagonal pattern to along eastern ‘carriageway’ edge and buildings (reclaimed from existing streetscape)
  - silver grey granite kerbs with 30mm upstands
  - sandstone sett paving (northern end and entrance at Neville Street)
  - tar spray and natural stone (buff) chips (southern end)
  - turning head defined by street furniture and planting only
  - the creation of an at-grade crossing to the exit from Little Neville Street

- Street Furniture and Planting
  - replacement contemporary (powder coated) LED lighting columns
  - semi-mature planting
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- painted stainless steel bollards to protect cellars/basement of UKi Partnerships
- silver grey solid granite benches
- silver grey granite bollards at Blue Apartments servicing access

The proposed scheme was selected as the preferred option as from a public realm perspective it meets the Network Rail requirements for the ability to restrict access to Dark Neville Street, but would allow further development, e.g. conversion to one-way operation, if required at a later date.

The proposal offers a significant gain in terms of pedestrian space, but maintains the turning head space on Little Neville Street and access for residents and business on Little Neville Street. The key features of the scheme are:

- the raising of the existing carriageway to provide pedestrian friendly space allowing free movement across footpath and carriageway
- the creation of an at-grade crossing to the exit from Little Neville Street
- focusing of higher quality finishes and tree planting in the larger area of public open space near LSSE
- the combination of high quality natural stone products with less costly widely available highway materials to create an attainable but high quality scheme – all paving is on a full carriageway construction
- re-use of existing basalt setts laid to diagonal pattern
- the retention of bollards on the southern section of Little Neville Street on the assumption that cellars/structure need protecting
- the use of a 30mm kerb check to assist with drainage
- the design of a carriageway layout that can be converted to a one-way layout by simply removing the access control on Dark Neville Street.
- the use of contemporary, well detailed street furniture, tree planting and lighting

However, it should be noted that the detailed layout and access control arrangements and materials for the Dark Neville Street / Neville Street junction are to be developed and confirmed in conjunction with Network Rail at the detailed design stage.

4.3.8 Consideration of Alternatives

During the initial discussions and exploration of options within the design team and with the Promoters, Leeds City Council and Network Rail a number of alternatives schemes were considered, with the materials and finishes for selected for each being based on the specific layout and operational characteristics of the proposal.

Broadly these public realm concepts and materials selections can be categorised by the overall ‘quality’ proposed, but with various combinations of levels of Urban Realm ‘quality’ and Materials ‘quality’:

- **Minimum Quality Level**
  - **Urban Realm**: Options which propose minimal change to the existing urban realm to minimise the impacts on existing vehicle traffic movements, servicing operations and third parties. These compromises may lead to a limited improvement in the public realm and potentially missing opportunities to improve the existing environment and maximise the potential benefits of LSSE.
  
  - **Materials**: Utilising cost efficient materials, such as tar spray and stone (buff) chip surfacing, throughout. Use of inexpensive but widely used materials combined with high quality finishes and fittings to present a realistic minimum level of development.
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- **Proposed Quality Level (Medium Quality)**
  - **Urban Realm:** Options which propose modest changes to the existing urban realm, such as maximising footway widths and introducing elements of shared spaces, improving the quality of the urban realm, but balancing the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicular traffic. Where possible the urban realm improvements and benefits are maximised without prejudicing other user or third party needs and providing a good environment with the introduction of LSSE.
  
  - **Materials:** Utilising a mixture of cost efficient and high quality materials where appropriate to balance durability, quality and cost demands of the overall proposal.

- **Highest Quality Level Throughout**
  - **Urban Realm:** Options which propose significant or radical changes, such as closure of Little Neville Street (except for access) to the existing urban realm and potentially have a significant impact on existing vehicle traffic movements, servicing operations and multiple third parties.
  
  - **Materials:** Utilising high quality materials, such as sandstone paving, throughout to maximum urban realm benefits.

4.4 **Capital Costs**

4.4.1 **Assumptions and Exclusions**

The following assumptions and exclusions have been used to develop the cost estimates;

1. It is assumed that excavation is into hard material
2. It is assume that sufficient quantity of black basalt cobbles are reclaimed from Little Neville Street for re-use
3. It is assumed that all depths of construction are according to standard pavement construction guidance.
4. Assume that 90% of excavated material is inert with a 10% allowance for disposal of hazardous material
5. Assumed that the electronic traffic barrier is to be 6m wide and will be controlled via intercom.
6. Assumed that a new power supply will be required for the electronic traffic barrier
7. Assumed that crocodile teeth - flow restrictors, will be sunk into the existing road surface.
8. Assumed that the trees will be semi-mature as they will be in a city centre environment
9. Assumed that a small crane will be required for installation of the granite benches
10. It is assumed that the lighting columns will use tapered powder coated columns with LED light fixings, 6m in height and use the existing power supply.
11. It is assumed that the Trees will have 2 in ground up-lighters and 2 granite bollards per tree. Assumed that lights can be connected to the existing power supply.
12. The cost estimate excludes any artwork or cladding to the rear of the Hilton
13. It is assumed that 5 number gulley's and covers will need modifications/ raising.
14. It is assumed that the new pedestrian crossing on Little Neville Street will be signalised.

4.4.2 **Costing**

Table 4.1 below details the cost estimate for the proposed treatment of Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street; an estimating certainty of +/- 30% has been used which this level of accuracy being considered appropriate at this concept stage of the design.
The costing of the proposed scheme reflects its use of a mixture of cost efficient and high quality materials and finishes as appropriate for the urban realm areas in relation to LSSE; this maximises the urban realm benefits in the areas where they are most needed (giving a ‘medium’ quality level overall). This includes the use of sandstone sett paving for surrounding LSSE and along the northern section of Little Neville Street and at the entrance to Little Neville Street from Neville Street; with a natural stone (buff) chip finished to the asphalt carriageway and footways on the southern areas of Little Neville Street.

### 4.4.3 Consideration of Alternatives

In addition to the costing of the proposed design, two other costing scenarios have been developed to allow different ‘quality of materials’ options to be assessed, based on the proposed layout design. These scenarios were used as a basis to identify alternative treatments, should the selected materials and finishing option prove not to be within the budget envelope for Urban Realm proposals associated with LSSE and other options would need to be considered; or if higher quality materials and finishes could be provided within the budget.

The three costing scenarios considered were:

- **Minimum Quality Level**
  This scenario represents a low cost option using cost efficient materials. This scenario would be as per the preferred quality level (proposed scheme) but all areas of sandstone surfacing would be replaced with the spray and chip surfacing throughout.

- **Proposed Scheme (Medium Quality Level)**
  This scenario represents a medium cost option using a mix of cost efficient and high quality materials to maximise the urban realm benefits in the areas where they are most needed. This is the preferred scenario as outlined in Section 4.

- **Highest Quality Level Throughout**
  This scenario represents a high cost option using high quality materials and maximum urban realm benefits. This scenario would be as per the preferred quality level (proposed scheme) but all areas of spray and chip surfacing would be replaced with sandstone surfacing throughout.

Table 4.2 below provides a comparison of the costs for the proposed option and the lower and higher quality scenarios considered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Quality Level</td>
<td>£253,230.12</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>£194,339.39</td>
<td>£312,120.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Scheme</td>
<td>£321,320.43</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>£246,594.75</td>
<td>£396,046.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Quality Level</td>
<td>£420,181.32</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>£322,464.74</td>
<td>£517,897.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix A. Traffic Option Development Plans
Appendix B. Traffic & Urban Realm Proposal
1. New kerbline to be Charcon eco-kerb.
2. Granite kerb to be silver grey granite, 300mm wide x 200mm deep.
3. Trees to be 30-35cm root ball 3x1.2x1m deep tree pit, uplift with 2no. in-ground uplighters and 2no 300x300x900mm granite protective bollards per tree.
4. Granite benches to be silver grey 400x750x1000mm set in 750mm wide silver grey granite feature trim.
5. Granite bollards, silver grey 300x300x900mm.
6. Replacement contemporary lighting columns using tapered powder coated columns with LED light fittings to head.
7. Screen to be 2.25m high louvred aluminium effect painted galvanized steel screen. e.g. Orsogril Talia 80.
8. Sandstone paving to be Greenmoor rustic (flamed finish) 200x300x200mm on instarmac (or equivalent).

Key to symbols:
- Stainless steel bollards
- Granite bollards - see note 5
- Granite bench - see note 5
- Lighting columns - see note 6
- Semi-mature tree - see note 3
- Sandstone sett paving - see note 8
- Asphalt with tar spray and natural stone drip finish
- Black basalt setts reclaimed from Little Neville Street laid to a diagonal pattern
- Red tactile paving

This map is based on Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty’s Stationery Office. © Crown copyright and database rights 2012 Ordnance Survey 100020521
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Appendix C. RoM with LCC 17/01/12
1. AN reviewed scheme, reasons for considering improvements on Little Neville Street and work do date.

Following a meeting between Jason Smith and Andrew Farnworth (NR) it has been accepted by NR that access control could be provided on DNS to restrict access and that vehicles proceeding onto LNS could utilise DNS.

2. MP reviewed LCC work to date, board paper and outcome of the highways board meeting.

The board paper selected Option 2, bollards at the end of LNS and Pedestrian Zone, as the preferred option. The main issues highlighted with the one-way option, Option 5, were related to taking rights over Network Rails land.

The Highways Board largely accepted the findings in the paper but highlighted some concerns with vehicles dropping off / picking up on Canal Wharf and Wharf Approach.

Has the LCC design for the Neville Street / Sovereign Street junction been finalised?

Thinks that a decision has been made but will check and send through CAD file of agreed design.

3. MB discussed possible options for the Hilton Hotel site in the future but it was agreed that this should not have a bearing on the option progressed as the redevelopment of the site is uncertain at present.

4. There is an issue with proposals for the cobble granite setts on LNS. The Heritage Officer (Phil Ward) thinks that they may have significance but has not yet looked at them in detail. MB will discuss.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the proposals with Phil. A separate meeting may be required to discuss the Urban Realm proposals with Phil Ward. Consideration of re-use of the setts may need to be made in the costing of options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>JM presented x3 Urban Realm options based on those identified in the highways board paper prepared by MP and discussed previously at the inception meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Option 1 – Two way option on LNS with bollards between LNS and DNS. Provision of a pedestrian orientated surface (spray and chip) on both the footway and the carriageway with a colour contrast stone kerb with 25mm upstand. The current footway alongside the Hilton Hotel is narrow so would look to remove and widen the footway on the other side of LNS. The stone setts could be re-used as trim around the base of the Hilton Hotel. With the minimal kerb upstand and the same surfacing for the footway and the carriageway the space will encourage the free movement of pedestrians’. The corner on LNS has been tracked to accommodate the large refuse vehicle (Phoenix) from the Leeds Design Guide. Possibility of using a band of setts at the entrance to LNS to reinforce the change in character of the street. May need to provide a build-out to maintain inter-visibility on the pedestrian crossing of LNS at the junction with Neville Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Option 2 – One-way option with access control on DNS. Option proposes to provide PCC on the footway and spray and chip on the carriageway with a 25mm upstand kerb to define the two areas. The surfacing extends into DNS to provide a dedicated pedestrian facility on the south side of DNS. Use of a high quality granite kerb to define the different surfaces/areas. Provision of trees with up-lighters to improve the area in the winter months / evenings. Bollards and street furniture to define the vehicle turning head but generally minimal use of street furniture. Possibility of maintaining the kerb line alongside the Hilton Hotel on the east to west section of LNS to provide the pedestrian inter-visibility at the junction with Neville Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Mark questioned whether the materials used on LNS and DNS should match those used on Granary Wharf (York stone).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would a Pedestrian Zone still be needed on LNS if access control was provided on DNS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Yes as it would ensure that LNS is a pedestrian space and it would future proof the street if retail development occurs on DNS and LNS has to be changed back to a two-way street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Option 3 – Two way on LNS as in Option 1 but with stone sett surfacing and provision of pedestrian facility on DNS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option included to allow a range of costs to be examined. This option will represent a higher cost option and allow comparison with the other options which include lower cost surfacing materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the PCC surfacing was replaced with stone sets in Option 2 it would be more acceptable to the Heritage Officer and would not be as expensive as Option 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Possible issues with spray and chip surfacing for maintenance, particularly on the corner where vehicle turning movements may wear the surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spray and chip surfacing would be cheaper and easier than resin bound gravel which is the alternative surfacing in the Leeds Design Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Could granite sets be used on the corner where there are vehicle turning movements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Possibility of using colour chip product (coloured aggregate laid on top of a coloured binder material). A patch of this surface material has been trialled on Marshall Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AT to send through details and JM to investigate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A 30mm kerb upstand is specified in the Leeds Design Guide. JM to update design when appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The east to west section of LNS will need to be raised to meet the footway level. If the c/way level was raised and the kerb line was moved, this would help with the levels at the UKI car park entrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widening the footway on the southern side of LNS will allow the ramp to be extended into the UKI Partnership building car park to tie in with the raised carriageway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>A ramp will need to be provided at the end of LNS to tie the raised...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **12** | MP | Issue of tourist (hotel direction) sign within the footway on Neville Street, to the south of LNS. This sign is mounted on two posts and can obstruct pedestrian movement.  
The sign could be positioned on a cantilever post to reduce the obstruction.  
The sign could be relocated and could reduce sign to only show hotel for right turn. |
| **13** | MP | At what stage is it appropriate to approach the Hilton Hotel with the proposals, with particular respect to an opportunity for screening their building possibly with a self-promotion opportunity? |
| **14** | AN | Is a signalised pedestrian crossing required across LNS at the junction with Neville Street?  
The pedestrian crossing is likely to be green most of the time (if Option 2) as it will run with the main line flow. Pedestrians may come to assume that they always have a green man aspect and cross against the red man aspect.  
General feeling that pedestrian signal control is not needed across LNS. Also there will be no signalised pedestrian crossing on Sovereign Street at the junction with Neville Street.  
Will speak with UTC regarding the need for a signal controlled pedestrian crossing on LNS and also ensuring that sufficient ducts are allowed for one-way operation during the planned junction improvements. |
| **15** | MP | Do the risks to Statutory undertaker’s equipment need to be investigated?  
Statutory undertaker’s equipment is held on the ftp site and has been looked at with regard to the options presented. There is no need for stats diversions, only raising of stats covers etc. Considered that there is no undue risk to stats. |
Appendix D. LCC Highways Board Paper
Report to The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation)

Date: 7 February 2012

Subject: Leeds Station Southern Entrance Transport and Works Act Order Submission

Summary of main issues

1. Leeds City Council is a funding partner in the proposed £14.4 m Leeds Station Southern Entrance (LSSE) scheme which received Programme Entry from the Department for Transport (DfT) in 2011 following a submission by promoter Metro in partnership with Network Rail. Construction is expected from summer 2013.

2. To construct and operate this complex scheme on a very constrained site, Metro is pursuing the necessary powers using a Transport and Works Act Order (TWAO). To meet the agreed DfT funding profile, the TWAO application needs to be submitted in March 2012. Whilst LCC has the opportunity to object to the order, it is clearly in LCC’s interest to avoid this by reaching ‘in principle’ scheme approval with Metro before submission, subject to the following of due processes.

3. The scheme provides a new pedestrian entrance and it is anticipated to attract up to 20,000 people movements per day. A significant proportion of these people are expected to use Little Neville Street, which is a narrow cul-de-sac. Without any changes to traffic restrictions, it is likely that Little Neville Street will become congested with vehicle drop-off and pick-up activity including taxis for which it is unsuited. This activity would be detrimental for pedestrian safety, amenity, traffic congestion, noise and air pollution.

4. Several options have been considered for managing this activity whilst retaining essential access and servicing needs. It is recommended that Little Neville Street be converted to a Pedestrian Zone with exemptions. This will require the loss of five pay and display parking bays and the associated revenue. Physical works are also
proposed to Little Neville Street to support pedestrian access for which a funding package is being developed. This street redesign is likely to be a one-way loop comprising Dark Neville Street and Little Neville Street as this option provides the safest layout and provides the opportunity to better manage vehicle access.

5 From the outset it was recognised that it was agreed between Metro and Network Rail with the Council’s support that the new entrance is not intended to provide the full range of station facilities and is intended to be a pedestrian only entrance, and which in any event was not considered to be feasible or desirable. Also given the volume of access traffic for the station it was considered that this was best managed and signed at the main entrances where it can be properly managed. Therefore the strategy is not to encourage such use in any way. Surrounding streets have been reviewed and as a result changes are proposed to waiting and loading restrictions on Canal Wharf / Wharf Approach.

Recommendations

6 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:
   i) confirm agreement in principle for Metro to promote changes to Little Neville Street through the Transport and Works Act Order application, namely introduction of a Pedestrian Zone and (subject to Network Rail agreement) conversion to one way operation;
   ii) confirm agreement that no other permanent highway or transportation interventions are expected at this point in time for inclusion within the Transport and Works Act Order application, other than a more restrictive waiting and loading regime on Canal Wharf and Wharf Approach; and
   iii) note the requirement to engage with Metro regarding funding of the proposed works on Little Neville Street and with Network Rail regarding access arrangements on Dark Neville Street.

1 Purpose of this report

1.1 In March 2012, Metro and Network Rail intend to submit a Transport and Works Act Order (TWAO) application to build and operate the proposed Leeds Station Southern Entrance (LSSE). This deadline is required to meet the objective of delivering the scheme within the current funding period for completion no later than 2014-15.

1.2 As highway measures were conditions and not explicitly agreed when the current planning consent was granted, this report is intended to minimise the risk that Leeds City Council will have any cause for objection to the TWAO application on highway grounds.

1.3 The report therefore requests approval to the inclusion of a Pedestrian Zone on Little Neville Street and conversion to one-way operation, within the TWAO application and to confirm that changes are not currently expected to be required on other parts of the adopted highway, explicitly as a result of the new station
entrance, other than a more restrictive waiting and loading regime on Canal Wharf and Wharf Approach.

1.4 While it is accepted that some further work is required to refine the proposals, consideration of the scheme presented in this report will allow LCC to provide formal feedback for the West Yorkshire ITA Board when they meet to consider endorsing the LSSE TWAO Application. The ITA Board meeting is planned at present for 24 February.

2 Background information

2.1 The Leeds Station Southern Entrance will deliver a new pedestrian only entrance and facilities for Leeds Station which is expected to attract up to 20,000 people movements per day. A significant proportion of these people are expected to use Dark Neville Street (Network Rail owned) and Little Neville Street (adopted highway). This entrance will be a secondary entrance to the station and is designed to support the high footfall of passengers with destinations in the South Bank of the city centre and Holbeck. Facilities for motorised traffic will remain at the primary entrances off New Station Street and Aire Street.

2.2 Details of the scheme are provided in the Metro briefing provided at Appendix A. The key points being that:-

- The scheme obtained planning consent in 2010 but it will expire before construction, so new consent is required.

- Metro is proposing to seek deemed planning consent through a Transport and Works Act Order which will provide the necessary consents to build and operate the scheme. It may, however, require a Public Inquiry.

- The programme is determined by the DfT funding profile for financial completion in 2014/15 as the funding cannot be ‘carried over’ to subsequent financial years. Construction will need to commence in summer 2013 with a 2014 opening. Programme slippage would jeopardise the scheme.

2.3 The LSSE timescale means that the West Yorkshire ITA needs to approve the TWAO submission when they meet on 24 February 2012, to meet the March submission deadline. It is therefore desirable that LCC’s official view on highway matters is confirmed to Metro before the ITA Executive Board meet.

2.4 As shown on the proposed station floorplan in Appendix A, there are three station access points:-

i) Onto Dark Neville Street;

ii) Footbridge ('wing') eastwards to Little Neville Street; and

iii) Footbridge ('wing') westwards towards Granary Wharf.

2.5 Little Neville Street is a narrow adopted cul-de-sac which joins Neville Street at Sovereign Street. At its other end is Dark Neville Street a private street which is owned by Network Rail, from there which has a gated access into Little Neville
Street although practice appears to be to leave the gates open to traffic. Dark Neville Street runs parallel within and underneath the station in the ‘dark arches.’ Thus a loop comprising Dark Neville Street and Little Neville Street is available for traffic from Neville Street. Surveys show that some vehicles such as goods vehicles currently use this loop to avoid turning around. Parking is restricted on Little Neville Street by double yellow lines except in five pay and display bays. Loading is not restricted and occurs regularly for the Hilton Hotel. The UKI building has an underground car park accessed off the south side of Little Neville Street. There is a relatively new footbridge spanning the River Aire which connects into Little Neville Street adjacent to the UKI car park entrance.

2.6 The Hilton Hotel has recently obtained planning consent to implement parking on the ground floor of their premises which includes a vehicle exit onto the alleyway between the hotel and the railway viaduct. Vehicles would then exit onto Little Neville Street. Although not yet implemented, any removal of this ability will be very likely to trigger an objection from the Hilton Hotel.

3 Main issues

3.1 Scheme justification and option selection

3.1.1 Without any changes to restrictions, it is likely that Little Neville Street will become congested with vehicle drop-off and pick-up activity including taxis. This activity would be detrimental for pedestrian safety, amenity, noise and air pollution.

3.1.2 In addition, there are concerns that the drop-off and pick-up activity could adversely affect the operation of the Neville Street / Sovereign Street junction. This is especially likely if vehicles turning left into Little Neville Street have their path blocked by parked or jostling vehicles on Little Neville Street near Neville Street.

3.1.3 It is therefore proposed to restrict this activity to provide a suitable, safe environment for pedestrians (in particular), whilst maintaining servicing and access and seeking to maintain an appropriate street environment. To manage the activity described, several options have been considered. At this point in time it is not possible to be definitive about the full scheme design because:

i) Network Rail needs to be engaged in the design process as the design partly depends on whether they want to restrict vehicles on Dark Neville Street; in particular whether they are prepared to grant a right of access along it for vehicles using Little Neville Street.

ii) Metro has recently commissioned a study to assess, design and cost the urban realm on Little Neville Street and this work is not currently complete (partly due to NR engagement).

3.1.4 Appendix B contains details on the expected issues and the options considered including the matter of taxi access to Little Neville Street. After due consideration it is considered to be inappropriate and hence it is proposed to include taxis within the proposed access restrictions (i.e. taxis will not be permitted to use Little Neville Street when any vehicle movement restrictions are in force).
3.1.5 One of the options considered in Appendix B is conversion of Little Neville Street to one-way operation. Discussion with Network Rail indicate they accept the principle of creating a one-way anti-clockwise loop using Dark Neville Street and Little Neville Street. Such a scheme would address any safety concerns regarding vehicles turning around on Little Neville Street. The TWAO process would secure access rights through Network Rail land for occupiers of the Blue Apartments, the hotel and the UKI building. This one-way option is shown as Variant B in Appendix C.

3.2 Design proposals and full scheme description.

3.2.1 Notwithstanding the early stage of the design work, it is proposed that the scheme introduce a Pedestrian Zone restriction on the entire length of Little Neville Street as this is a common element of the shortlisted options. From experience in the City Centre core, Pedestrian Zone signing on the entrance to Little Neville Street would have a deterrent effect.

3.2.2 Traffic surveys have been undertaken on Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street to help identify the most appropriate form of the restrictions. Observations on street suggest that there will need to be signed exemptions to allow the following activities at any time:

i) Access to off-street property, to maintain access to the UKI underground car park and egress from the proposed Hilton Hotel ground floor car park. This could alternatively be achieved through a Permit Holders exemption although this adds difficulty for visitors to these premises and costs for permits;

ii) Loading by goods vehicles, to maintain servicing for the Hilton and deliveries for residents of the Blue Apartments. Note that displacing this activity onto Neville Street is not preferred because of the heavy flow on Neville Street and the disruption which loading vehicles would cause; and

iii) Cyclists could be more common with the new station entrance so the Pedestrian Zone should allow non-motorized vehicles, although the main provision for parking will remain on New Station Street.

3.2.3 Loading to and from cars will need to be prohibited as part of the Pedestrian Zone as this is the activity which is, in particular, being managed. This will cause some inconvenience to residents of the Blue Apartments. However, the ability to receive goods vehicle deliveries at any time provides a means for most activity to be catered for.

3.2.4 Ad-hoc observations and a formal survey conducted on Aire Street, the existing drop-off and pick-up point for the main station concourse, suggest that vehicle activity can be significant during evenings and weekends and is popular with leisure travellers. Because of the high pedestrian flows during the morning and evening peaks and the steady demand for vehicle drop-off and pick-up, it may be necessary for the Pedestrian Zone to operate all day and during the evening (e.g. 7am to 10pm) including weekends.
3.3 Traffic Regulation Orders

3.3.1 Careful consideration has been given to the timing of the access restrictions particularly about whether a late evening finish such as 10pm is the most appropriate Zone end time. If the time is set later than 10pm then it would ensure pedestrians going for the last trains do not come into conflict with vehicles. However, an earlier finish time could be beneficial for personal security and disabled drivers, as discussed below.

3.3.2 In the evening when pedestrian flows will be reduced, the quantity of vehicle activity on Little Neville Street would ideally be sufficient to provide natural surveillance for pedestrians, given that there is currently little frontage activity to make pedestrians feel less vulnerable. It may be necessary to reconsider the proposed finish time and bring it forward to perhaps 7pm, when pedestrian flows may have significantly reduced from the evening peak.

3.3.3 Anecdotal evidence suggests that Little Neville Street has been used during the evenings by disabled drivers, probably to access local eating and drinking establishments. It is not yet known to what extent this activity occurs or whether there are alternative facilities.

3.3.4 It may be useful to provide for additional vehicle activity during the evening but there are practical difficulties with signing further exemptions, especially in light of the complex Pedestrian Zone signs proposed. Appendix D contains a summary of the options considered to date. Discussions are ongoing between LCC and Metro and their technical advisors to reach the most appropriate solution.

3.3.5 The preferred layout on Little Neville Street, from a safety perspective, would be one which avoids the need for reversing in an area where pedestrian activity will be high. LCC currently has a similar situation on Wormald Row (between Dortmund Square and Albion Street) where pedestrian accidents have occurred as a result of the difficulties in reversing across high pedestrian flows. Achieving this safer layout is possible with the one-way option Variant B in Appendix C.

3.3.6 In the future, it is expected that Network Rail will consider developing the dark arches and wish to restrict vehicle traffic. Such a change would require LCC to amend Little Neville Street from a one-way loop to a two-way cul-de-sac. In this event, LCC would be required to amend the traffic orders and signs on Little Neville Street, make minor amendments to the signal equipment at the Sovereign Street junction and possibly relocate some street furniture to create a turning head. To mitigate against this risk, the street design work currently being undertaken by Metro’s advisors is attempting to produce a hybrid design which can be retrospectively converted back to two-way operation with minimal works. LCC will explore with Metro any opportunities to protect the one-way scheme and seek financial redress in the event of future changes.

3.3.7 Other design considerations are summarised in the table in Appendix E, including urban realm, adoption of land to be acquired and height restrictions on Dark Neville Street. There are no issues raised which fundamentally undermine the scheme.
3.4 Wider Influence of the Station Entrance

3.4.1 The constrained nature of the new station access means that it is not practical to try and cater formally for drop-off and pick-up facilities, as there are no suitable locations at which to physically deliver a fit for purpose facility close to the entrance. Furthermore any attempt to formally provide for pick-up and drop-off which does not satisfy demand is more likely to lead to congestion and other problems. It is considered more appropriate to discourage demand through managed prevention and not undertake any measures which could have the effect of inducing or stimulating such a demand which is fully catered for by the facilities at the main station entrance. Network Rail are known to be investigating the options for making improvements to the station drop-off and short stay parking facilities at the Aire Street entrance as part of their wider site planning. LCC are being engaged in early discussions on this matter and it is expected that any such improvements will provide enhancements to ensure the more suitable and attractive facilities which are impractical at the LSSE site.

3.4.2 Appendix F contains a summary of the assessments undertaken on the likelihood and impact of pick-up and drop-off activity on surrounding streets. It concludes that, as demand is to be managed rather than provided for, the only works proposed would be on Canal Wharf and Wharf Approach to further restrict waiting and loading. In this location, it is felt that changes which discourage drop-off and pick-up are required, but as this activity is very difficult to completely eradicate, it is proposed to introduce restrictions which will at least encourage appropriate driver behaviour.

3.4.3 Any taxi rank provision in relation to the Southern Entrance would be a walk of a reasonable distance in the elements and would not be too attractive compared to accessing New Station Street or the Northern Entrance. Given the difficulty of providing a rank anywhere appropriate on-street, it is recommended that no provision is made as part of the scheme.

3.5 Prior Approvals Not Applicable.

3.6 Programme – As listed in Appendix A, works are due to start on site in Summer 2013. Programme updates will be provided by Metro to LCC via LSSE Project Board.

4 Corporate Considerations

4.1 Consultation and Engagement

4.1.1 The Leeds Station Southern Entrance received planning consent in 2010 with highways matters being conditioned. The main scheme is unchanged. The Pedestrian Zone and one-way option were not included in the current planning consent.

4.1.2 Public or stakeholder consultation has not specifically been undertaken on the Pedestrian Zone principles contained in this report. Metro has begun the process of public consultation prior to submission of the TWAO application. Discussions
with adjacent occupiers have included an indication that changes are being considered on Little Neville Street but no specific details have been provided.

4.1.3 Formal consultation will therefore occur as part of the TWAO process. Ward Members for City and Hunslet were written to prior to Christmas, informing them of the proposals and inviting comments by Friday 06 January. A reminder was sent on Thursday 02 February 2012 as no responses have been received to date.

4.1.4 Traffic Management and Highways Development Services sections have been involved in the scheme development work including meetings with Metro and their advisor Mott Macdonald. Similarly the city centre planning team and urban design teams have been engaged in the development of this report. The urban design team will also be involved in the detailed design of the proposals.

4.2 **Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration**

4.2.1 Metro is promoting the scheme through the TWAO route. This allows for detailed consultation and objections to the scheme on equality or other grounds.

4.2.2 This section considers the impact on protected characteristics for the proposed highway changes of the LSSE scheme only. The LSSE scheme is not being promoted by LCC and therefore an audit is not required for the full scheme for this decision. However, any negative effects of the highway elements should be considered in any full assessment completed by the promoters to justify the scheme’s impacts. The screening described below will be made available to the promoters.

4.2.3 Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration screening has been carried out on the Pedestrian Zone proposals. The key findings are that the impact is very localised, being limited to one small street, with the main protected characteristic affected being disability. On balance, the negative effects of implementing the Pedestrian Zone scheme (‘Do Something’) seem no worse than the effect of leaving the street open to become congested (‘Do Nothing’). The net effect is therefore assessed as **neutral**.

4.2.4 The negative impact on any disabled residents or visitors to the Blue Apartments, caused by access restrictions, could be mitigated by switching the ‘access to off street premises’ exemption to ‘permit holders’. However, given the additional costs in implementing a permit system and the likelihood of the number of affected persons being very low, it is suggested that this decision is reserved until further information is known about the needs of residents.

4.2.5 For clarification, the new station entrance is intended as a pedestrian entrance only, i.e. not for access by vehicle. It is therefore intended that, whilst the new station entrance will be fully accessible, those with a mobility impairment accessing the station by vehicle will continue to use the northern concourse as at present, where the staff and facilities are located.
4.3 Council Policies and City Priorities

4.3.1 City Priority Plan – investment in the new station entrance and enhancement of pedestrian links to and from it directly contributes to the ‘Best City… for business’ element of the City Priority Plan 2011-2015, whose measurement is identified as:

i) Increase the percentage of residents who can get to work by public transport within half an hour at peak times.

ii) Reduce carbon emissions (in this case, through encouragement to use low carbon modes).

4.3.2 Local Transport Plan: The proposals are in line with the following core strategies:

i) S1- Provide an appropriate road environment with facilities for each user group.

ii) S4- Encourage the correct behaviour of all road users.

4.3.3 Community Safety: The routes taken by pedestrians to and from the new station entrance include the dark arches on Dark Neville Street and the rear of the Hilton Hotel with little active frontage on Little Neville Street. The weight of pedestrian flow during the day is very likely to mitigate the majority of personal security concerns although it is possible that in the early morning or late evening there will be concerns. It has been suggested to Metro that the use of CCTV should be investigated within the scheme proposals to satisfy Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

4.4 Resources and value for money

4.4.1 Full scheme estimate. A cost estimate has not yet been prepared for the scheme as this is the subject of a brief issued during week ending 16th December. However, for reference, a good quality urban realm scheme which includes the full adopted highway and the land to be acquired could be in excess of £300,000. A more modest scheme to the rear section of Little Neville Street could cost between £100,000 to £125,000. (Basic calculations only based on NGT rates)

4.4.2 Capital Funding and Cash Flow. This report does not seek approval to incur expenditure. The Council is working with Metro to assemble a funding package which allows these works to be included in the scheme plan.

4.4.3 Revenue Effects. As per the capital element of the scheme, approval of this report does not result in any direct impact on the department’s revenue budgets. It must be noted that the removal of the five pay and display parking bays on Little Neville Street, which currently generate circa £12,000 per annum income, could result in some net loss of revenue for Leeds City Council. This removal and loss of revenue has been discussed with Parking Services, who understand the strategic nature of the scheme and have not objected to date.

4.4.4 Several pay and display parking bays will be suspended on Water Lane close to Leeds Bridge during construction, as it is proposed to transfer building materials
from truck to barge at a temporary wharf accessed off Water Lane near Asda. It is expected that the bays will be suspended for about 12 months.

4.4.5 Metro, as scheme promoter, is seeking confirmation from its co-promoter Network Rail and scheme funding partner Leeds City Council that they will not seek compensation for loss of revenue from leases or parking income as a result of the project. Highways Board is asked to note the request and consider supporting the inclusion of lost revenue as a local contribution to the scheme rather than seeking reimbursement.

4.5 **Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In**

4.5.1 There are no legal implications arising as a result of this report.

4.5.2 There are no access to information issues.

4.5.3 This report is not seeking a Key or Major decision. It is not eligible for call-in.

4.6 **Risk management**

4.6.1 Risk management will be undertaken by Metro during the project development phase. The project is governed by a Project Board, on which LCC sits. The key risk for LCC is objections to the scheme on the grounds of parking and access. This is being mitigated through the regular and close engagement between LCC officers and Metro and their specialist advisors. The TWAO process will address the normal risks of objections associated with traffic orders.

4.6.2 If and when the scheme implementation of works on Little Neville Street is transferred to Leeds City Council, the appropriate risk management procedures will be followed.

5 **Conclusions**

5.1 The proposed Leeds Station Southern Entrance is intended primarily for pedestrians but it will result in demand for ‘drop-off’ and ‘pick-up’ vehicle activity unless this is managed. A failure to manage the demand will result in a worsening of the environment, congestion and risk of pedestrian / vehicle collisions. This could also lead to objections.

5.2 It appears feasible to introduce a pedestrian zone on Little Neville Street to manage the demand for this activity. Exemptions can be provided for existing and planned essential activity such as access to the underground car park and loading by goods vehicles. The pedestrian zone proposals require the removal of five pay and display parking bays on Little Neville Street.

5.3 Network Rail has indicated a willingness to adopt a one-way traffic flow system through Dark Neville Street which is favoured by LCC. The design is progressing to minimise any expenditure in the event of Little Neville Street needing to be converted to two-way again.

5.4 Other streets in the vicinity of the new entrance have also been reviewed to identify any required measures to manage pick-up and drop-off demand. It is not
anticipated that any measures on other parts of the adopted highway will be proposed as part of the LSSE scheme, at this time, except for more restrictive waiting and loading restrictions on Canal Wharf and Wharf Approach.

6 Recommendations

6.1 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:

   i) confirm agreement in principle for Metro to promote changes to Little Neville Street through the Transport and Works Act Order application, namely introduction of a Pedestrian Zone and (subject to Network Rail agreement) conversion to one way operation;

   ii) confirm agreement that no other permanent highway or transportation interventions are expected at this point in time for inclusion within the Transport and Works Act Order application, other than a more restrictive waiting and loading regime on Canal Wharf and Wharf Approach; and

   iii) note the requirement to engage with Metro regarding funding of the proposed works on Little Neville Street and with Network Rail regarding access arrangements on Dark Neville Street.

7 Background documents

7.1 LSSE Approved Planning Application:-


7.2 Mott Macdonald Technical Note 296480/4.2/AN04 Revision A, for Metro, 18 November 2011.

7.3 Equality Impact Assessment Screening, December 2011
Leeds Station is the second busiest station outside London, used by circa 36 million passengers a year. It is owned and managed by Network Rail. The area to the south of the station has seen substantial growth and regeneration over the past 10 years. Major new office accommodation such as Bridgewater Place has been created, as well as new residential and leisure facilities including the Mint Hotel. The new developments have created demand for a new entrance from the railway station linking directly with the new developments to the south of Leeds. Up to 20% of Leeds Rail station passengers would benefit from the new entrance.

The £14.4m Leeds Station Southern Entrance (LSSE) scheme comprises a concourse deck over the River Aire within a visually iconic enclosed building. Open link span bridges will provide direct stepped access from this concourse to the east and west banks of the river. The concourse also extends back through the span of the station viaduct to link with a further bridge running parallel to Dark Neville Street and this access point provides step free access. From the concourse, access to the station footbridge is provided by steps, escalators and lift. At the station footbridge level the widened bridge provides an upper concourse with customer information screens, potential ticket office, ticket vending machines and automated ticket barriers.

LSSE is jointly promoted by Metro and Network Rail. Metro is currently funding all development costs associated with the scheme. Once built, the asset will be owned by Network Rail.

Outline design was completed in May 2009 and public consultation was undertaken during summer 2009. Responses to the consultation indicated a high level of support for the scheme with 96% of respondents supporting the idea for a new southern entrance for the station. Full planning permission was granted in May 2010. Details relating to the treatment of Little Neville Street were not specified in the consent but were ‘reserved matters.’

Following the General Election and subsequent Comprehensive Spending Review the scheme was put on hold by the Department for Transport. In February 2011, the DfT re-awarded LSSE ‘Programme Entry Approval’, the first stage in the Government’s Major Scheme approval process. In May 2011, Metro approved the third Local Transport Plan (LTP3), which included the approval of funding for the LSSE development costs. In reapproving the scheme, the DfT agreed to provide up to a maximum of £12.4m towards scheme construction costs, with a further £0.5m of Section 106 monies from Leeds City Council. Metro is providing £1.5m for the development costs. The total approved scheme cost is £14.4m.

The scheme is proposed to be procured through a traditional Design and Build contract but with a break point after detailed design. It is anticipated that (subject to contract) Network Rail’s MAFA (Multi-Asset Framework Agreement) for the London North East Region (Carillion) would be commissioned to complete the Design and Build contract including any works on the highway (which would be via a Section 278 agreement).
The Department for Transport (DfT) has confirmed that a Transport and Works Act Order (TWAO) is deemed necessary to construct and operate the scheme, due to the constrained nature of the site and in order to gain the necessary consents required to deliver the new station entrance within the River Aire navigation. In order to submit the TWAO in March 2012, the Promoters are undertaking work in a range of areas. This includes land referencing, environmental assessment and consultation with the affected parties to open up lines of communication and discuss any concerns each party may have. The Promoters are also commencing consultation with Statutory Consultees, including Environment Agency and English Heritage.

The current timescale for LSSE is:

- March 2012 – TWAO application made
- Late 2012 - Public Inquiry (if required)
- Early 2012 - Detailed design commences
- Early 2013 – Secretary of State decision
- May 2013 – Scheme submitted for Full Approval to DfT
- Summer 2013 – Construction commences
- Summer 2014 – Scheme open
Proposed Station Entrance Layout (showing walking routes into/out from the entrance)
Metro has appointed Mott Macdonald as technical advisor for the TWAO application. Motts has recently completed a review of traffic management options for Little Neville Street (see Section 6.1). The report was reviewed in a small working group Metro, Motts and LCC officers from Transport Policy, Highways Development Services and Traffic Management.

Justification for Preventing Drop-Off and Pick-Up Activity

The existing Transport Statement (AECOM) contains a Proposed Improvements chapter which discusses options for a vehicular drop-off area for passengers on Little Neville Street. Such a drop-off area requires traffic to be routed in a loop via Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street as turning vehicles around in the highway would be difficult given local constraints. Motts reviewed the drop-off proposals in conjunction with the scheme promoters and following agreement with the Working Group, Motts statements have been adopted below proposing that drop-off facilities are inappropriate for the reasons stated:

- The previous (to be updated) pedestrian flow modelling indicates that of the 20,000 passengers expected to use LSSE on a daily basis, a large proportion will traverse Dark Neville Street. The drop-off facility would significantly increase the number of vehicles on Dark Neville Street and is likely to lead to queuing traffic and congestion. This would result in an increased likelihood of conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles albeit in a low speed environment.

- Traffic congestion on Little Neville Street and Dark Neville Street may result in pedestrian intimidation in what would be a car dominated environment with vehicles jostling to drop off passengers. We would be concerned about the attractiveness of the LSSE access routes to pedestrians, and this may negatively impact on the number of users.

- Queuing vehicles on Dark Neville Street in proximity to large numbers of pedestrians may be a concern given the confined nature of the road in the undercroft, and potential for worsening of air quality in that locality.

- Queuing vehicles on Dark Neville Street may block access to the car parking within the undercroft and this may lead to concerns from Network Rail (infrastructure owner) over possible impacts on their attractiveness to users and long term revenue potential.

- Queuing vehicles on Little Neville Street may block access to the UKI car park and the Blue Apartments, potentially leading to objections and increased scheme delivery risk.

- A large through movement of vehicles on Dark Neville Street from a drop-off facility on Little Neville Street may compromise on the viability of any future retail aspirations on Dark Neville Street.

- An alternative vehicular drop-off facility exists on the north side of the station and this is only a few minutes away for vehicles travelling from the south. It is
recommended that a vehicular drop-off facility is not provided for LSSE and that control measures are taken to prevent this.

**Justification for Not Providing a Taxi Rank**

It is envisaged that taxis would want to gain access to Little Neville Street to pick up and drop off passengers. Due to the large number of taxis on New Station Street, taxi drivers may see Little Neville Street as a convenient location to pick up a fare where they do not have to join the back of a long queue, as they do on New Station Street.

LSSE proposals would present very limited opportunities (due to space constraints) for a taxi rank on Little Neville Street. Therefore any such facility would require careful vehicle management by a marshal to help avoid congestion. Given the limited room for vehicle storage and turnaround (should access to the Dark Arches be blocked as part of local traffic management) it is suggested that a taxi rank is not appropriate for LSSE. In any layout design, it is considered that the noise and air pollution from a rank would be unacceptable adjacent to the Blue Apartments.

If a taxi rank were provided, it would be difficult to sign from within the station, as there could be confusion which rank passengers need to head to. Station signage to a single taxi rank (at the main entrance) would provide more clarity for passengers, so it is strongly recommended that the creation of an alternative rank is rejected. LSSE is intended to be a pedestrian access point and not an alternative route to a further taxi rank.

A large and well managed taxi rank already exists serving the station main entrance and this offers waiting facilities under cover.

**Justification for Removal of Existing Pay and Display Parking Bays**

Retention of the existing five pay and display parking bays on Little Neville Street would of necessity require that vehicle traffic retains unrestricted access to the street. In this case, the pay and display bays and surrounding ‘yellow lines’ would be likely to be used for pick-up / drop-off activity which is to be discouraged or prevented, as justified above.

In addition, without a one-way system in place, traffic using the pay and display bays is likely to turn around. Given the potentially high turnover and high pedestrian flows, the risk of pedestrian / vehicle collision will be increased if the spaces are not removed.

Consideration has been given to allowing some access to pay and display bays off peak in the daytime, but it is considered that pedestrian flows will still be high enough to warrant their removal.

**Consideration of Options for Managing Traffic Activity**

Motts considered five options as follows:-

- Option 1: bollards at the northern end of Little Neville Street to prevent through traffic movements
- Option 2: Option 1 plus a Pedestrian Zone or similar restriction;
- Option 3: Option 2 plus a second set of bollards on Little Neville Street to physically prevent vehicles going beyond the underground car park entrance; and
Option 4: A full closure.

Option 5: A one-way route comprising Dark Neville Street and Little Neville Street, with a Pedestrian Zone or similar restriction.

Option 4 was immediately ruled out because there is no alternative access to the well-used UKI underground car park. Option 1 was seen as likely to be ineffective without a substantial and sustained enforcement effort.

Option 3 has three main issues:-

- The Hilton Hotel planning consent allows vehicles to traverse the section of Little Neville Street which would be blocked off. This scheme would be almost certain to raise a strong objection from the Hilton Hotel.

- A survey showed that there were 14 vehicles larger than a ‘transit van’ between 0700 and 1800. Dropping lockable bollards on this many occasions per day would be impractical and automatic rising bollards are costly and a maintenance liability.

- There is insufficient space to allow vehicles to turn around on Little Neville Street. This will result in vehicles either reversing in or out of the street, putting them in conflict with pedestrians, unless vehicles are allowed access to the restricted area.

Option 5 requires a one-way loop to be formed using both adopted highway and private property. Whilst the rights to allow this could be obtained within the TWAO, it is currently unclear if Network Rail will formerly agree to this (for a variety of reasons).

This leaves Option 2 as the most practical solution with Option 5 and Option 3 (with rising bollards) as potentially problematic alternatives. Option 1 would be a ‘fall-back’.
Appendix C  Little Neville Street Pedestrian Zone Indicative Designs

These are subject to ongoing design work and funding and suggest how Option 2 (Pedestrian Zone) or 5 (Pedestrian Zone with one-way loop) could look depending on whether vehicles will be able to drive through Dark Neville Street.

Variant A: Maintain access from Little Neville Street to Dark Neville Street (one-way loop is the preferred option)

Advantages:
- HGV do not have to turn round (provided NR open the barriers)
- Low cost

Disadvantages:
- Relies on NR management to avoid difficult and dangerous reversing manoeuvres if large vehicles cannot go through the dark arches – or drivers may choose to try and turn anyway. NR view not yet established.

Removal of 5 no. existing parking bays

Network Rail to consider vehicle management on Dark Neville Street

Pedestrian route to/from Little Neville Street

Land to be acquired and suggested for adoption. New public realm area subject to funding. Pedestrians only

Optional public realm area improvements

Sovereign St scheme by HD&C

UKI building

Blue apart's

Hilton Hotel

Crown Copyright. All Rights Reserved. Leeds City Council 100019567

Without yellow lines

With yellow lines

PEDESTRIAN ZONE

7 am 10 pm

except for access to off-street premises and for loading by

PEDESTRIAN ZONE

7 am 10 pm

except for access to off-street premises and for loading by

At any time
Variant B: No vehicle access from Little Neville Street to Dark Neville Street (except in exceptional circumstances)

Advantages:
Not reliant on Network Rail to service Little Neville Street. But barrier option may overcome reversing risks (see below)
More attractive pedestrian environment

Disadvantages:
High cost
Reversing manoeuvres required in proximity to pedestrians (street furniture could be set to reduce risk). Turning area could encourage more illegal parking.
### Appendix D  Access Restriction Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Option description</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational 7 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R0</td>
<td>Zone operates 7 days a week, 24 hours a day. Parking restricted at all times.</td>
<td>Simple to sign / understand</td>
<td>Lack of evening activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum congestion / noise</td>
<td>Inflexible for residents and occupiers (unless permit scheme allows it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Zone operates 7 days but time limited to 7am to 7pm. Parking restricted at all times.</td>
<td>Signs still relatively legible. Allows loading by cars and taxis during evenings.</td>
<td>Evening pick-up and drop-off activity is uncontrolled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1a</td>
<td>As R2 but parking unrestricted (in some places) when zone not operational.</td>
<td>Higher levels of street activity for natural</td>
<td>Street clutter (need for signs and single/double yellow lines). Risk of severe congestion in evenings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>surveillance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Zone operates 7 days but time limited to 7am to 7pm. Parking bays provided for blue</td>
<td>Easy to sign. Maintains facility for blue badge</td>
<td>Disabled bays could be easily misunderstood, as not available during the day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>badge holders use during evenings/ Nights. Other parking restricted at all times.</td>
<td>holders.</td>
<td>Bays likely to be abused by drop-off / pick-up activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational Mon-Fri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Zone operates Monday to Friday (24 hours). Parking restricted at all times.</td>
<td>Signs still relatively legible. Allows loading by cars and taxis at weekends.</td>
<td>Weekend pick-up and drop-off activity uncontrolled. Lack of activity week evenings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Zone operates Monday to Friday (24 hours). Parking restricted at all times.</td>
<td>Overcomes any objection due to lack of disabled</td>
<td>Illegible signing. Loading restricted on-street except in marked bay(s) – increases street clutter and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pick-up and drop-off for access to properties.</td>
<td>loading issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>Zone operates Monday to Friday but time limited to 7am to 7pm. Parking restricted at</td>
<td>Allows loading by cars and taxis in evenings and</td>
<td>More cumbersome signing – possible but less legible. Evening / weekend pick-up and drop-off activity is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all times.</td>
<td>at weekends.</td>
<td>uncontrolled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5a</td>
<td>As R2 but parking unrestricted (in some places) when zone not operational.</td>
<td>Higher levels of street activity for natural</td>
<td>Street clutter (need for signs and single/double yellow lines). Risk of severe congestion in evenings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As R1a but Mon-Fri instead of 7 days</td>
<td>surveillance.</td>
<td>and weekends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintains parking status quo in evenings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Option description</td>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td>Disadvantages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>As R2 but Mon-Fri instead of 7 days</td>
<td>Easy to sign. Maintains facility for blue badge holders.</td>
<td>Disabled bays could be easily misunderstood, as not available during the day. Bays likely to be abused by drop-off etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E  Other Design Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Consideration</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signs Authorisation</td>
<td>The proposed signs are not prescribed in the Traffic Signs and General Directions but they are a combination of existing signs which deviate little from the prescribed signs. It is expected that LCC will need to seek authorisation from the DfT for the sign. Discussions will be needed between LCC and Metro and their Advisors to confirm how and when this will be accomplished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>It is noted that the Pedestrian Zone is a moving vehicle restriction and therefore only enforceable by the police. Our experience suggests that an initial police enforcement effort (British Transport Police or West Yorkshire Police) coupled with a street presence from LCC enforcement officers would have a noticeable effect. However, changing the street design is likely to have the largest influence on the street being self-enforcing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Security</td>
<td>Little Neville Street is not particularly overlooked and at night some pedestrians may be deterred from using it. Street redesign, in some instances, has been shown to reduce or displace crime and the benefits for personal security should also be considered. This reinforces the need for design change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height Limit for Vehicles</td>
<td>A one-way rote option requires all vehicles accessing Little Neville Street to use the arches under the railway, which restrict headroom. The arches will allow standard HGV to pass such as refuse trucks and delivery wagons. However, larger vehicles may need to gain access at off-peak times using a temporary TRO to reverse down Little Neville Street from Neville Street. This is expected to occur only infrequently, e.g. building works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Impaired Movement</td>
<td>See Equality Impact Assessment. Note that street redesign would potentially be beneficial for the mobility impaired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban design / realm</td>
<td>It would be good practice for the new station entrance to be well connected into the surrounding network of pedestrian routes. The routes adjacent to the new station should ideally be of sufficient quality to make them attractive to use. The current street environment on Little Neville Street is not particularly attractive for pedestrians. It is recommended that works to improve the street environment are included in the scheme similar to Variant B in Appendix C. Metro is currently commissioning work to assess this and LCC is involved in the review process. Metro is working on a funding package.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Consideration</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adoption of Land</strong></td>
<td>The scheme as submitted for TWAO is expected to include acquisition of a small triangle of land between Little Neville Street, the railway viaduct and the Blue Apartments which can be seen on the plans in Appendix C. This land connects the open span footbridge from the new station entrance to Little Neville Street. It is suggested that the land to be acquired should be adopted by LCC to reduce the risk of future problems if the maintenance were left to a third party. Adoption would also allow any traffic orders on the street to cover this area. Given the small area involved and the scheme being part-funded by LCC, it is suggested that the usual requirement for a commuted sum would be waived provided that it forms a recognised part of LCC’s contribution to the scheme. A decision is not required at this point in time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contractor</strong></td>
<td>Who would undertake the works on Little Neville Street? Main scheme contractor or LCC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No decisions have yet been made on whether the scheme would be constructed by LCC or whether it would be included in the main contract, undertaken by one of Network Rail’s contractors. The works will require a Section 278 Agreement. The decision is not important for the TWAO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sovereign Street Junction</strong></td>
<td>Interface with Sovereign Street junction signal improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scheme principles are compatible with LSSE. Some opportunity to adjust detailed design to reduce abortive work for LSSE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F  Wider Influence of the Station Entrance

The new station entrance has been proposed to help serve the growing demand for trips to and from the areas south of the station. The scheme promoters have agreed that it will be a pedestrian-only entrance. There are a range of factors why this is so, including:-

- the site is very constrained by the railway viaduct, river and apartment buildings each side; and
- key services will continue to be based around the main concourse.

The level of existing drop-off and pick-up activity associated with the main entrance is significant. An evening survey in December 2011 showed that the traffic flow into Aire Street was about 500 vehicles per hour at 7pm. The constrained nature of the new station access means that it is not pragmatic to try and cater formally for drop-off and pick-up facilities, as these cannot physically be provided close to the entrance.

Any attempt to formally provide for pick-up and drop-off which does not satisfy demand is more likely to lead to congestion and other problems. It is considered more appropriate to discourage demand through managed prevention.

Despite the fact that the new entrance is not designed to accommodate vehicle drop-off and pick-up of passengers, consideration has been given to the likelihood of some activity occurring on the streets closest to the new entrance. The approach in considering highway impacts has therefore been to:-

- Identify potential drop-off and pick-up locations.
- Consider whether drop-off and pick-up activity could cause significant congestion or safety problems or is otherwise detrimental.
- Assess whether changes to the street layout can or should be made to mitigate the effect, by either providing for or prohibiting the activity.

The locations identified are shown on Figure F1 and the expected activity and proposed measures are shown in Table F1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Possible demand</th>
<th>Proposed measures</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little Neville Street (LNS) / Dark Neville Street (DNS)</td>
<td>High levels of DOPU causing congestion incl. on Neville Street</td>
<td>Restrict - Pedestrian Zone supplemented by access control on DNS</td>
<td>Close to station entrance. Need to protect required access and pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neville Street (N)</td>
<td>Opportunistic drop-off when northbound traffic stops</td>
<td>None (existing restrictions)</td>
<td>Clearway and guardrail options investigated but not suitable. Expected frequency low given drivers committed to City Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sovereign Street</td>
<td>DOPU could be attractive if provided for. Prevents use of parking bays</td>
<td>Manage using existing restrictions</td>
<td>Provision would undermine Sovereign Street Planning Statement. Not practical to cater for potential demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neville Street (S) / Water Lane (E)</td>
<td>DOPU unlikely</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Unlikely due to walk distance, restrictions, impact of stopping etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal Wharf / Wharf Approach</td>
<td>Quieter roads, could be attractive for DOPU</td>
<td>More restrictive waiting/loading regime</td>
<td>Existing parking problems could be exacerbated. Measures proposed to 'manage down' the demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mint Hotel area (Wharf Approach north of canal)</td>
<td>Unknown, depends on arrangement and enforcement of 3rd party land</td>
<td>Not in LCC control</td>
<td>TWAO provides route landowner/occupiers to liaise with scheme promoter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure F1  Locations Considered for Likelihood of Drop-off and Pick-up Activity

- **Existing drop-off / pick-up point**
  - Locations:
    - LSSE
    - 240m
  - Potential walking route
  - Activity unlikely or controlled
  - Some activity expected
  - Third party land (not considered)

- **Walk distance from LSSE to point identified**
  - 240m

- **Potential walking route**
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