

**REPORT TITLE:**

<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Cabinet Committee – Local issues</b>
<b>Date:</b>	<b>19 November 2024</b>
<b>Cabinet Member (if applicable)</b>	<b>Councillor Munir Ahmed</b>
<b>Key Decision Eligible for Call In</b>	<b>No Yes</b>
<p><b>Purpose of Report:</b> To consider objections received to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order – ‘Amendment Order No 7 of 2024’ - Church Street, Bridge Street, Platt Lane, London Street, New Street, Spa Fields, Slaithwaite.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To consider the objections received from 6 objectors.</li> <li>Officers propose, as a result of the content of some of the objections, to revise the scheme to remove a proposed short length of “no loading at any time” outside St James Parish Church from the proposals. This will go towards satisfying some of the objections received from three of the 6 objectors – but without unduly compromising the overall scheme objectives.</li> <li>To overrule the remaining objections and implement the scheme as advertised, with the exception of the section highlighted above.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reasons for Recommendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposals deal with issues and concerns, as reported by local ward councillors and members of the public and observed by officers. These issues are caused by inappropriate parking causing congestion, safety issues for pedestrians and access issues for larger vehicles.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Resource Implications:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All the proposals installed would be funded from the Council’s revenue budget.</li> </ul>	
<b>Date signed off by <u>Executive Director:</u> <u>David Shepherd</u></b>	<b>17/09/2024</b>
<b>Director for Finance: Kevin Mulvaney</b>	<b>16/09/2024</b>
<b>Director for Legal and Commissioning (Monitoring Officer): Sam Lawton</b>	<b>08/10/2024</b>

**Electoral wards affected: Colne Valley**

**Ward councillors consulted: Cllr Harry McCarthy, Cllr Beverley Addy, Cllr Matthew McLoughlin**

**Public or private: Public**

**Has GDPR been considered:** Yes

## **1. Executive Summary**

- Local ward councillors have received many complaints over the years about obstructive parking taking place on Church Street, Bridge Street, Platt Lane, London Street, New Street and Spa Field at Slaithwaite. A number of parking assessments identified there are issues with parking on the footway blocking pedestrian access, parking on both sides of the road creating narrow sections of carriageway causing congestion and vehicular obstruction and parking in such positions to hinder or prevent access/egress to a number of businesses.
- The results of the surveys indicated that to resolve these issues
  - Sections of double yellow lines are needed on Bridge Street, Platt Lane, New Street, London Road, and Spa Fields to maintain HGV access to industrial units and create passing points along these routes.
  - A number of shared residential parking bays and limited waiting bays and parking bays were required on Bridge Street, in order to regulate parking taking place here. Parking occurs on both sides of the road along Bridge St and drivers choose to park on the pavement to keep the road clear but restrict pedestrian movements. These proposals are designed to reduce the likelihood of pavement parking by restricting parking to one side of the road, or the other, which will also assist in maintaining access for HGVs on Bridge Street to the industrial units as shown on the plan detailed in Appendix no. 2.
  - “No waiting at any time / no loading 7am to 10am and 4pm to 7pm” parking restrictions are required, on one side of the road on Church Street, in order to prevent access issues for through traffic and obstructive pavement parking and parking on both sides and the on the footpath.
  - The introduction of sections of “No waiting at any time / No loading at any time” around the junctions of Church Street, Nabbs Lane and Bank Gate to prevent the relocation of displaced parking to these locations.
- In consultation with local Cllrs a scheme was developed, and the required Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was advertised 6 August 2024 and 3 September 2024.
- During the formal advertising 6 objections were received.

## **2. Information required to take a decision**

2.1 Officers have worked with local Councillors over a sustained period of time, to develop a scheme of waiting restrictions aimed at: improving traffic flow in and around Slaithwaite Town Centre, including protecting safe access to number of industrial premises within this very compact but very busy town centre, protecting the footways to ensure the safe passage of pedestrians around the centre, and give residents in the local area greater opportunities to park within a short walking distance of their homes.

2.2 The scheme proposals were sent to formal consultation with our Statutory consultees and formally advertised in the press, and on street 6<sup>th</sup> August 2024 – 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2024 and 6 objections were received

2.3 **Objections** – Full objections are included with this report ( Appendix 1)

### **Objection 1 –**

The objector is concerned that the proposed restrictions will make the already difficult parking situation in Slaithwaite worse, as the current parking provision, in their view, is

inadequate. They are also concerned about the impact these proposals will have on local businesses and local community services, and their accessibility, and in turn the economic viability of the town centre, and the increase traffic speeds that will occur, when parking is removed and traffic flows freely.

The objector requests that any additional parking restrictions are only considered alongside additional parking and safe crossing routes.

**In Response:**

Parking is in high demand in many parts of Slaithwaite and this proposed traffic regulation order removes parking, or controls parking, in a number of important locations, but officers have been mindful of keeping restrictions to a minimum.

Congestion is significant on Church Street as a result of the current parking arrangements and the concerns here are heightened by drivers mounting and parking partly on the footway, specifically on the southwest side where it is proposed to introduce “no waiting at any time/no loading 7am to 10am and 4pm to 7pm”. This parking on the footway is done in a misguided belief that this would improve the space for the passing traffic but merely prevents pedestrian access

Parking on Bridge Street is in very high demand for residents, business owners, business customers, business employees and parents of children at the nursery. The current arrangements are unrestricted beyond the existing double yellow lines at the junction with Britannia Road. Parking occurs on both sides of the road but requires cars etc. to park partly on the footway to create enough space for the wagons to gain access to the businesses further down. The TRO advertised is intended to rationalise parking and improve access for all road users. It is proposed to remove parking from one side of the road where it is too narrow, provides space for residents with permit holder bays, parking for visitors to businesses and the doctors surgery with limited waiting spaces to ensure a turnover of vehicles and provides a clear path through and room for turning into the businesses for HGVs.

The objector requests that more parking is created in Slaithwaite, however the Council does not have either the land or the funds available to create any additional off street parking provisions.

**Objection 2 –**

This objector is concerned about the introduction of double yellow lines on both sides of the road on Church Street, as it will allow traffic to move more freely will increase vehicle speeds and create a major safety risk at peak times for pedestrians and young children. Their view is that the existing parking slows drivers down and the “two minute” delay this causes allows people to cross with less risk due to only having to cross a single running lane.

**In Response -**

The current parking on both sides of the Church Street has a major impact on visibility for through traffic, as they approach from either direction, the junction of Nabbs Lane, as well as for those entering and leaving it. It is difficult for drivers to see approaching traffic and therefore judge whether or not it is safe to progress through the artificially created “one way” section of this road. There is also a narrow but used vehicular access to the church that is also difficult to negotiate because of the visibility.

Currently parking takes place, for the majority of the day, on the Church side of the road, and this will remain. However, the restrictions on the opposite side of the road will prevent parking that not only maintains free flowing traffic, but also, because this parking tends to be

where pavement parking occurs so restricting this section will improve the route that the majority of pedestrians use.

It is acknowledged that there is the potential for vehicle speeds to increase, however, the road at this point has a 20mph speed limit, so they should not rise significantly. The area will however be monitored closely upon implementation for unintended consequences.

### **Objection 3**

The objector raises two concerns

- the first is about clarity over the 20mph restrictions, and the ability to find, as part of these proposals, extensions to the current 20mph zone, particularly into Nabbs lane
- Secondly, where the parked cars removed from Church Street will now park. They are concerned that Nabbs Lane will be the place they park and have suggested this road should have permit parking for residents.

### **In Response –**

There are no changes proposed to the existing speed limits in this area, as part of this proposal, and as such this report is unable to deal with that issue. Officers have however recorded this concern, and it will be investigated, alongside all other speed limit change requests, as and when resources become available.

Permit parking was not considered for Nabbs Lane as alternative spaces can be found on Old Bank and other locations nearer the village centre for any parking displaced from Church Street. The impact on parking on this road will be monitored but no changes are proposed for the moment.

As requests for permit parking requires completing of an application form by residents, to trigger investigation, an application can be sent to the objector, to allow them to apply, if they believe any of the changes, once introduced, have had an impact on their ability to park.

### **Objections 4, 5 & 6 –**

These objections all relate to the same issue which is that a section of “no waiting at any time / no loading at any time” across the access to St James Parish Church, as they believe this will have an impact on deliveries and unloading in relation to the Church and the Community Centre activities. The proposal prevents any unloading/loading which will have an impact on the Scout Group and in general workmen, working on the Church or Community Centre.

### **Response to Objections 4, 5 & 6**

This objection refers to a specific section of proposed “No Waiting at Any Time/No Loading at Any Time” restrictions that were intended to replace the “Keep Clear” marking across the access to St James Parish Church. The intention was to reinforce the request to “keep clear”, and ensure access is available at all times, particularly as we are removing parking adjacent to this with the other restrictions on Church Street.

As this space is required for temporary loading and unloading, Officers are proposing to remove the “no loading” restriction from the proposed traffic regulation order. It cannot remain as it currently is, as “Keep Clear” markings are not intended to facilitate loading, and any vehicle seen blocking the access, could be liable for a fixed penalty notice for obstruction. When double yellow lines replace the Keep Clear, there is facility within the

order that allows a grace period for loading and unloading which should go towards addressing the concerns of the objectors.

## **Explanation**

### **3 Implications for the Council**

#### **3.1 Council Plan**

An assessment of the request for restrictions has been made using the Council's approved processes, which ensures it has been considered in a fair and balanced way. The results of this assessment found that removing parking in the locations identified would improve road safety and allow traffic to move more easily through these parts of Slaithwaite. This would include supporting employment sites to remain active despite increased parking affecting movement through the village. These would support the Council Plan April 2024 to March 2025 especially in two priority areas, priority 3 – Continue to deliver a greener, healthier Kirklees and address the challenges of climate change; and priority 4 - Continue to invest and regenerate our towns and villages to support our diverse places and communities to flourish.

#### **3.2 Financial Implications**

The cost to process the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) are £6,775.

If the objections are overruled, and the proposed parking restrictions are installed there will be additional expenditure of £7000 for the lining work to be completed, which will be funded from existing Highways revenue budgets.

If the objections are upheld the installation costs will not be incurred, but the TRO costs have already been incurred.

There will also be a loss of any potential future enforcement.

#### **3.3 Legal Implications**

The Council has the legal power to make a Traffic Regulation Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and in doing so is required to follow the procedures set out in the Act and associated Regulations. The Legal work to advertise and promote this order has already been done. Before making an Order, the Council must consider all objections made and not withdrawn. If the order is made, additional legal officer time will be required to seal and make the order, the costs for which are accounted for above. If the objections are upheld, there will be no further legal implications

#### **3.4 Other (e.g. Risk, Integrated Impact Assessment or Human Resources) - None.**

### **4 Consultation**

The three local ward councillors were involved in the development of these proposals and consulted on the final proposed restrictions prior to advertising. Ward Cllrs support the scheme.

The statutory consultees, residents / businesses on affected roads were also consulted. After comments received from local business on Bridge Street, during the formal consultation period, the decision was taken to increase the limited waiting time on this road, to allow additional time for parking for customers associated with local businesses.

Formal consultation on Spa Fields also resulted in an increase in the extent of double yellow lines to resolve complaints regarding access/egress issues to the local businesses there.

## **5 Options**

### **5.1 Options considered**

- a). That the objections be overruled, and the proposals implemented as advertised.
- b). That the majority of the objections be overruled, and the proposals be implemented as advertised with the exception of the proposed “no loading at any time” outside St James Parish Church is removed from the proposals.
- c). That objections be upheld, and those elements of the proposals should be implemented that have not been subject to any objections, that being those proposed on New St, Platt Lane, London Rd and Spa Fields.
- d). That objections be upheld, and all proposals abandoned.

## **6. Reasons for recommended option**

The officer recommendation is option (b):

That the proposals should be implemented as advertised with the exception of the proposed “no loading at any time” outside St James Parish Church, to make the network safer and improve the flow of traffic through Slaithwaite. They will also maintain access to business premises and make the footways safer in key locations. It is believed that removing the “no loading” proposals will not compromise the aims of the scheme, because the double yellow lines will restrict general parking, but allow for short term access requirements. For these purposes the proposed restrictions more appropriate than the current “Keep Clear” marking, which are often ignored, but more importantly does not legally allow loading and unloading to take place on its extents. It may ease arrangements for the people attending the various activities at the Church and Community Centre.

Councillor Munir (Portfolio Holder – Environment and Highways) fully supports officer recommendation.

## **7. Next steps and timelines**

If the objections are overruled, the changes to the parking restrictions will be installed in the current financial year.

If any of the objections are upheld, parts of the restrictions will have to be removed from the installation and the proposed road safety benefits lost.

## **8. Contact officer: Ken Major**

**Principal Technical Officer - Ken Major Email:** [ken.major@kirklees.gov.uk](mailto:ken.major@kirklees.gov.uk)

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

None

## **10. Appendices**

Appendix 1 – Objections as submitted.

Appendix 2 – Plans showing advertised traffic regulation order.

**11. Service Director: Graham West**