

**Name of meeting:** Cabinet Committee - Local Issues  
**Date:** 29<sup>th</sup> January 2020

**Title of report:** Objections to Kirklees TRO No 9 Order 2019, Proposed No Waiting at Any Time restrictions, at the junction of A636 Wakefield Road / Pennine Way, Scissett and the introduction of traffic calming in the form of road humps on Pennine Way, Scissett

**Purpose of report:** To consider objections received to the above advertised Traffic Regulation Order.

<b>Key Decision - Is it likely to result in spending or saving £250k or more, or to have a significant effect on two or more electoral wards?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Key Decision - Is it in the <a href="#">Council's Forward Plan (key decisions and private reports?)</a></b>	<b>No</b>
<b>The Decision - Is it eligible for call in by Scrutiny?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Date signed off by <a href="#">Strategic Director</a> &amp; name</b>	<b>Karl Battersby - 13.01.2020</b>
<b>Is it also signed off by the Service Director Finance?</b>	<b>Eamonn Croston - 10.01.2020</b>
<b>Is it also signed off by the Service Director for Legal Governance and Commissioning?</b>	<b>Julie Muscroft - 10.01.2020</b>
<b>Cabinet member <a href="#">portfolio</a></b>	<b>Councillor Rob Walker</b>

**Electoral wards affected:** Denby Dale

**Ward councillors consulted:** Yes

**Public or private:** Public

**Has GDPR been considered:** Yes

## 1. Summary

To consider objections received in response to the public advertisement of Kirklees (TR) (No 9) Order 2019 - The proposed introduction of additional 'No Waiting at Any Time' parking restrictions on A636 Wakefield Road / Pennine Way, Scissett and the public advertisement of the proposal to introduce 3 no. road humps on Pennine Way, Scissett.

Pursuing the implementation of these parking restrictions and traffic calming proposals were a condition on a Planning Application.

## 2. Information required to take a decision

The restrictions on Wakefield Road/Pennine Way, Scissett and the introduction of 3 road humps on Pennine Way contained in Traffic Regulation Order (TRO), have been proposed in connection with Planning Application Number – **2013/93441**. Planning permission was granted for “erection of residential development of up to 200 dwellings and associated works including demolition of existing farm building” at land adj Pilling Lane/Holly Road/Langley Lane/ Riverside, Scissett, Huddersfield, HD8 9JF/

The approval proposed that, as part of the planning conditions, traffic calming and safety improvements are required to Pennine Way and its junction with Wakefield Road. (Appendix 1)

These included:

- Construction of 3 no. road humps and a new section of footway on Pennine Way;
- Alterations to the junction of Pennine Way and Wakefield Road to improve visibility;
- Propose the installation of sections of double yellow lines (no waiting at any time) to ensure the safe operation of the junction.

These documents can also be viewed online at the Planning Services website at [www.kirklees.gov.uk/planning](http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/planning).

The developer has committed, through a Section 278 Agreement, to implement these improvements work prior to the development being occupied, to maximise the safety benefits this will bring at this busy junction.

The TRO proposals (Appendix 2) were publicly advertised between 2 August 2019 and 3 September 2019, and during that period 2 objections were received. (Appendix 3)

### **The first from a resident of Pennine Way, Scissett**

Although the resident on Pennine Way supports the improvements to the exit onto Wakefield Road, they object to the proposed traffic calming measures on Pennine Way due to the following points:

- There will be an increase in pollution as vehicles slow down then speed up again to negotiate the bumps
- An increase in noise and vibration to adjacent properties
- Delivery vehicles don't slow down for these bumps
- Some private users don't slow down

- In winter when covered in snow they increase the chance of not being able to navigate the slope
- Emergency Vehicles suffer problems with these bumps
- Increase in wear and tear to vehicle suspension systems
- Would a 20mph limit be better on the estate

**In response:**

Traffic calming by the use of road humps is a proven method of reducing speed and is used throughout the district in similar circumstances. The humps proposed have a relatively shallow gradient with a flat top which will act as a physical and visual deterrent to speeding vehicles. The spacing of the humps is set to keep speeds low and to encourage people to drive appropriately for the location. (20mph limits would also require physical features to ensure that they are self-enforcing).

If the humps are driven over correctly they will have no detrimental effect on vehicles and there is no evidence of any increase in noise levels associated with lighter vehicles (cars and vans up to 3.5t) as this is offset by the reduction in speed. With regards to any increased vibration this is usually associated with larger vehicles and it is anticipated these will be kept to a minimum as it is not intended to install the road humps until all construction traffic has ceased.

As part of the consultation we have also carried out consultation with our 'statutory' consultees that include the police / fire and ambulance service and have received no adverse comments from them regarding the proposals.

**The second from a resident of Pennine Rise, Scissett**

The resident is concerned that the proposed parking restrictions are shorter than the standard visibility splay length and this will continue to reduce visibility for drivers exiting from the junction.

**In response**

Although the visibility splay may occasionally be compromised by parked vehicles, the visibility to the oncoming traffic will still be in excess of the minimum 40m required.

It is felt that the current proposal provides an adequate balance of safety and visibility without putting too onerous a restriction on the current level of on-street parking provision for residents.

**3. Implications for the Council**

**3.1 Working with people** - The proposed works were considered necessary at planning application stage and approved by Planning Committee. These proposals are to mitigate the impact of the development on the highway network.

**3.2 Working with Partners** – Not applicable

**3.3 Place based Working** – This is a local solution aimed at improving the highway network for local people.

**3.4 Climate Change and Air Quality** – These proposals will not have a detrimental impact on Air Quality or Climate Change.

**3.5 Improving outcomes for children-** These proposals are aimed at reducing the speeds traffic can achieve on entering and travelling within a residential area

**3.6 Other** - If the TRO is not implemented, it is likely the benefits of reducing speeds on Pennine Way and improving safety and visibility at the junction Pennine Way/Wakefield Road will not be achieved.

#### **4. Consultees and their opinions**

Statutory consultees have been consulted on these proposals and no objections have been received

The Denby Dale Ward Councillors have been consulted on the proposals and are supportive of the scheme, with the request the scheme is implemented as soon as possible.

Cllr Turner responded:

“I have no comments on the actual plan other than, it was part of the granted planning permission, and am supportive of the proposals.

What I would like to see is the proposals done sooner than next year, especially the double yellow lines, as the access onto the A636 from the estate is not good, and I am sure the residents would appreciate this.”

#### **5. Next steps and timelines**

Cabinet Committee Local Issues to consider the objections raised during the formal advertising period for the introduction of traffic calming and the installation of waiting restrictions and the information contained in this report, and reach a decision on whether or not the traffic calming and TRO are implemented as advertised

#### **6. Officer recommendations and reasons**

That the objections be overruled, and the traffic calming and TRO proposals are implemented, as advertised, to allow the approved planning conditions to be discharged, and allow improvements to a local road junction that is to become busier as a result of building new homes

#### **7. Cabinet portfolio holder's recommendations**

Cllr Walker supports the local Ward Councillors and the Officer recommendation.

#### **8. Contact officer**

Jonathan Walsh -  
Principal Engineer  
(01484) 221000  
[jonathan.walsh@kirklees.gov.uk](mailto:jonathan.walsh@kirklees.gov.uk)

#### **9. Background Papers and History of Decisions**

Planning Application Number – **2013/93441**

#### **10. Service Director responsible**

Sue Procter -  
Service Director - Environment  
(01484) 221000  
[sue.procter@kirklees.gov.uk](mailto:sue.procter@kirklees.gov.uk)

