

MINUTES OF TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER GOVERNING BODY MEETING

17 October 2022 – 14.00 to 15.30

Attendees:

Members

Corporate Lead (Design & Asset Management) - Chair	CL(DAM)
Corporate Lead (Transportation)	CL(T)
Corporate Lead (Green Space & Street Scene)	CL(GS&SS)

Other

Highways and Planning Solicitor (Advisor)	H&PS
Transport Policy and Strategy Manager	TP&SM
Project Manager (Strategic Infrastructure)	PM(SI)
Team Leader (Traffic Engineering)	TL(TE)
Traffic Engineer	TE
Active Travel Officer (item 3d only)	ATO

1. Apologies

Assistant Director of Strategic Infrastructure – on leave	ADoSI
Flood Programme Manager – post currently vacant	FPM
Performance Manager – post currently vacant	PM
Graduate Engineer – on leave	GE

2. Matters arising

The minutes of the last meeting (1 September 2022) were agreed by email and have been issued to the website.

3. Orders for Consideration

a) Sowerby Bridge CIP, Bolton Brow – King Cross TRO

NB CL(GS&SS) declared they had submitted an objection to the proposal and so, on the advice of H&PS, recused themselves from the discussion.

TP&SM and PM(SI) reported that the proposed scheme has completed the Statutory Consultation and several objections including a petition and representations from councillors were received.

The broad content of the objections was discussed by the TROGB, but it was agreed that the objections need reviewing in more detail and presenting again before a considered decision can be made.

Outcome

It was unanimously agreed that the objections be further reviewed in more detail and brought back to the TROGB for discussion. Undertaking an additional review of recent accident data was also agreed.

b) Brighouse Road, Hipperholme TRO/SLO

TL(TE) outlined the scheme and reported on the breakdown of the objections received (see Appendix 1 below). Note that the second consultation did not attract any further objections, those listed in appendix 1 are carried through from the first consultation.

The TROGB reviewed the responses and agreed that the proposals are both required and suitable, therefore the objections were overruled, and the proposal can be implemented as advertised.

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 the Order as proposed and holds that the objections be overruled.
- (ii) That the objectors be informed

c) Bradford Road, Northowram TRO

TL(TE) outlined the scheme which has been recently informally consulted.

The proposed TRO did receive objections relating to the proposed parking restrictions, particularly that they will displace parking to other areas. This issue was discussed, and it was considered that the restrictions were still necessary and were minimised as much as possible.

In addition, the proposed zebra crossing has also generated some objections relating to the loss of parking spaces due to the zig-zag markings. Whilst the crossing is shown on the consultation plans (for completeness) it is noted that this is outside of the scope of the TROGB and will be dealt with separately as part of the crossing Notice procedure (Section 23 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984).

The TROGB agreed that the TRO proposals are required and suitable and can be progressed to Statutory Consultation.

Outcome

It was unanimously agreed that the proposals can proceed to statutory consultation.

The TRO Governing Body:

- (i) Approves the progression of this scheme including instruction to the Case Manager and the Head of Democratic and Partnership Services to draft the necessary documentation to progress the statutory consultation.

d) School Streets Projects ETROs

TL(TE) outlined the history of these schemes to improve the environment and safety around schools.

The two schemes below were introduced in late 2021 and the consultation periods closed in March 2022 and December 2021 respectively. The Experimental periods are approaching their closure and a decision is required on whether to make them permanent.

1. Lee Mount Primary School, Halifax

No objections have been received during the consultation period and the school have confirmed they are happy with the arrangements and would like to see it continue.

2. Trinity Academy, Sowerby Bridge

In the early days of the experiment objections were received while the scheme was settling in (see Appendix 2 below). As time has passed the scheme has

settled in better and in a recent inspection it was seen to be working well. The school is happy to retain the scheme.

The Governing Body unanimously agreed that the objections were, on balance, outweighed by the benefits of the schemes and so the objections received should be overruled and the schemes be made permanent.

Outcome

It was unanimously agreed that the objections be overruled and the schemes be made permanent.

The TRO Governing Body:

- (i) Approves the making and implementation of the orders.
- (ii) That the objectors and affected schools be informed.

4. Any other business

a) Park Road, Elland TRO

TL(TE) reported that this scheme has been formally consulted and no objections had been received. The procedure allows progression without reporting to the TROGB in this case, so this is notification of progression only.

5. Date of Next Meeting

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

A further special meeting has been arranged for the review of objections to the Sowerby Bridge CIP, Bolton Brow – King Cross TRO. This will be held on 2 November 2022 at 16.00-17.00.

Appendix 1 – Brighouse Road, Hipperholme

Summary of comments received (In themes)	Number of mentions in responses	Responses to comments received
Objections to the proposal/Documents		
1. Loss of parking on Brighouse Road due to the length of parking restrictions.	4	<p>The proposed double yellow lines are required primarily to improve site lines from the new development and protect the proposed pedestrian crossing points. In addition, they generally make the road safer and free from obstructions.</p> <p>The main purpose of primary routes such as the A644 (Brighouse Rd) 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>2. Issues with refuge islands.</p> <p>a) Missing information in documents,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refuge islands not mentioned in the statement of reasons. • Refuge island not included in the legend of the proposed design. <p>b) The road is not wide enough to accommodate the proposed refuge islands, concerns that they will cause accidents and poor visibility for vehicles exiting nearby streets.</p>	2	<p>These issues were resolved in the second consultation</p> <p>The road is comfortably wide enough to accommodate both carriageways and the refuge islands and complies with standards.</p> <p>In the planning consent appeal decision, it was noted that the refuge islands would prevent the current unsafe practice of vehicles overtaking stationary queuing traffic and crossing the hatched markings to turn at the Hipperholme traffic lights. In addition to that, the refuge islands will provide a two-stage safe crossing for pedestrians to nearby bus stops.</p> <p>The proposed restrictions will also provide clear visibility for vehicles exiting Brooklands, Southedge Terrace and Barfield Rd.</p> <p>Therefore, it is considered that the proposals will improve safety at the site.</p>

Summary of comments received (In themes)	Number of mentions in responses	Responses to comments received
3. Site notices – A Clerical error was noticed in the notice and site notices were not ideally positioned.	1	These issues were resolved in the second consultation
4. Proposed bus stop markings near resident's driveway, concerns that sight lines will be blocked.	1	The Bus stop markings are located approximately 7.5 metres away from the driveway. Buses on Brighthouse Road are not on a high frequency corridor, so the impact on residents should be minimal and safe exit should be possible with patience in waiting for clear visibility. During peak times dropping and picking passengers typically takes less than 2 minutes.
Outside of scope of TRO		
Why was the proposed highways work not completed prior to the development?	1	During the planning consent appeals decision, it was agreed that the highways work should be carried out after the dwellings have been occupied, as the need for mitigation would only occur during that time.
Concerns regarding the height of the boundary wall in the new development, it will block sight lines.	1	According to the approved design documents, the agreed height of the wall is 1.6 meters and set behind the visibility splay from the junction. This has been referred to the Planning Service to ensure it is correct. The proposed parking restrictions will allow suitable visibility for vehicles exiting the new development.
Concern with the name of the new road/ street (Brooke Avenue) in the new development that it will cause confusion. Nearby streets have a similar name such	1	The naming of new roads/streets was legally approved during the early stage of construction and careful consideration was made to ensure that the road/street name was suitable for the area and would not conflict with or duplicate any existing names within the area. The name was approved by the post office and councillors.

MINUTES OF TRO GOVERNING BODY MEETING – 17 October 2022 – 14.00 to 15.30

Summary of comments received (In themes)	Number of mentions in responses	Responses to comments received
as Brooklands, Brookeville Avenue and Brooke Green.		

Appendix 2 – Trinity Academy, Sowerby Bridge

Summary of comments received (In themes)	Number of mentions in responses	Responses to comments received
In objection		
<p>1. No waiting and loading</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • moves the parking issue to other residential areas • not able to park in front of own property (causes stress and worry) • not enough enforcement 	2	<p>It is noted that this is an issue at all sites where parking restrictions are proposed. However, inappropriate parking outside of the school reduces the carriageway width, causes congestion which reduces safety. It is believed that there is capacity for parking in the surrounding streets.</p> <p>In many residential areas it is not possible to provide parking for all residents where they would like to. Further, it is not necessary for the Council to provide parking outside of your home.</p> <p>The main purpose of a highway 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>The Council has limited resources and they are needed across the whole of Calderdale (Towns, schools etc) so whilst enforcement is carried out, they cannot always be there.</p>
2. Potential issues with increased traffic on Milton Avenue	1	<p>It is noted that Milton Avenue is a narrow road with existing parking issues, and this was accepted as a potential issue at the start of the experiment.</p> <p>There were some issues noted initially, but after a short period of time the complaints tailed off and no issues have been observed.</p>
3. The school requires drop off points, car parks, one way systems...	1	<p>Although these could be attractive options, practically there are difficulties relating to lack of development space and the effect something like a one way would have</p>

MINUTES OF TRO GOVERNING BODY MEETING – 17 October 2022 – 14.00 to 15.30

Summary of comments received (In themes)	Number of mentions in responses	Responses to comments received
		on speeds and issues on other roads. Regardless, these options are outside the scope of the current budget
4. Operation during school holidays	1	Unfortunately, the legal Order cannot be written in a way that would only cover term time (as the dates change each year). However, as barriers will not be in place at holiday times, access would be physically possible.
5. Potential accidents at Burnley rd diverted parking –	1	We have no records of any accidents.