

MINUTES OF TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER GOVERNING BODY MEETING

20 February 2024 – 09.00 to 11.00

Attendees:

Voting Members

Assistant Director of Strategic Infrastructure – Chair for items 3a) and 3b)	ADoSI
Corporate Lead (Design & Asset Management) – Chair for item 3c) onwards	CL(D&AM)
Corporate Lead (Green Space & Street Scene)	CL(GSSC)
*Traffic Engineer CL(T)Sub [item 3e) only]	TE1
*Traffic Engineer CL(T)Sub [item 3c) and 3d) only]	TE2
<i>*n.b. Voting members vary due to availability and involvement in schemes being considered</i>	

Other

Team Leader (Traffic Engineering)	TL(TE)
Project Manager (Major Projects)	PMMP
Project Manager	PM
Traffic Liaison Officer (observing)	
Graduate Project Manager (observing)	

1. Apologies

Corporate Lead (Transportation)	CL(T)
Highways and Planning Solicitor (advisor)	H&PS
ADoSI was not available for the whole meeting and attended items 3a) & 3b) only.	

2. Matters arising

The minutes of the last meeting (9th November 2023 @ 15.00) have been agreed by email and have been uploaded to the website ([view previous minutes](#)).

3. Orders for Consideration

a) Elland Future High Street Fund (FHSF) TRO

PMMP and TL(TE) presented the proposals under the FHSF aims to reconfigure the road layouts, pedestrianizing the core of Southgate, reducing carriageway widths and introduce new and widened footways. These measures will improve road safety, create welcoming gateways that are easily accessible on foot and by bike and improve circulation within Elland town centre.

The scheme has been subject to a consultation with the local public via letters and [information on the council's website](#).

The responses received, and discussions undertaken by the GB are as follows: -

1. **Church Street** ([see proposed plan](#)) – Proposal to add limited waiting at the south western end of the road.

No objections/comments were received. The GB discussed the proposals and unanimously agreed for the proposal to progress to the next stage, i.e., statutory consultation.

2. **Coronation Street (junction with Southgate)** ([see proposed plan](#)) – This proposal relates to the point closure of Coronation Street at the junction with Southgate, and amendments to parking and loading north of the cinema. No objections/comments were received for this section. N.b. Objections were received relating to other proposals on Coronation Street (see item 13 below).

The GB discussed these proposals and unanimously agreed for that part of the proposal to progress to the next stage, i.e., statutory consultation.

3. **Elizabeth Street** ([see proposed plan](#)) – Proposal to make the eastern end of Elizabeth Street (between Huddersfield Road and Southgate) one way (travelling east to west).

No objections/comments were received. The GB discussed the proposals and unanimously agreed for the proposal to progress to the next stage, i.e., statutory consultation.

4. **Huddersfield Road (town centre)** ([see proposed plan](#)) – Proposal to rearrange parking and bus stop to maximise spaces.

No objections/comments were received. The GB discussed the proposals and unanimously agreed for the proposal to progress to the next stage, i.e., statutory consultation.

5. **Northgate** ([see proposed plan](#)) – proposal to provide a time restricted loading bay, and restrict parking on a narrow length of road

One objection was received. The GB discussed the merits of both the proposals and the objection points and unanimously agreed to overrule the objections (see comments in Appendix A below) and agreed for the proposal to progress to the next stage, i.e. statutory consultation.

6. **Southgate** ([see proposed plan](#)) and **Westgate** ([see proposed plan](#)) – proposal to restrict access to Southgate to pedestrians and cyclists only except for permits and loading between 08.00-10.00 and 16.00-18.00 and closing Westgate to through traffic.

Ten objections/comments were received. The GB discussed the merits of the proposals and the objection points (see comments in Appendix B below).

CL(GSSC) questioned how the permits/bollards will be enforced. PMMP reported that the permits will be managed by the parking Team, and the bollards by the CCTV team.

The GB unanimously agreed to overrule the objections and agreed for the proposal to progress to the next stage, i.e. statutory consultation.

7. **Town Hall Street** ([see proposed plan](#)) – No objections/comments were received. The GB discussed the proposals and unanimously agreed for the proposal to progress to the next stage, i.e. statutory consultation.

Some additional localised proposals were also consulted, resulting from requests from members of the public.

8. **Gordon Street, Elland** – Following a survey of residents in the summer, a proposal for Resident Parking Zone (RPZ) was consulted.

Four objections were received. The GB discussed the merits of the proposals and the objection points and unanimously agreed to overrule the objections (see

comments in Appendix C below) and agreed for the proposal to progress to the next stage, i.e., statutory consultation.

9. **South Lane, Elland** – Following complaints about inappropriate parking that blocks accesses, a scheme to restrict parking on South Lane was prepared and consulted with affected businesses.

No objections were received, just one comment in support. The GB discussed the proposals and unanimously agreed for the proposal to progress to the next stage, i.e., statutory consultation.

10. **Huddersfield Road, Elland (Ainleys area)** – Following complaints about inappropriate parking that blocks accesses, a scheme to restrict parking on Huddersfield Road was prepared and consulted with affected businesses.

No objections/comments were received. The GB discussed the proposals and unanimously agreed for the proposal to progress to the next stage, i.e., statutory consultation.

11. **Sunnybank Drive, Greetland** – Following complaints about inappropriate parking blocking access and pedestrian traffic, a scheme to restrict parking at the junction with Saddleworth Road was prepared and consulted with affected residents.

Two objections/comments were received. On the whole, the comments were in support, but with requests for the restrictions to be extended.

The GB discussed the merits of the proposals and the comments received and unanimously agreed to progress as comments in Appendix D below and agreed for the proposal to progress to the next stage, i.e., statutory consultation.

12. **Woodfield Avenue, Greetland** – Following complaints about inappropriate parking blocking access and pedestrian traffic, a scheme to restrict parking at the junction with Saddleworth Road was prepared and consulted with affected residents.

No objections/comments were received.

The GB discussed the proposals and unanimously agreed for the proposal to progress to the next stage, i.e., statutory consultation.

13. **Coronation Street, Elland (resident parking)** ([see proposed plan](#)) – Following complaints about inappropriate parking blocking accesses, a scheme to restrict parking at the location and adjust resident parking was prepared and consulted with affected residents.

There has been a significant response to the proposed changes to the residential parking element. It was not possible to complete analysing the responses, so was proposed to delay considering these until the next meeting.

The GB unanimously agreed for the proposal to be deferred to the next meeting.

14. **Dewsbury Road, Elland** – Following complaints about inappropriate parking blocking traffic flows, a scheme to restrict parking at the location was prepared and consulted with affected residents.

The responses suggested that the issue is caused by a temporary shortage of off-street parking caused by ongoing scaffolding works and also damage to the car park caused by a fire. The building's managers have confirmed that the scaffolding work is now complete.

It was proposed that any decision be delayed to see if the situation improved. The GB unanimously agreed for the proposal to be deferred to the next meeting.

Outcome

It was unanimously agreed (ADoSI, CL(D&AM) and CL(GSSC)) that proposals 1 to 12 can proceed to statutory consultation. Items 13 and 14 are to be considered at the next GB meeting.

The TROGB:

- (i) Approves the progression of schemes 1 to 12 including instruction to the Case Manager and the Head of Democratic and Partnership Services to draft the necessary documentation to progress the statutory consultation.
- (ii) Schemes 13 and 14 to be presented at the next GB Meeting for consideration.

b) Fallingroyd TRO

TL(TE) requested an update on the proposed scheme. Unfortunately, ADoSI was unable to attend for the rest of the meeting due to commitments elsewhere. It was agreed that this will be discussed outside of the meeting or raised at the next meeting.

Outcome

It was unanimously agreed that this be deferred.

NB ADoSI left the meeting due to conflicting meetings, CL(D&AM) took over as chair.

c) Ash Green, Mixenden – TRO

Further to discussions at the previous meeting ([see the previous meeting minutes](#), item 3b), the scheme has now been subject to statutory consultation. TE1 and PM described the proposed scheme and the responses received.

The GB discussed the merits of the proposals and the content of the comments/objections received and unanimously agreed to progress as noted in the comments in Appendix E below and agreed for the proposal to be implemented (CL(D&AM), CL(GSSC) and TE2).

Outcome

It was unanimously agreed that the objections be overruled, and the TRO should be implemented as advertised.

The TROGB:

- (i) Approves the making and implementation of the Order as proposed and holds that the objections be overruled.
- (ii) That the objectors be informed

d) Haworth Old Road, Hebden Bridge – ETRO

TL(TE) reported that the Experimental TRO introduced on 26 September 2022 to control the excessive and inconsiderate parking had now been in place for nearly 18 months (expires 26 March 2024).

The solution has largely been successful in terms of reducing the parking. We have received a small number of objections, and a consultation to understand the residents thoughts is currently underway (closes at the end of February).

Due to timescales, TL(TE) asked if it was acceptable to present the outcomes of the consultation and objections by email at the beginning of March, as the next GB meeting would be too late to make a decision.

The GB discussed the merits of the suggestion and unanimously agreed to make a decision based on an emailed report (CL(D&AM), CL(GSSC) and TE2).

e) Greenfield Avenue, Lightcliffe – TRO

TL(TE) and TE2 described the proposed TRO. Number 2 Greenfield Avenue has received planning consent to convert the property into a retail unit. One of the required planning conditions was to progress DYLS to prevent unsafe parking close to the unit and the junction.

A scheme to protect the junction was consulted with statutory consultees and affected residents. In response two comments/objections were received (see appendix F)

The GB discussed the merits of the design, comments and objections and unanimously agreed the proposal can proceed to statutory consultation (CL(D&AM), CL(GSSC) and TE1) including the comments in Appendix F.

Outcome

It was unanimously agreed that the proposal can proceed to statutory consultation in accordance with Appendix F.

The TROGB:

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

4. Any other business

a) Scrutiny meeting

This was briefly discussed, but it was agreed to defer this to a future meeting, when ADoSI was present.

5. Date of Next Meeting

19 March 2024, 15.00 to 16.30.

Appendix A – Northgate, Elland

Summary of comments received. (n.b. in themes)	No. of mentions in responses	Governing Body responses to comments received
A 1. No Longer be able to park outside of house.	1	<p>Northgate is a public highway and as such, no-one has the right to park in a particular space on the public highway, including in front of their house.</p> <p>Highways exist for the function of transporting vehicles and pedestrians; they do not exist to provide parking spaces. Parking spaces can be allowed where it is safe to do so and if the flow of traffic is not obstructed.</p> <p>The road at that point is very narrow, and the change to the traffic flows around the Church Street/Southgate junction is likely to increase traffic so it is considered that the flow needs to be protected on Northgate</p>
A 2. Work vehicle is parked under CCTV view	1	As above
A 3. Decrease value of property, would seek compensation	1	As above, parking is not a right and the Council is not responsible for any compensation claims
A 4. Object to loading area proposed for Dobson's only	1	The loading bay is provided for all businesses in the area.
A 5. Use the proposed loading area for permit only parking for objector/neighbour	1	<p>The new loading bay is required for all businesses in the area.</p> <p>We are not able to introduce a Resident Parking zone for such a limited number of addresses, that would amount to private parking on the highway, which is not allowed.</p>
A 6. Appalled that car park was sold without space being offered to residents	1	This is outside the scope of the consultation; this will be forwarded to the relevant team who dealt with the sale.

Appendix A – Northgate, Elland

Summary of comments received. (n.b. in themes)	No. of mentions in responses	Governing Body responses to comments received
A 7. Suggestion that part of the car park was not owned by the Council, including access rights	1	This is outside the scope of the consultation; this will be forwarded to the relevant team who dealt with the sale.

Appendix B – Southgate, Elland

Summary of comments received. (n.b. in themes)	No. of mentions in responses	Governing Body responses to comments received
B 1. Removal of parking/alternatives not provided	4	<p>The proposal removes on-street parking from Southgate as part of the FHSF works, this allows footpaths to be widened and Southgate to be pedestrianised.</p> <p>After earlier consultations we have retained Coronation Street car park, although it will now be reduced in size (by 10 spaces to 16). This will allow shoppers to continue to be able to park in a council car park centre of town.</p> <p>In addition, we are also proposing to create short stay parking on Church Street, to allow a better turnover of spaces.</p> <p>We are also improving vehicle access to Timber Street car park from the west (re-establishing access from Southgate). This will make the previously poorly used car park much more accessible. Note that the southern end of Southgate is around 1 minute (less than 100m) walk from Timber Street Car park.</p>
B 2. No longer able to "pop in"/making the town less appealing/affects viability of shops	2	<p>The town centre has 5 car parks (totalling 121 spaces) that are adjacent to or within a short walking distance of the centre, therefore whilst parking will no longer be available directly in front of the shops multiple opportunities remain for shoppers to pop into town. These are: -</p> <p>Southgate (market) - 20 spaces,</p>

Appendix B – Southgate, Elland

Summary of comments received. (n.b. in themes)	No. of mentions in responses	Governing Body responses to comments received
		<p>Coronation Street - 16 spaces (currently 26), Boxhall Road 15 spaces, Timber Street 56 spaces and Crown Street - 14 spaces This is in addition to existing on-street parking provision on Coronation Street, Church Street and Boxhall Road.</p>
<p>B 3. Current improvement works are stopping passing trade.</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>The current works have temporarily restricted traffic from flowing through the town and have removed some of the on-street parking. This currently totals just 5 spaces at the north side of town. The car parks within Elland Town Centre are 1 minute walk from all shops. The work is progressing well, but with the constricted type of work, maintaining access for pedestrians and shops, and maintaining quality of work means that work may be stop/start. We are however endeavouring to complete the works as quickly as possible.</p>
<p>B 4. The Council should be encouraging businesses and provide plentiful parking</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Elland Town Centre will still have extensive car parking. The town centre has 5 car parks (totalling 121 spaces) that are adjacent to or within a short walking distance of the centre. As noted above, we are also upgrading the entrance to Timber Street car park, offering a more direct access from Victoria Road/Southgate. This is in response to previous consultations that this car park was under used due to difficult access. Timber Steet has 56 spaces and first hour is free.</p>
<p>B 5. Happy that the Council is investing</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>This is welcomed feedback</p>
<p>B 6. Disabled/level access required and to be close to shops</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>As noted above, there is still a significant number of parking spaces very close to the town centre.</p>

Appendix B – Southgate, Elland		
Summary of comments received. (n.b. in themes)	No. of mentions in responses	Governing Body responses to comments received
		In addition, improved disabled access is being provided throughout the high street with formal tactiles and dropped kerbs for safer crossings.
B 7. Concerned that cycles/scooters can share the pedestrianised areas - safety issue	2	This is not formally a shared space. The concern is understood, but as the space for pedestrians will be significantly improved by the pedestrianisation, it is considered that overall, the safety of pedestrians will be improved.
B 8. Alternative solution - Retain the existing arrangement with vehicular access but restrict parking bays to within certain times.	1	Retaining any parking on Southgate would need us to allow all vehicles have access onto Southgate, this would reduce safety and reduce the improvements designed into the scheme. As noted above, there remains a significant number of parking spaces within car parks or on street, all within a short walk.
B 9. Closure of "the Cross", creates a diversion that is extensive (to West Vale)	1	Between Southgate and Boxhall Road, Westgate is a very narrow road with footways too narrow for safe pedestrian movements (many have been observed to walk in the road). The route is regularly used as a foot route to and from the primary school, and so parents with small children and pushchairs cannot comfortably on the footways. Despite the visibility from Southgate being very poor, it is also used for two way traffic even though it is not wide enough. It is therefore proposed to close this section of the road, to give priority back to pedestrians. We expect that current through traffic will take other more suitable routes, and local traffic (shopping etc) will have opportunities to turn around on Church Street to avoid Northgate/west Vale diversions back to eastern Elland.

Appendix B – Southgate, Elland

Summary of comments received. (n.b. in themes)	No. of mentions in responses	Governing Body responses to comments received
B 10. Increased traffic on Boxhall Road	1	Boxhall Road may well see the reverse and have a reduction in traffic as the 'rat run' through Westgate will no longer be available. It is expected that through traffic will divert to more suitable routes.
B 11. Pedestrianisation was trialled during Covid and only attracted badly behaved youths on bikes	1	As most were socially distancing themselves, it is difficult to compare those times with the current ones. Any town centre can be mistreated, and violations should be reported to the relevant authorities (i.e. police)
B 12. Deliveries - not always possible to adjust deliveries around timing of closures	1	It is noted that deliveries will not always be available at the core times (08.00-10.00 and 16.00-18.00). Note that additional loading bays are available on Northgate, Crown Street and Coronation Street. All are outside of the pedestrianisation zone and within easy access of the high street.
B 13. Petition received after closure of the consultation and following the Governing Body meeting See Appendix G	<p>Total 460 signatures</p> <p><i>338 Signatures on paper</i></p> <p><i>83 Online Signatures</i></p> <p><i>39 Non-verified online signatures</i></p> <p>n.b. no check has been undertaken to</p>	<p>In response to the headings covered in the petition: -</p> <p>Footfall</p> <p>The current works have temporarily restricted traffic from flowing through the town and have removed some of the on-street parking. This currently totals just 5 spaces at the north side of town.</p> <p>The car parks within Elland Town Centre are 1 minute walk from all shops.</p> <p>The work is progressing well, but with the constricted type of work, maintaining access for pedestrians and shops, and maintaining quality of work means that work may be stop/start. We are however endeavouring to complete the works as quickly as possible.</p> <p>Benefits of Vehicular Access</p> <p>Whilst through traffic new to the area is able to see the shopping opportunities, the usual traffic (new and existing) also means that it dominates the streetscape and was a risk to</p>

Appendix B – Southgate, Elland

Summary of comments received. (n.b. in themes)	No. of mentions in responses	Governing Body responses to comments received
	<p>see if there is repetition of signatures within the paper document, or whether there is any duplication across different versions.</p>	<p>both pedestrians and cyclists. The pedestrianisation will open up the footways and provide more space for people to wander and view at leisure rather than travelling past at 20mph.</p> <p>Lack of parking</p> <p>The town centre has a total of 5 car parks (totalling 121 spaces) that are adjacent to or within a short walking distance of the centre, therefore whilst parking will no longer be available directly in front of the shops multiple opportunities remain for shoppers to pop into town.</p> <p>These are: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Southgate (market) - 20 spaces, • Coronation Street - 16 spaces (currently 26), • Boxhall Road - 15 spaces, • Timber Street - 56 spaces, and • Crown Street - 14 spaces <p>This is in addition to existing on-street parking provision on Coronation Street, Church Street and Boxhall Road.</p> <p>We are proposing to create short stay parking on Church Street, to allow a better turnover of spaces (approximately 50m away from the previous parking)</p> <p>We are improving access to Timber Street car park (re-establishing access from Southgate). This will make the previously poorly used car park much more accessible. Note that even the southern end of Southgate is only a 1 minute (less than 100m) walk from Timber Street Car park.</p> <p>One hour free parking</p> <p>The Council’s website includes clear information on charges, including the free first hour.</p>

Appendix B – Southgate, Elland

Summary of comments received. (n.b. in themes)	No. of mentions in responses	Governing Body responses to comments received
		<p>Coronation Street tariff</p> <p>Boxhall Road tariff</p> <p>Timber Street tariff</p> <p>Crown Street tariff (n.b. free at all times)</p> <p>Cosmetic vs substantial improvements</p> <p>In addition to the events planned by the Elland Events Committee, Elland is in the process of adopting a Conversation Area Management Plan and once this is adopted it will allow the town to bid for monies from Historic England to underpin the works of the Future High Street, this will include funding for listed buildings and shop fronts e.t.c.. Elland Town Board will be looking at opportunities to attract funding to the town, the board was established to represent the businesses and residents of Elland and meets regularly.</p> <p>Why visit southgate</p> <p>Whilst this is outside the scope of the Traffic regulation Order, we note that Elland has an events committee that plans regular events in the town centre in addition to the shops, café, restaurants and bars within the town.</p> <p>Do not pedestrianise southgate!</p> <p>Whilst the proposals remove on-street parking from Southgate it allows footways to be widened and Southgate to be pedestrianised.</p> <p>After earlier consultations we have retained Coronation Street car park, although it will now be reduced in size (by 10 spaces to 16). This will allow shoppers to continue to be able to park in a council car park centre of town.</p> <p>In addition, we are also proposing to create short stay parking on Church Street, to allow a better turnover of spaces.</p> <p>We are also improving vehicle access to Timber Street car park from the west (re-</p>

Appendix B – Southgate, Elland

Summary of comments received. (n.b. in themes)	No. of mentions in responses	Governing Body responses to comments received
<p>Questions/comments (not objections)</p> <p>B 14. Confirm access available for private parking behind businesses</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>establishing access from Southgate). This will make the previously poorly used car park much more accessible. Note that the southern end of Southgate is around 1 minute (less than 100m) walk from Timber Street Car park.</p> <p>If businesses have approved parking as part of their ownership/rental agreement, registrations numbers can be logged, and access can be maintained.</p>
<p>B 15. Improvements to enforcement (near Post Office).</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The existing parking restrictions outside of the Post Office should be sufficient to give clear access. Unfortunately, as Civil Enforcement Officer (CEO) resources are limited, they cannot be there 100% of the time so drivers will risk getting a ticket. The only addition we could make is to introduce "no loading" restrictions, but unfortunately this would also prevent disabled parking too and so are not proposed.</p>
<p>B 16. Queries about soft landscaping quality</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>This is outside of the scope of the consultation; this has been forwarded to the design team</p>
<p>B 17. Design details to discuss</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>further information can be seen at the Next Chapter website, questions can also be asked through that page.</p>
<p>B 18. Request for more information, relating to specific future development</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>This is outside of the scope of the consultation; this has been forwarded to the design team. Further information can be found at the Next Chapter website.</p>

Appendix C – Gordon Street, Elland

Appendix C – Gordon Street, Elland		
Summary of comments received. (n.b. in themes)	No. of mentions in responses	Governing Body responses to comments received
C 1. Existing parking restrictions ignored, blocks access, creates disabled issue	1	The existing restriction can only be enforced by the police, whereas the proposed restriction can be enforced by the Council's CEOs too. Unfortunately, enforcement is always an issue, the CEOs are a limited resource and cannot be at all places at all times, so even though it is clear that parking should not take place, there is always a risk that drivers will risk parking.
C 2. The street is used as a free car park	1	The intention of the proposed changes is to maximise the resident parking area and make it more effective to enforce. The current restriction is only enforceable by the Police, but the RPZ can be enforced by the Council's CEOs too.
C 3. Recent increase in parking due to new Taxi Company	1	Any change of use is a matter for the Calderdale Council Planning Team. Any specific complaints regarding the running of the office (noise etc) will be investigated by the Council's Licensing or Environmental Health Teams. Any vehicles using the site are required to obey any local traffic and parking restrictions and will be enforced as resources allow.
C 4. Parking on the pavement (Victoria Road) a hazard to pedestrians	1	Unfortunately, enforcement is always an issue, the CEOs are a limited resource and cannot be at all places at all times, so even though it is clear that parking should not take place, there is always a risk that drivers will risk parking.
C 5. Comment in Support	1	Resident in full support
C 6. Turning area needed at the southern end	1	This is to be considered in the final design.
C 7. Extend the proposed RPZ to include no 1	1	We need to keep the junction with Victoria Road clear (establishing a 10m clearance in line with the Highway Code), but also maintaining clearance to the access located between numbers 1 and 3, unfortunately there is not sufficient space to allow a parking space in what remains.

Appendix D – Sunnybank Drive, Greetland

Appendix D – Sunnybank Drive, Greetland			
Summary of comments received. (n.b. in themes)		No. of mentions in responses	Governing Body responses to comments received
D	1. Support. Parking is Ridiculous/dangerous	2	The parking can be inconsiderate and impedes access for pedestrians and other vehicles. The proposal is to protect the junction and improve the situation for pedestrians in particular.
D	2. Block driveways/impede visibility	2	As 1 above
D	3. Fully Support proposals	1	As 1 above
D	4. Safer to extend beyond Sunnybank Lane	1	Whilst the Keep Clear markings in place suggest that there is an access issue, the purpose of the DYLS is for maintaining ped safety. Whilst DYLS may be of benefit, it is considered to be outside of the scope of the proposal and may weaken the success.
D	5. Needs patrolling	1	Unfortunately, enforcement is always an issue, the CEOs are a limited resource and cannot be at all places at all times, so even though it is clear that parking should not take place, there is always a risk that drivers will risk parking.
D	6. Parking in bus bays	1	As 5 above
D	7. Extend DYLS to the bus stop	1	This will be reviewed and added to the next phase of consultation.

Appendix E – Ash Green, Mixenden

Appendix E – Ash Green, Mixenden		
Summary of comments received. (n.b. in themes)	No. of mentions in responses	Governing Body responses to comments received
E 1. Poor parking behaviour from parents	4	Parking can be inconsiderate and impedes access for pedestrians and other vehicles. The proposal is to better define/control parking and improve the situation for pedestrians in particular.
E 2. Increased traffic flow on surrounding streets	1	The traffic flows are relatively minor along these residential streets and we do not consider that the road closures will impact to an unsafe level.
E 3. Request funding is spent on alternative measures (pot holes)	1	This funding is provided specifically for this project, and we cannot spend it on other works such as resurfacing.
E 4. Added journey time	1	We do not consider there is a major added journey time around the closures. It would add <1 min (300-400m extra)
E 5. Access issues into driveway next to modal filter	1	At this stage in the process, introducing further restrictions would delay the TRO and the scheme. It is therefore proposed to introduce some informal keep clear markings to protect the turning area in the first case. This can be monitored, and further proposals can be considered if required.
E 6. Raised platform causing issues in snow/icy weather	1	This is a gritting route and we do consider that the benefit of the traffic/speed calming measures do outweigh this concern. We would add that Bus operators have been consulted too and have not objected.
E 7. Issues with off road vehicles	1	This is a police matter, and the police are aware and aiming to reduce this issue in the area. We would add that the Police have been consulted on the proposals and have not objected.
E 8. ASB in the area	1	This is a police matter, and the police are aware and aiming to reduce this issue in the area.

Appendix F – Greenfield Avenue, Lightcliffe

Appendix F – Greenfield Avenue, Lightcliffe		
Summary of comments received. (n.b. in themes)	No. of mentions in responses	Governing Body responses to comments received
F 1. The location is quite remote and cannot be effectively enforced. Can bollards be used instead?	1	Unfortunately, the footway is currently too narrow to add bollards. Although there is available space in highway land to do this, it is beyond the scope of the planning condition, so we cannot insist the developer carries this out.
F 2. Adjacent property will be constructing a driveway, can the proposal be extended to protect it?	1	The proposal will be re-drafted to include this, and will be included in the statutory consultation.

Appendix G

Petition to Calderdale Council

This petition should be sent to:
Democratic Support
Calderdale MBC
Town Hall
Crossley Street
Halifax
HX1 1UJ

Alternatively, scanned petitions can be e-mailed to:
democratic.support@calderdale.gov.uk

What is the issue you would like to petition about?

The Proposed pedestrianisation of Southgate – Elland

It is believed the current plan, as it is, would have a detrimental effect on the businesses located there for the following reasons:

- **FOOTFALL** - The recent temporary road closures have demonstrated to many Southgate shop owners/occupants that people are simply not prepared to park a distance away and walk to those shops. Footfall since the road closure has been down to about one third of what was typical. This has had a negative impact on many businesses, which have struggled since the departure of the banks and relocation of the Post Office.
- **BENEFITS OF VEHICULAR ACCESS** - The previous vehicular traffic along Southgate (~~admittedly using it as a cut through or to visit one shop in particular and often resulting in illegal parking~~), did enable passing drivers/passengers to observe and register the businesses in situ. Pedestrianisation of the road will remove the passing of potential new customers.
- **LACK OF PARKING** - The lack of parking in Elland is a fundamental problem, specifically along the north end of Southgate. The removal of parking spaces in Coronation Street car park to allow for grass and trees, with the addition of just two additional on-street parking spaces on the road adjacent to the car park, (?are these the disability parking spaces mentioned?) will be detrimental to the foot fall.
- **ONE HOUR FREE PARKING** - Free parking in Elland (at least for the first hour) should be better advertised.
- **COSMETIC VS SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENTS** - Making Southgate Square more aesthetically attractive, by adding different paving, soft landscaping and trees, will not increase the overall appearance of the dated buildings and shops and thereby the overall aesthetic of the area. Are there future plans to improve the shop facades (as shown in the Calderdale next chapter images?) It is noted that the Council plans

mention 'events at the revitalised Southgate Square.' What events are envisaged?

- **WHY VISIT SOUTHGATE?** - Unless there are significant reasons to visit, for example, cafés and bars being permitted to place outdoor seating (limited by the weather) there is, at present little reason to walk down Southgate. An attractive overhead canopy (such as at Westgate Arcade, Halifax) would go some way to encouraging visitors to stay and "...linger, with things to see and do in the heart of town."

What do you think the Council or its partners should do?

Do not pedestrianise Southgate!

On-street parking outside shops is essential for the convenience of customers and the success of high street stores. In today's competitive retail landscape, where online shopping offers unparalleled convenience, providing hassle-free parking can give brick-and-mortar stores a crucial advantage. Easy access to parking not only attracts more customers but also encourages them to spend more time exploring and shopping. By prioritizing convenient on-street parking, high street stores can better compete with the efficiency of online shopping and create a more inviting and competitive retail environment. This ultimately supports the vibrancy and sustainability of local businesses and communities.

We feel it would be better suited to Elland if on-street parking is retained and Coronation Street carpark remains at the current number of spaces. Improvements can still, easily be made around the existing parking.

We urge you to reconsider the current plans and work towards a solution that supports local businesses while still promoting pedestrian safety and accessibility. Please stand with us in preserving Elland's vibrant community spirit and economic stability.

Do you intend this petition to:

Trigger a debate at a Council meeting? YES / NO

(Please note a minimum of 2000 separate, valid signatures are required for a Council debate)

Trigger consideration by a Scrutiny Panel? YES / NO

(Please note a minimum of 500 separate, valid signatures are required for a Scrutiny Panel consideration)

250
Signs
+ on li.
supp.

Petition Organiser

Name	Full Address	Signature	Telephone Number	Email Address

Petitioners

Calderdale Council will become the data controller when the petition is submitted to the Council. The details you provide on this form will only be used for the purpose of this petition. Your information may be shared with the petition organiser, Councillors, Council officers or service providers.