

MINUTES OF TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER GOVERNING BODY MEETING

1 December 2022 – 10.30 to 12.00

Attendees:

Members

Assistant Director of Strategic Infrastructure (Chair)	ADoSI
Corporate Lead (Design & Asset Management)	CL(DAM)
Traffic Engineer	TE1

Other

Highways and Planning Solicitor (advisor)	H&PS
Team Leader (Traffic Engineering)	TL(TE)
Transport Policy and Strategy Manager	TP&SM
Project Manager (Strategic Infrastructure)	PM(SI)
Traffic Engineer	TE2
Corporate Lead (Transportation) – item 4 only	CL(T)

1. Apologies

- Corporate Lead (Transportation) – recused themselves from items 1-3 due to involvement in the scheme design.
- Corporate Lead (Green Space & Street Scene) – recused themselves as they had submitted an objection to the design.
- Project Manager 2 (Strategic Infrastructure) - Unavailable
- Flood Programme Manager – Post currently vacant
- Performance Manager – Post currently vacant

2. Matters arising

The minutes of the last meeting (2 November 2022) will be agreed by email before issuing to the website.

3. Orders for Consideration

a) Sowerby Bridge CIP, Luddendenfoot to King Cross

The full scheme, encompassing several Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) proposals, extends from Luddendenfoot to King Cross and includes parking restrictions and mandatory cycle lanes.

The elements listed below have recently been subject to a statutory consultation and all three elements received objections.

1. A58 and A6142 (between their two junctions), Sowerby Bridge

TP&SM explained that the design team have decided to remove the proposals for the Pye Nest Road section from the proposed TRO, to concentrate on the A58 route (as this connects better with the other elements of the scheme and the wider network). That element of the scheme would therefore no longer be before the TRO Governing Body (TROGB) for consideration.

The objections relating to the revised TRO (i.e., the A58 only) were discussed at length by the TROGB and the responses considered (see Appendix 1).

On concluding the discussions, the TROGB members voted and unanimously agreed to approve the revised TRO proposals (i.e., the A58 section only) and overrule the objections as the proposals are required, proportionate and the benefits of the proposal outweigh the disbenefits.

Outcome

It was unanimously agreed that the objections be overruled, and the restrictions are implemented as per the revised proposal.

The TROGB:

- (i) Approves the making and implementation of this part of the Order as the revised proposal (i.e., A58 only) and holds that the objections be overruled
- (ii) That the objectors be informed.

b) Wharf Street, Sowerby Bridge

TP&SM described the proposed scheme to increase footway space, provide a loading bay and provide a bus bay. In doing so, this would involve the removal of some parking spaces (a net loss of 3 spaces).

The objections received concentrated on the proposals reducing the parking capacity on the road. The issue was discussed, and it was considered that as there is alternative parking available within a short walking distance (including the Tuel Lane car park which is to be improved by the project), therefore the implications on parking are minimal.

On concluding the discussions, the TROGB members voted and unanimously agreed to approve the TRO proposal and overrule the objections as alternative parking is available close by.

Outcome

It was unanimously agreed that the objections be overruled, and the TRO should be implemented as advertised.

The TROGB:

- (i) Approves the making and implementation of this part of the Order as proposed and holds that the objections be overruled
- (ii) That the objectors be informed.

4. Any other business

a) Stocks Lane, Mytholmroyd

CL(T) explained that following a wall collapse on Stocks Lane in February 2022 a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order has been in place closing the road to ensure safety for road users. As the wall is not owned by the Council, negotiations have been ongoing between the owner, their insurers and the Council since the collapse and a solution is approaching.

During this time there has been interest from the local community to introduce the closure on a permanent basis as it has improved the traffic situation in the village.

A proposal to progress this whilst the temporary closure is still in place was considered, but the TROGB concluded that the Council needs to study the full implications of the proposal (including the effect on neighbouring villages) before progressing as a TRO proposal.

5. Date of Next Meeting

The next planned meeting is due to be held on 1 December 2022, 15.00 to 16.00.

Appendix 1

Summary of comments received (In themes)	Number of mentions in responses	Governing Body Responses to comments received
In Support		
1. Supportive of active travel Improvements tailored specifically towards pedestrians and cyclists. Additive to increasing use of e-bikes to support cycling given local topography. Improve health, reduce pollution and congestion.	3	NB the support was from residents and the cycle forum No response required.
In Objection¹		
2. Petition <i>"Petition to stop the proposed No Parking on the A58/Pye Nest"</i> "The main arguments against No Parking restrictions are safety, as people will have to park on the opposite side of the road, and cross the road to get to there (sic) houses, also it will cause congestion on the surrounding streets and even more congestion during snowy winter periods, if you agree sign below"	68 (Petition signatories)	The Council's petition scheme (section 4) states that the Council cannot accept a petition that "refers to a matter which is already the subject of legal proceedings". As this is in response to a legal consultation (the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO)), the Council rules cannot accept this as a formal petition. However, the petition was continued to be considered as an objection to the TRO. This advice was sought and confirmed by Head of Legal & Democratic Services during the course of Statutory Consultation. A number of homes and addresses on Rochdale Rd already have parking provision on private drives. The main purpose of primary routes such as the A58 is to safely transport vehicles and pedestrians. Providing parking spaces (particularly close to the destination) is a secondary purpose and it is not always possible to provide both.

¹ NB Pye Nest has now been removed from the proposal and therefore objections relating to it are not responded to here, unless objections received were joint for Rochdale Rd and Pye Nest

Summary of comments received (In themes)	Number of mentions in responses	Governing Body Responses to comments received
<p>3. Loss of parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of parking spaces, effect on businesses • More difficult for disabled/ mobility impaired visitors • Businesses may struggle for loading 	14	<p>Most homes on Rochdale Rd do have off-street parking</p> <p>The main purpose of primary routes such as the A58 is to safely transport vehicles and pedestrians. Providing parking spaces is a secondary purpose and it is not always possible to provide both.</p> <p>Alternative parking is also available in side streets and there is no proposed reduction in any existing disabled spaces</p> <p>The supermarket is a Sainsbury's Local and its primary business is users making small shops with quick turnover of parking – there will still be ample parking within a short walk of the store after the introduction of these restrictions</p> <p>Loading for Sainsbury's is done from the side-street</p> <p>Parking surveys carried out as part of Statutory Consultation have demonstrated there is ample parking available in side streets as well as the main road</p>
<p>4. Functionality/behaviour</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not being used enough by cyclists currently • Incline is prohibitive to cycle usage regardless of presence of new cycle lanes 	12	<p>Investment in active travel infrastructure is fundamental to delivering modal shift in the future rather than reflecting the current situation.</p> <p>Supportive representations regarding this element of scheme have been received from Calderdale Cycle Forum</p> <p>The uphill cycle lane is being provided in recognition of cyclist behaviour and need for greater protection from uphill traffic flows (greater speed differential).</p>
<p>5. Funds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not sensible use of Council funds/ resources • Money should be used on potholes etc. • Accident rate does not substantiate these measures 	9	<p>The project is specifically funded via a capital programme (West Yorkshire-plus Transport Fund), these funds are ring fenced and cannot be used for other purposes.</p> <p>Funding for improvements/ maintenance such as repairing potholes comes from separate funding allocation within the Council. This project complements these other activities.</p> <p>This project is an active travel scheme and not specifically linked to addressing accident rates (this is done separately within the Council as an ongoing process)</p>

Summary of comments received (In themes)	Number of mentions in responses	Governing Body Responses to comments received
6. Consultation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The works were not consulted with residents and businesses before implementation 	4	<p>The scheme has been subject to various levels of consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> August/September 2018 - Public Consultations January/February 2020 - Engagement on Final Designs February 2022 - specific informal consultation on the TRO proposals September 2022 - statutory consultation on the TRO proposals. <p>Recent meetings have also been held with local ward councillors as part of both TRO consultations.</p>
7. Safety <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Speeding on A58 in general Narrowing road for motorists (via introduction of cycle lane) increases risk from speeding HGV traffic using as a cut through Concern sideroads are not gritted during winter Proposal will increase requirement for pedestrians to cross Rochdale Rd/ Pye Nest 	13	<p>Alternative parking in driveways or side streets is more difficult in adverse winter weather conditions.</p> <p>The Council makes every effort to ensure all highway is gritted during adverse weather conditions, but do not have the resources to grit every road in all bad weather conditions.</p> <p>Lane widths remain within accepted standards as part of these proposals</p> <p>Parking surveys suggest available parking in adjacent side streets and should limit instances of increased need for pedestrians to cross the road because of these proposals. There are also crossing facilities / pedestrian refuges in place along the A58 (outside Sainsbury's and two in vicinity of Crow Wood Park)</p>
8. Simply displaces existing issues on A58/Rochdale Rd to sideroads <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues may actually be exacerbated on narrower roads 	8	<p>It is safer to park on side roads given typical vehicle speeds compared to main highway</p> <p>Surveys confirm there is available capacity in minor side roads</p>
9. The proposals are not compliant with current standards (LTN 1/20)	4	<p>The scheme development/design took place prior to the introduction of LTN 1/20 guidance. There is no remaining capital funding in the budget to redesign at this</p>

Summary of comments received (In themes)	Number of mentions in responses	Governing Body Responses to comments received
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ad-hoc approach Not segregated infrastructure per latest guidelines 		<p>stage given that the project has received its final approvals and is into delivery phase.</p> <p>The cycle lane is still mandatory even if not segregated from main highway.</p>
<p>10. Scheme objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dispute that proposals will stimulate economic growth, deliver modal shift, improve air quality etc. 	13	<p>The scheme has been designed with a view to improving connectivity along the A58/A672 as a strategic corridor as a whole (via targeted improvements along the highway).</p> <p>The project is not claiming objectives such as economic growth will be achieved by the interventions on Rochdale Road (or even Sowerby Bridge as a whole) alone, they are additive and important to the wider Business Case however.</p>
<p>11. Access of Calderdale Depot</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Located on entrance to Crow Wood Park 	3	<p>Resolved by implementing additional advisory signage at entrance to depot</p>
<p>12. Additional access requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EV charging, construction (removal skips etc.) 	1	<p>Skip license could still be obtained for mandatory cycle lane (loading is also permitted from cycle lane)</p> <p>There is no EV charging there currently, note that the Council's policy does not allow trailing cables across footways so is not permissible now.</p>