

# MINUTES OF GOVERNING BODY MEETING

15 July 2021

## Attendees:

Corporate Lead (Design & Asset Management)	CLDAM
Highways and Planning Solicitor	H&PS
Corporate Lead (Green Space & Street Scene)	CLGS&SS
Corporate Lead Transportation	CLT
Engineer	E
Traffic Engineer	TE
Graduate Engineer	GE
Executive Support Officer	ESO

## 1. Apologies

Assistant Director of Strategic Infrastructure, Flood Programme Manager and Performance Manager.

In his absence ADoSI delegated the chair position to CLDAM.

## 2. Matters arising

None, the previous minutes were accepted as a correct record by email prior to the meeting.

## 3. Orders for Consideration

### a) A672 Oldham Road, Rishworth – Speed Limit Order

TE described the scheme of reducing the existing National Speed Limit to 50mph on the section of Oldham Road from Booth Wood to the Borough boundary with Oldham. The reasons have 2 elements

1. Historically there have been accidents involving speed and loss of control. Guidance indicates that 50mph is a suitable speed limit for a road of the type and setting. Speed tubes have been in place and have shown that the average speed is in the high 40's. The 85%ile is a little higher but within the 50-60mph range.
2. The dual carriageway section of the road at junction 22 of the M62 has street lighting. The presence of street lighting implies that (unless indicated otherwise) a 30mph speed limit may operate. Whilst there is no confirmation of this, it is understood that there was no intention to affect the speed limit by introducing the lighting and therefore a 30mph limit was never proposed or intended. There is no speed limit signing to indicate anything but national speed limit, which would be required for any change of speed limit. The existing lining on the carriageway also implies a higher speed limit (50/60mph). It is intended to remove any ambiguity with the proposed speed limit. The proposed 50mph limit will also mirror the speed limit from the Oldham boundary which was reduced to 50 mph some years ago.

TE reported that the scheme has been out for Informal consultation and no responses have been returned.

CLGS&SS asked whether the speed limit around junction 22 could be reduced further to 40mph. TE commented that the layout and existing speed readings indicate that a reduced speed would not be appropriate and unlikely to be obeyed.

CLT asked whether the existing 30mph area (outside of the area directly affected by this proposal) could be extended. TE advised it could be looked at but is outside of the scope of this scheme.

CLT also asked whether the transition point of the existing 60/40mph could be moved to lengthen the 40mph area. TE confirmed that the existing location is adequate.

### **Outcome**

It was unanimously agreed that the scheme can progress to formal consultation

The TRO Governing Body:

- (i) Approves the instruction to the Case Manager and the Head of Democratic and Partnership Services to draft the necessary documentation to progress to formal consultation.

### **b) Church Lane, Hebden Bridge – Traffic Regulation Order**

GE explained the scheme of proposed “No waiting at any time” (DYLs) restrictions on Church Lane, Hebden Bridge. The restrictions are required to improve traffic flow along the road removing obstructions and reducing congestion. GE reported that the scheme has been out for Informal consultation and no responses have been returned.

CLGS&SS asked whether the remaining parking spaces would have any time restrictions. This was discussed, but it was concluded they are not required.

TE noted that the remaining parking spaces might not be long enough to maximise usage, so they will need slight adjustment. The length of the DYLs outside the church will be investigated to see if they can be adjusted to better suit. N.b. Dimensions will be added to the consultation drawings for clarification.

E suggested that the proposed DYLs at the southern end of Church Street (on the eastern side of the road) should also include “no loading” restrictions to make sure disabled parking is not encouraged here close to King Street. It was agreed this needs to be added to the plans before formal consultation.

CLGS&SS asked if we could extend the DYLs across the entrance to Mytholm House. It was agreed, as we can't control parking behind the channel edge (not highway) there would be no benefit.

The Governing Body agreed that GE, TE and E finalise the proposed changes and progress to formal consultation.

### **Outcome**

It was unanimously agreed that the proposed changes be made as discussed and the scheme can progress to formal consultation

The TRO Governing Body:

- (ii) Approves the instruction to the Case Manager and the Head of Democratic and Partnership Services to draft the necessary documentation to progress to formal consultation.

### **c) Any other business**

None