

**REPORT TITLE: To consider objections received for TRO AMD No 23 2025
 Eastborough Crescent, Dewsbury - Proposed Removal of existing Permit Parking**

Meeting:	Cabinet Committee – Local Issues
Date:	13 March 2026
Cabinet Member (if applicable)	Cllr Tyler Hawkins
Key Decision Eligible for Call In	No Yes
<p>Purpose of Report: To consider objections received to an application for the removal of permit parking from more than 60% of the residents on Eastborough Crescent and an application for the permit parking to remain in the Eastborough area from a local ward councillor as part of Traffic Regulation Amendment (No 23) 2025</p>	
<p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the permit parking area on Eastborough Crescent and in the Eastborough area is formally removed in line with the Council’s approved policy used to assess and manage all permit parking schemes throughout Kirklees. • 82% of residents have provided written support for the removal of the permit-parking scheme from Eastborough Crescent and more than 60% written support from all the streets in the Eastborough area , and in accordance with the Council’s approved policy, which requires more than 60% support to qualify for these changes, that approval be given to remove the lines and signs on site and finalise the associated Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). <p>Reasons for Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In accordance with the Council’s permit parking policy, written support from more than 60% of properties within a permit parking scheme is required for the scheme’s removal. An initial application was received from 23 of the 28 properties (82%) on Eastborough Crescent. No objections were received from other residents when the current proposals were advertised. • A local ward councillor for this area did however ask for the other permit parking areas to remain in the Eastborough area. In order to review the initial decision to progress the removal of the permit parking here, majority support would be needed from the 3 ward councillors which was not attained. • Retaining the permit parking area despite this level of support for removal would be inconsistent with the Council’s permit parking policy. 	
<p>Resource Implications:</p> <p>The Traffic Regulation Order for the removal of the proposed permit parking scheme and the relevant lining and signing will be funded through the Parking Team.</p>	

Date signed off by <u>Executive Director</u> & name	David Shepherd : 11/02/2026
Is it also signed off by the Service Director for Finance?	Kevin Mulvaney : 19/02/2026
Is it also signed off by the Service Director for Legal Governance and Commissioning (Monitoring Officer)?	Samantha Lawton : 25/02/2026

Electoral wards affected: Dewsbury East

Ward councillors consulted:

- **Dewsbury East councillors** – Cllr Eric Firth, Cllr Paul Moore, Cllr Cathy Scott

Public or private: Public

Has GDPR been considered? Yes

1. Executive Summary

1.1 A permit parking scheme on Eastborough Crescent was introduced in March 1992 to help ensure that residents could park close to their homes for the majority of the time. The scheme was amended in 2002 to include Sundays. These measures were implemented because the street is adjacent to the Dewsbury Market area, where car boot sales were taking place at that time, resulting in visitors parking in the surrounding streets and preventing residents from parking near their homes. At present the market is currently being upgraded and modernised and continues to attract people and may become more popular again in the future.

1.2 Following an approved increase in permit costs and an annual charge across the district in 2024 (as detailed as item 11 in the link detailed in the appendices), several applications for the removal of permit parking schemes were received in the Council in 2025. Reasons cited for their removal included the belief that the schemes were no longer needed, objections to the increased charges, questioning the legality of the removal process, the consultation and the administration of permit parking schemes in the Dewsbury area and concerns about insufficient enforcement.

1.3 Each application received in 2025, for individual streets, to be removed from the permit scheme, were assessed in accordance with the Council's current permit-parking policy. Applications that provided more than 60% written support meeting the threshold for the removal of the scheme were approved to be progressed, subject to the subsequent processing of a legal TRO.

1.4 At that time residents from 23 of the 28 properties on Eastborough Crescent (82%) and more than 60% on each of the other surrounding roads including Battye Street (69%), St Philip's Close (67%) and Camroyd Street (94%) applied to request the removal of the permit parking scheme here. The remaining 5 properties on Eastborough Crescent did not sign this application. As these applications met the approved criteria set out in the

Council's current permit parking policy, this triggered the next stage of the process to begin to remove the scheme/s from each street.

2 Information required to take a decision

2.1 Scheme and TRO Background

2.2 Several applications were received from local residents in the Kirklees North area in 2025 requesting the removal of permit parking schemes. Each application was assessed on a street bystreet basis, and those who applied with more than 60% written support, meeting the required criteria (as detailed on page 4 in Appendix 3), were notified by letter that their request had been accepted, subject to the completion of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). Residents were advised by letter that the schemes would be suspended during the legal process to revoke them. Of all the proposals, only the permit areas in the Eastborough area received objections. Four from local residents of Eastborough Crescent and one from a local ward councillor throughout this area including Batty Street, St Philip's Street, Camroyd Street and Eastborough Crescent.

2.3 Processing a revocation to remove the permit scheme from Eastborough Crescent and the surrounding roads as shown on the plan detailed in Appendix 1 is a lengthy, legal process which can take up to 6 to 9 months to complete but is needed to comply with current legislation. The suspension of these schemes involved notifying residents of the process and giving them an opportunity to trial the removal of the permit areas to help them decide if this was the right decision for them during the TRO process and an opportunity to withdraw their application if the majority of residents, then reconsidered their initial decision.

2.4 This process also served as a reminder that due to financial and resource costs, if the revocation was successful and the scheme was fully removed, and parking issues returned, then residents would be unable to apply for the reinstatement of a permit parking scheme for two years, and only then, if the circumstances on the street were significantly different to those at the time of the scheme removal.

2.5 The proposals to remove the permit parking scheme on Eastborough Street and the surrounding roads were advertised between 18 December 2025 to 25 January 2026 during which time a petition and five individual objections were received as detailed in Appendix 2).

3. TRO Objections

Objection 1 – The objector asked for the permit area to be reinstated at a reduced cost for permits as random vehicles were being parked in the area and residents were struggling to park on their street.

In response to objection 1.

- a) In line with the approved permit parking policy, residents from more than 60% of the properties would need to provide written support for the scheme to be reinstated before the TRO is sealed and the scheme taken out. At present, there have been no new applications received supporting this decision. Approval for the proposals for resident and visitor permit parking was approved by Cabinet on 8 October 2024. There are no

current plans to reduce the approved permit costs however, in accordance with the Council's Financial Procedure Rules, prices will be reviewed annually and adjusted in line with inflation.

Objection 2 – The objector does not feel removing the permit parking here will benefit residents and will only cause more problems. They did not provide written support to the scheme's removal.

In response to objection 2.

- b) The current permit parking policy was developed to manage expectations of our residents and assist with a fair and consistent approach to the implementation and removal of permit parking schemes across the district. The policy states that if 60% or more residents no longer feel the scheme is necessary, then the scheme will be removed subject to the successful processing of a revocation. The policy requires residents to work collectively towards a shared outcome. As more than 82% of residents have indicated their support for the removal of the scheme, their request is required to take precedence in accordance with the approved policy framework.

Objection 3 – A local ward councillor has registered an objection to the removal of permit parking in the Eastborough area including Battye Street, St Philip's Close and Camroyd Street as well. They also submitted a formal challenge regarding the legal compliance, procedural fairness, consultation, integrity and transparency of the process.

In response to objection 3.

- c) A written response was provided to the Councillor outlining compliance with the approved Council permit policy, status of procedures and integrity and transparency of the process, compliant with current policy. The current permit policy has been applied consistently for the residents of Eastborough Crescent and the residents of all the other streets in this area. In line with the policy, in order for the Council to review the permit area as stated in the approved application pack, more than 50% support is required from local ward councillors. Support to the application process has been received from one of the local ward councillors (who collected the relevant written support to the scheme's removal) and during the public advertisement only one objection was received from the objector, and no response was received from the third Councillor. This does not meet the criteria for a review.

Objection 4 – The objector does want the permit parking scheme removing from Eastborough Crescent as they state other drivers are now parking outside their home making it difficult for them to park outside their home. They state they are happy to pay a yearly fee meaning they can park outside their own property.

In response to objection 4.

- d) As outlined above, the policy requires residents to work collectively towards a shared outcome. With more than 82% of residents indicating support for the removal of the scheme, their request is required to take precedence in accordance with the approved policy framework. Eastborough Crescent is adopted highway, and residents therefore

do not have a legal right to park directly outside their properties. Should the scheme be removed, parking along the street would then operate on an unrestricted, first-come, first-served basis.

Objection 5 – The objector contacted the Council to formally request the reinstatement of the residential permit parking scheme on Eastborough Crescent, citing difficulties experienced by residents as a result of other drivers parking for extended periods without restriction. The Council explained the process required to retain a permit parking scheme and issued an application pack to enable residents to gather the necessary level of support, in line with the policy requirement for more than 60% endorsement for the scheme to remain in place.

In response to objection 5.

- e) The applicant has been advised of the criteria necessary for a valid submission; however, no further application has been received to date.

Objection 6 – The objector submitted a formal application for the reinstatement of the permit area stating residents have had ongoing parking difficulties due to non-residents starting to park here,

In response to objection 6.

- f) Unfortunately, the application was unsuccessful on this occasion, as names were provided without corresponding addresses and the required written support was incomplete.

3.0 Implications for the Council

Retaining the permit parking area despite this level of support for removal would be inconsistent with the Council's permit parking policy and may lead to inconsistencies in the administration of other schemes.

3.1 Council Plan

Annual charges for permits are required to contribute to the council recovering costs of administering a permit system. The parking permit policy clearly explains to residents what the Council can and cannot do in line, ensuring compliance with traffic management legislation. Working with and listening to local residents to understand what they need. Recognising the needs of the community in this area have changed and responding to those needs.

3.2 Financial Implications

If the objections are upheld, then this will be in opposition of the approved policy. This may result in the need to re-run consultation, analysing responses, committee reporting, portfolio briefings and correspondence handling resulting in future officer time. It would also mean that all residents would need contacting again to explain the decision which could then lead to complaints handling at a cost to the Council.

The reduction in permit parking income because of this decision would be approximately £10,078.55.

3.3 Legal Implications

- The revocation of the scheme has been consulted on and advertised, as legally required by:
 - The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984
 - The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 (1996 Regulations)
 - The Traffic Regulation Orders have been progressed in accordance with the statutory requirements of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the 1996 Regulations. Formal consultation has been undertaken, and objections have been duly considered as part of this report.
- Under Regulation 9(1) of the 1996 Regulations, the Council must consider whether to hold a public inquiry before approving and making the order objected to. As none of the objections were made on the grounds of restrictions to loading and unloading, there is no obligation to hold a public inquiry (Reg 9(3) of the 1996 Regulations) but it is still for the Council to exercise its discretion in this respect, all of which, where relevant, are considered in the report above and below.
- The report considers changes to the Councils car parking permitting schemes in both Eastborough Crescent and in roads in the wider Eastborough area. These are covered by TRO s that are longstanding /mature schemes
 - Whilst initially it was thought that just residents of Eastborough Crescent wanted to be taken out of the wider scheme and it was proposed by the Council that other roads in the wider Eastborough area be retained within the existing car park permitting scheme, the Survey suggested a potentially different outcome.
 - The results of the consultation produced a conclusion where- by in addition to the Crescent, residents in a wider area expressed a wish to be taken out of the car parking permitting scheme. The Consultation revealed that 82% of the residents in Eastborough Crescent and over 60% in the wider area - (including Battye Street (69%), St Philip's Close (67%) and Camroyd Street (94%) applied to request the removal of the permit parking scheme here.)
 - Residents in these streets (mentioned above) indicated they wanted the parking permit restrictions removed and the existing TRO amended.
 - The Report therefore notes that retaining the Car Parking Permit Scheme across the wider Eastborough Area (despite the level of resident support for removal) would be inconsistent with the Council's permit parking policy. Whilst there is an Objection to taking the wider area out. However, to do so in these circumstances would be inconsistent with the current policy and the wishes of residents, furthermore, this objection has been fully rebutted in the report
 - Turning back to the Report. Overall it describes a) the consultation periods b) the application of the Councils Car Parking Scheme Policy c) the evaluation of responses and d) in accordance with policy explains that by virtue of wishes of those that have responded more than 60% of

respondents across the wider Eastborough area have expressed a wish to come out of the scheme and it is on this basis the matter is being taken forward

- Some residents have raised the matter of reduced cost and staying in the scheme but paying less. A Local Councillor has also raised objection to the wider withdrawal from the scheme. Wishing to retain the controls over the roads in the wider area whilst one Local Councillor supported the removal and one did not respond.
- As a result of these differing views, this proposal is being reported to Cabinet Committee Local Issues for consideration by Members of the matters raised. All the steps taken in considering these objections have been fair clear inclusive transparent and consistent with the application of the current policy.
- One of the objectors raised a question about legal compliance with policy and the procedures applied to proposals under the Councils Car Parking Permit Scheme.
- Looking at the report and steps taken the way that the review of the the car parking permit scheme has been undertaken and the way the Council is proposing to respond to the consultation involving a report to Cabinet and Members is in terms of any legal critique rational fair and reasonable. It has followed the Councils policy, and the procedures have been carried out in a consistent and transparent way.
- The final evaluation will be by Members considering all objections and the information in this report which sets out background the process and fairly records the views of objectors in a balanced and proportionate manner.

3.4 Climate Change and Air Quality

Under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 the Council has to have regard to, amongst other things: the strategy prepared under section 80 of the Environment Act 1995 (national air quality strategy):

Kirklees Air Quality Strategy and Action Plan 2019 commit to improvements to congested junctions and supporting / encouraging active travel and modal shift on journeys to the nearby school.

Although removing the permit parking would essentially remove any restrictions on parking here and car numbers may increase, the Council are committed to working with the nearby school on Rockley Street to support the Council's commitments to addressing the climate emergency by enabling a modal shift towards more sustainable modes of transport to and from the premises.

- 3.5** As part of another scheme, there are also plans to introduce a traffic calming scheme on Battye Street which is being funded by a collaborative initiative between Kirklees Council and the West Yorkshire Combined Authority and is funded by the Transforming Cities Fund. The aim of this scheme is to reduce congestion, improve air quality, and improve facilities for pedestrians and cyclists.

3.6 Other (e.g. Risk, Integrated Impact Assessment or Human Resources)

- None other than that set out above under 'Legal Implications'

4.0 Consultation

Consultations on the proposal have been carried out with residents, local ward councillors and statutory bodies in October 2025. Support to the application process was received from one of the local ward councillors who collected the relevant written support to the scheme's removal and during the public advertisement one objection from another Councillor was received along with four objections from local residents here. No response was received from the third Councillor.

5.0 Engagement

Statutory Consultees were consulted and no adverse comments were received.

Residents were notified of their application success and the subsequent process by letter once prior to the public advertisement of the proposals. During the public advertisement 5 objections were received against the proposal.

6.0 Options

- a) That the objections be outweighed, and the scheme removed as requested by more than 60% of the residents here.
- b) That the objections be upheld, and the scheme is reinstated.

Officer recommendation Option a) – that the objections be acknowledged, outweighed and the proposals to remove the scheme is advertised to be sealed and any relevant signs and lining be removed as soon as practical.

6.1 Reasons for recommended option

23 out of 28 properties on Eastborough Crescent (82%) signed to request the removal of the permit parking scheme. This meets the threshold set out in the permit parking policy which triggered the next stage of the process to remove the scheme.

6.2 Councillor Hawkins supports Officer recommendations (Portfolio Holder – Environment and Highways)

7.0 Next steps and timelines

If the recommended options are approved and the benefits of the scheme, as advertised, **are** determined to outweigh the objections, and the objections put aside, a timeline will be developed to formally remove the lining and signing and the TRO sealed as soon as practical.

If CCLI members deem that the objections **are not** determined to outweigh the anticipated benefits of the revocations, then the proposals to remove the permit parking

here, as consulted and advertised, will not go ahead and residents will be required to reapply for permits before enforcement recommences.

Contact officer

- Karen North – Principal Technical Officer (highways lead for the scheme)

Tel: (01484) 221000 **Email:** karen.north@kirklees.gov.uk

8.0 Background Papers and History of Decisions

Appendices are attached as outlined below.

9.0 Appendices

- Appendix 1- TRO Plan
- Appendix 2- Full Objections (redacted)
- Appendix 3 – The Council's permit parking policy

10.0 <https://democracy.kirklees.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=139&MID=7709>
[Agenda for Cabinet on Tuesday 8th October 2024, | Kirklees Council](https://democracy.kirklees.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=139&MID=7709) (Item 8)

11.0 Service Director responsible

Tony Galloway.