

REPORT TITLE: To consider objections received for proposed Traffic Regulation Order Reference Traffic Regulation Amendment (No 15) Order 2025 – Various Roads in South Kirklees

Meeting:	Cabinet Committee – Local issues	
Date:	13 March 2026	
Cabinet Member (if applicable)	Councillor Tyler Hawkins	
Key Decision Eligible for Call In	Yes	
Purpose of Report: To consider objections received to the Traffic Regulation Amendment (No 15) Order 2025 covering South Kirklees.		
Recommendations		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> That the benefits of the scheme are deemed to outweigh the formal objections, and as such the proposed parking restrictions should be approved and implemented as advertised. 		
Reasons for Recommendations		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The objections to the proposal do not outweigh the benefits 		
Resource Implications:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The design and implementation of the proposals have been funded through existing budgets and contribution via a planning condition. 		
Date signed off by <u>Executive Director:</u> <u>David Shepherd</u>	<u>David Shepherd</u>	05/02/2026
Is it also signed off by the Service Director for Finance:	<u>Kevin Mulvaney</u>	08/02/2026
Is it also signed off by the Service Director for Legal and Commissioning (Monitoring Officer):	<u>Samantha Lawton</u>	26/02/2026

Electoral wards affected: Golcar, Newsome and Holme Valley North

Ward councillors consulted: Cllr Andrew Marchington, Cllr Angela Sewell, Cllr Graham Turner; Cllr Karen Allison, Cllr Andrew Cooper, Cllr Susan Lee-Richards; Cllr Charles Greaves, Cllr Donna Bellamy, Cllr Tony McGrath

Public or private: Public

Has General Data Protection Regulation been considered: Yes

1. Executive Summary

1.1 A traffic regulation order was advertised for south Kirklees which either created new or amended parking restrictions in ten separate locations across Huddersfield, Holmfirth, Honley and Slaithwaite.

1.2 Objections were received to the proposals in three of the locations: two separate locations in Huddersfield and one in Honley.

1.3 This report explains the objections and why we believe they should be overruled.

2. Information required to take a decision

2.1 A notice of proposals for the traffic regulation order was advertised from 22 September 2025 to 13 November 2025. The traffic regulation order covered a number of locations across south Kirklees. The eight objections received during the advertisement period relate to just three of the areas:

- i) Celandine Avenue/Raw Nook Road, Huddersfield.
- ii) Broadgate/Somerset Road/Longley Lane, Huddersfield.
- iii) Bradshaw Road in Honley, where a number of restrictions were proposed at junctions with Bradshaw Road.

2.2 One objection was received relating to the proposals on Celandine Avenue in Huddersfield. One objection relating to the proposals on Bradshaw Road in Honley. The remaining six objections all relate to the proposals on Somerset Road and Broadgate, Huddersfield. See Appendix 2 for the full objection details.

2.3 Objection 1 – Junction of Celandine Avenue/ Raw Nook Road, Huddersfield

The first objection relates to the Celandine Avenue/ Raw Nook Road junction, and the objector believes restrictions should have been included to remove parking from this junction as well as restrictions along Celandine Avenue that were contained in the TRO.

In Response

The parking restrictions proposed on Celandine Avenue are as a result of student parking from the nearby college. Over time the students have been parking in Dunsmore Drive, on New Hey Road and also on Celandine Avenue starting from the New Hey Road end.

The proposed restrictions are to make the road safer and more accessible to residents, while maintaining some level of parking. The objector suggests we should have included the junction of Celandine Avenue and Raw Nook Road, but the parking here was not as a result of students. The parking here is by residents and therefore much harder to deal with.

While we do not support parking within 10m of the junction as per the Highway Code we would find it extremely difficult to move cars when parking is in high demand in these areas. Although there has been parking in this junction, we found no personal injury collisions in our accident history suggests the junction is operating in a safe manner.

We cannot add restrictions into this TRO that are deemed missing by objectors, we would need to re-advertise the TRO, including the extra restrictions, if the decision was

made to uphold this objection. Or we could complete this TRO as per the existing restrictions and then create a new TRO, in order to advertise the changes, if the decision required them to be created.

2.4 Objection 2 – Broadgate and Somerset Road, Huddersfield

This objection relates to the restrictions being introduced on Broadgate and Somerset Road. The objector believes that those living at properties between no. 146 & 166 Somerset Road will suffer from increased parking problems as a result of this proposal for two main reasons:

- i) They have not been included in any permit parking and the parking outside these properties remains unrestricted.
- ii) The proposed double yellow lines would remove usable parking spaces that are currently relied upon daily. This will not reduce the number of cars needing to park — it will simply force them into even fewer available spaces.

The objector proposes an alternative arrangement as follows:

- Time-restricted permits (e.g., 08:00–18:00) rather than 24-hour restrictions, so spaces can still be shared among all residents outside peak periods.
- Permit eligibility extending to all households on Somerset Road, not just those between 168 and 186.
- Reviewing options for additional marked parking spaces on Broadgate where road width safely allows.

In Response

During a local consultation for those who would be affected by the scheme carried out in late 2024 there was no support from the residents for permit parking outside no.s 146 to 166. Despite our letter to these properties explaining that the planning permission for the vet's extension had a condition that meant they paid towards the traffic regulation order that would include resident permit parking outside 168 to 186.

We asked the residents directly if they wished to have permit parking included outside these properties. Nobody replied in favour of this and two properties objected to the installation of permit parking. For that reason, we did not pursue the permit parking in this location.

Secondly the proposed double yellow lines are only placed to improve visibility and remove obstructive footway parking from Broadgate. During the development of the scheme for the permit parking outside 168 to 186 Somerset Road we also received complaints from local residents about dangerous parking on Longley Lane and Broadgate near their respective junctions with Somerset Road. The advertised proposal has sought to prevent dangerous parking in these locations rather than remove usable parking spaces.

In the case of Broadgate, the dangerous parking involved cars parking on the footway and affecting visibility for car drivers and accessibility for pedestrians. Once you remove parking from the junction you also have to deal with its potential displacement and as a result the extent of double yellow lines on Broadgate were proposed. This dealt with the existing parking on the junction but also prevents parking too close to a number of private accesses, the back lanes to the houses on Somerset Road and the junctions of Templar Drive and Broadgate Crescent.

The layout of double yellow lines was the minimum required not to move the problem to an adjacent road, private access or back lane and therefore is appropriate.

In response to their proposed changes:

- Time-restricted permits (e.g., 08:00–18:00) rather than 24-hour restrictions, so spaces can still be shared among all residents outside peak periods. – ***Donaldsons Vets at Somerset Rd lists 114 staff currently and the opening hours are generally 8.30am to 6pm, but they do offer a 24-hour service so a number of staff will be onsite outside of these hours. Therefore, parking in the local area by staff will continue beyond the proposed 8 to 6pm limit.***
- Permit eligibility extending to all households on Somerset Road, not just those between 168 and 186. – ***The option for these properties to be included in the permit scheme was consulted on and found no support.***
- Reviewing options for additional marked parking spaces on Broadgate where road width safely allows. – ***Parking has only been restricted where it is necessary to do so to prevent visibility and access issues. The remainder of the road remains available to those who park safely and without causing obstruction. We do not mark bays that have no restrictions on them so marking additional spaces is not an efficient use of our resources.***

2.5 Objection 3 – Broadgate and Somerset Road, Huddersfield

This objector is concerned that the proposals will just move the parking to outside their house and to other unrestricted locations.

The objector states “please bear in mind that none of the suggestions you have made solve any problems, all it does is move it up or down the road”. The objector makes reference to an earlier consultation that proposed permit parking being included for the properties between 142 and 166 Somerset Road and what happened to it as it was not in the advertised proposals.

They finish by saying we should control the parking from Donaldsons vets, making them use their own car park.

In Response

This objector has concerns about displaced parking and the fact we never included the properties between 142 and 166 Somerset Road in the resident permit parking scheme. In their objection which can be seen in full in Appendix 2 they say they “We received a letter earlier this year about permit parking on our stretch of the road, I objected to that”. This was one of the properties that did not respond favourably to permit parking between 142 and 166 so we dropped the proposal from the scheme.

We had anticipated the displacement of the staff parking with the overall proposal and highlighted this in our consultation with the residents, but this did not result in any support for the permit parking here as explained in Objection 2 above.

Secondly the reason why we are adding restrictions to the road around Somerset Rd etc. is because we cannot control what goes on, on private land we cannot demand that Donaldsons change their policy toward parking by staff.

2.6 Objection 4 – Broadgate and Somerset Road, Huddersfield

This objector is concerned with limited parking being available for 146 to 164 Somerset Road while properties between 168 to 186 Somerset Road will benefit from a permit parking bay which will exclude all other road users 24/7.

They suggest some alternatives if the Vets cannot be persuaded to make full use of their parking spaces, as follows:

- Either implement time restricted permit only parking outside 168 to 186 from 08:00 to 18:00 OR remove the restriction that only houses from 168-186 can access the permits
- Create additional legitimate parking spaces along the north side of Broadgate near the Somerset Road junction and use double yellow lines on the opposite side only. Broadgate is wide enough to accommodate three vehicles, is not a busy road and the yellow lines would ensure visibility of traffic travelling north towards the junction.

In Response

As clarified in objection 2 & 3 the properties between no. 146 & 166 Somerset Road were consulted on whether they wanted to be included in the permit parking and there was no support for it.

The reason for not changing the times of the permit bay outside 166 to 186 Somerset Road is clarified in objection 2. The request to remove the permit parking here would also be contrary to why the scheme was developed. Ever since the vets has opened these properties have had to deal with staff parking and they reached out to the Council to see if we could change that.

If we dropped the permit parking here, then nothing would be improved and the funding received from the vets as part of a planning condition would have been wasted.

2.7 Objection 5 – Broadgate and Somerset Road, Huddersfield

This objection is on the grounds that the Highway Code Rule 243 states you should not park within 10 metres of a junction, so the double yellow lines proposed do not need to be any longer than that.

By having double yellow lines longer than 10m we will be pushing the problem somewhere else.

In Response

The objector is correct that parking within 10m of a junction is something drivers should not do as per Highway Code Rule 243. However, we disagree that the double yellow lines should therefore stop at 10m from the junction with Somerset Rd.

As stated in the response to objection 2 we have to also think about where this parking is being displaced to and that is why we have continued further up Broadgate. By proposing the additional double yellow lines, we are protecting the visibility out to the back lanes for the properties on Somerset Road, the private accesses and the junctions of Templar Drive and Broadgate Crescent. After these lines it is then safe and appropriate for drivers to park on Broadgate as long as they don't block drives or footways.

2.8 Objection 6 – Broadgate and Somerset Road, Huddersfield

This objector is concerned that these restrictions will “make it more difficult for my parents as the staff from the vets will have less available space to park, so are more likely to park outside my parents home, making it more difficult for family to be able to park to help them.”

They too have raised concerns that Vet staff should be parking in the car park and not on these roads.

In Response

It is clear that the proposals will displace some parking from the resident permit bay and the dangerous parking on the junction, but the amount of parking is unlikely to change the effect on this property.

The property would already be affected by the parking on Broadgate and immediately outside this property is still unrestricted so the possibility of someone else parking outside the property has not changed.

2.9 Objection 7 – Bradshaw Road, Honley

The objector believes we are not dealing with all the issues on Bradshaw Road.

They believe the junction of Bradshaw Crescent is probably one of the worst junctions for visibility that joins Bradshaw Road and the entry/exit is frequently congested due to the density of terrace houses that do not have off road parking. For the reasons for doing the junctions in the TRO we should also include this one.

The second point they raise is that the new double yellow line coming from the junction of Stoney Lane, outside the pub does not go far enough, it needs to continue on toward the junction with Meltham Road to tie-in with a new layout under construction.

In Response

Bradshaw Crescent was investigated during the initial work but as no personal injury collisions were found in our accident database, we did not feel the location required the same action as the other junctions concerned.

The second location identified covers outside the Blue Tiger Restaurant and again no personal injury collisions were found in our database that related to parking here. In this case the section of road is likely to be parked on briefly while take-aways are collected from the restaurant. Even if we installed double yellow lines, it would be very difficult to enforce due to the short duration of stopping.

Overall, we feel it is better to leave the road as it is currently as anyone looking to park for longer time periods will use the car park that belongs to the restaurant.

2.10 Objection 8 – Longley Road, Huddersfield

The objector believes we need to add a section of double yellow lines to both sides of the road outside 7,9, 12 & 14 Longley Road. This is to improve safety and visibility for both drivers and pedestrians, who are negatively impacted by parking blocking these footpaths/crossings.

The location is made up of property accesses and an alleyway running between 7 & 9 and 12 & 14 respectively.

In Response

The request for additional double yellow lines cannot be fulfilled as part of this TRO, as they never formed part of the advertised Order. In order to place TROs here we would need to consult and advertise a new TRO.

It is our policy not to create double yellow lines to resolve parking issues for individual properties, unless we resolve it as a consequence of installing restrictions to deal with issues that affect the wider population or relate to road safety improvements. There are no personal injury collisions at this location, so we would not propose to install double yellow lines at the accesses/alleyway exit point in this case.

3. Implications for the Council

3.1 Council Plan

These parking restrictions are contributing to our Council Plan by providing a safer and less congested environment for all road users on the highway network.

3.2 Financial Implications

Funding for this scheme has been secured from our Traffic Regulation Order budget and supplemented by a contribution as a result of a planning condition for the extension to the vets. The monies received as part of the planning condition has been spent as part of the preparation and advertising costs for the TRO; therefore, no monies will remain to be returned.

3.3 Legal Implications

3.3.1 This scheme has been consulted on and advertised, as legally required by:

- a) The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- b) The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations 1996 (1996 Regulations).

3.3.2 Under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 the Council has to have regard to

- a) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises.
- b) the effect on the amenities of any locality affected and (without prejudice to the generality of this paragraph) the importance of regulating and restricting the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles, so as to preserve or improve the amenities of the areas through which the roads run.
- c) The strategy prepared under section 80 of the Environment Act 1995 (national air quality strategy).

d) The importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles; and e) Any other matters appearing to the local authority to be relevant.

3.3.6 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.

3.3.7 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 at times listed under Regulation 9(3)(a) of the 1996 Regulations, 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.

3.3.8 If the objection is upheld then none of the proposed TRO on Longley Lane, Somerset Road, Broadgate and other adjacent roads will be installed. The road will remain unrestricted and at risk of the existing unsafe and inconvenient parking issues first raised by residents in the area.

3.3.9 This is a geographically wide-ranging TRO and its proposals have generated a range of area specific objections. The report includes details of the consultation process and the evaluation undertaken of the points made. There are a number of objections reported some of which ask for measures that were not proposed and advertised others for mitigation where the data of accidents/injury do not support a change.

The section dealing with Objections is extensive and comprehensive responses are provided. The above paragraphs describe the procedures followed.

The next stage is set out below next steps Section 8 which involves Members evaluating the responses to the objections and deciding whether to affirm the Order.

3.4 Climate Change & Air Quality

Under Sec 122 of 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 commits to improvements to congested junctions and supporting / encouraging active travel and modal shift on journeys to school.

As this traffic regulation order aims to control parking and reduce congestion in this will have a positive effect on Climate Change and Air Quality and is in line with our current Strategy.

4 Consultation

The scheme was developed over an extended time period and the properties affected around Broadgate and Somerset Road, the proposals were consulted in Sept/Oct 2024, during which we received a number of comments that led to a slightly amended layout.

This consultation also showed no overall support to the properties between 146 & 166 Somerset Road for permit parking.

Consultation with statutory consultees was then carried out in December 2024, with no comments received.

The scheme was then added to the wider Traffic Regulation Order and advertised in September 2025.

The Celandine Avenue area was consulted in March 2025, and some comments resulted in minor changes to the restrictions layout.

The Bradshaw Road element of the TRO was consulted on in July 2025, and no comments were received from those affected.

5. Engagement

As described in the consultation paragraph above.

6. Options

- a) That the benefits of the scheme **are deemed** to outweigh the objections, and the proposals be implemented as advertised.
- b) That the benefits of the scheme **are deemed not to outweigh** the objections, and the proposals be abandoned.

Officer recommendation – Option (a)

7. Reasons for recommended option

- 7.1 The officer recommends these proposal as it ensures that parking becomes restricted to safe areas and the residents of 166 to 168 Somerset Road have an opportunity to park.

For Raw Nook Road/Celandine Avenue the improvement suggested by the objector cannot be included in the existing proposed traffic regulation order, but we will monitor the situation in the future.

For Bradshaw Road we do not support the suggested additions as the locations have no personal injury collisions, so making changes here would be low on our priority.

The Longley Lane proposals only improve things for a small number of drives and access to an alleyway, as a result we would not have recommend any restrictions here as part of any normal investigations. So, it would not be appropriate to recommend installing double yellow lines to deal with the problem raised.

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

8. Next steps and timelines

Cabinet Committee Local Issues to consider the objections raised during the formal advertisement period for the installation of the proposed parking restrictions and reach a decision on whether the restrictions are to be implemented as advertised.

If Cabinet Committee Local Issues, **deem that the benefits of the scheme do outweigh the objections** the scheme will be implemented as advertised.

If Cabinet Committee Local Issues **deem that the benefits of the scheme do not outweigh the objections** the proposals objected to will be removed from the overall TRO and the safety benefits and parking controls will be lost.

9. Contact officer:

Ken Major
Principal Engineer
(01484) 221000

Email: ken.major@kirklees.gov.uk

10. Background Papers and History of Decisions

Non

11. Appendices

Appendix 1 - Plans
Appendix 2 - Objections as received [redacted]

12. Service Director responsible: Tony Galloway