

MINUTES OF TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER GOVERNING BODY MEETING

4 December 2024 – 14.30 to 16.30

Attendees:

Voting Members

Assistant Director of Strategic Infrastructure – Chair	ADoSI
Corporate Lead (Design & Asset Management)	CL(DAM)
Corporate Lead (Transportation)	CL(T)
Corporate Lead (Green Space & Street Scene)	CL(GSSC)

Other

Highways and Planning Solicitor (advisor) 1	H&PS1
Highways and Planning Solicitor (advisor) 2 (observing)	H&PS2
Team Leader (Traffic Engineering)	TL(TE)
Project Manager	PM
Traffic Engineer	TE
Operations Officer (Parking Services)	OO(PS)
Senior Transport Planner	STP

1. Apologies

Corporate Lead (Transportation) would need to leave the meeting at 16.00 due to another appointment.

2. Matters arising

None

3. Previous Minutes

TL(TE) reported that the minutes for the meetings on 09/10/24 and 06/11/24 were in circulation for confirmation by some attendees. ADoSI confirmed agreement to both during the meeting and CL(DAM) confirmed acceptance after the meeting by email.

Following the meeting TL(TE) arranged for the minutes to be added to [the website](#).

4. Orders for Consideration

a) Moorfield Street, Halifax TRO

This scheme (see [proposed drawing](#)) was previously presented to the Governing Body (GB) at the [meeting of 14 August 2024](#) after completion of the informal consultation. Approval was given at that meeting to proceed to the statutory consultation.

The statutory consultation commenced on 14 November 2024, and closes on 5 December, shortly after this GB meeting. As the next GB meeting is not planned until 29 January 2025, it was considered appropriate to consider this scheme now and the GB be updated should any responses be received before the closing time. At the time of the meeting, no further responses have been received to the consultation.

The comments received at the informal stage were reconsidered by the GB. The discussions confirmed that the proposed responses to the received comments/objections included in appendix A of the minutes of the 14 August meeting remain appropriate.

Note 1: - the consultation period closed before these minutes were finalised and no further responses were received.

Outcome

It was unanimously agreed (ADoSI, CL(DAM), CL(T) and CL(GSSC)) that the objections received at the informal stage be overruled and the TRO should be implemented as advertised should no further responses be received before the end of the consultation (see note 1 above).

The GB:

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

b) Longfellow Court and Red Acre Lane, Mytholmroyd TRO

This scheme (see [proposed drawing](#)) was previously presented at the [meeting of 14 August 2024](#) after completion of the informal consultation. At that meeting, approval was given to progress the proposal to statutory consultation.

This statutory consultation also commenced on 14 November 2024, and closes on 5 December. It was again considered appropriate to consider this scheme before closure and the GB be updated should any responses be received before the closing time.

The comments/objections received for both elements are noted in [Appendix A](#) with the proposed responses, along with the following discussions: -

Longfellow Court

STP asked whether parking across driveways would be enforceable without further restrictions? OO(PS) confirmed that parking across driveways is not illegal, although it can be enforced. However, CMBC will only enforce with the resident's approval, as enforcement would have to include all vehicles, including a risk for the residents themselves.

CL(T) asked if we could extend the restrictions to no waiting at any time (NWAAT) on both sides, to reduce the likelihood of parking on the footway. TE explained that the restricted waiting proposed are a compromise to maintain some parking for residents.

Red Acre Lane

ADoSI questioned whether extending the NWAAT to the supermarket/garage access on Burnley Rd would necessitate further restrictions on the south side of Burnley Rd control displacement of parking? The GB recognised the potential parking displacement issue but as it is difficult to foresee the extents of any displacement, it was agreed to proceed with the advertised proposal, if displacement occurs it would have to be looked at separately.

GB members noted that the proposal is to place 7m of double yellow lines on Red Acre Lane, which is less than the distance recommended in the highway code, so felt that this was a reasonable compromise.

The GB discussed the issues on both sites and unanimously agreed with the recommendations listed in Appendix A.

Note 2: - the consultation period closed before these minutes were finalised and no further responses were received.

Outcome

It was unanimously agreed (ADoSI, CL(DAM), CL(T) and CL(GSSC)) that the objections received be overruled and the TRO should be implemented as advertised should no further responses be received before the end of the consultation (n.b. see note 2 above).

The GB:

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

c) Phase 2 On street parking P&D Changes

The scheme (see proposed [drawing 1](#), [drawing 2](#), [drawing 3](#), and [drawing 4](#)) was previously presented at the [Meeting of 19 March 2024](#) after completion of the informal consultation. Following the GB decision to overrule the objections received at that stage, the scheme has since been subject to the statutory consultation and has been brought to the meeting to consider the outcome.

The comments/objections received in response to the statutory consultation are noted in [Appendix B](#) along with the responses. The GB discussed the responses and agreed that the objections have satisfactorily been resolved and unanimously agreed to overrule them.

Outcome

It was unanimously agreed (ADoSI, CL(DAM), CL(T) and CL(GSSC)) that the objections be overruled, and the TRO should be implemented as advertised.

The GB:

- (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) Car club spaces, Halifax and Elland TRO

The scheme (see [Drawing 1](#), [Drawing 2](#), and [Drawing 3](#)) was previously presented at the GB [meeting of 14 August 2024](#) after completion of the informal consultation. Following the GB decision for the scheme to proceed at that stage, the scheme has been subject to the statutory consultation and has been brought to the meeting to consider the outcome.

This statutory consultation also commenced on 14 November 2024, and closes on 5 December. It was again considered appropriate to consider this scheme before closure and the GB be updated should any responses be received before the closing time.

As no objections were received, no vote was specifically required from the GB but the outcome was noted.

Note 3: - the consultation period closed before these minutes were finalised and no further responses were received, and so no further action was required.

Outcome

This was brought to the GB for information only; no decision was required by the GB at this stage.

5. Any other business

H&PS1 confirmed that this was his last week with Calderdale and thanked the whole meeting for their support over his time here.

On behalf of the GB, ADoSI thanked H&PS1 for their counsel and work over the years and welcomed H&PS2 to the future meetings.

6. Date of Next Meeting

29 January 2025 at 14.30

Appendix A – Longfellow Court/Red Acre Lane

	Summary of comments received.	Governing Body responses to comments received/Notes
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr – in favour of the proposal but would like the restrictions extending to the supermarket/garage access on Burnley Rd. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking is at a premium in this area, additional restrictions may encourage more parents to park on the side roads, exacerbating the situation. • The GB agreed with the TE recommendation to leave restrictions as they are proposed.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident on Longfellow Court – in favour but would like the restrictions omitting in front of their driveway, and the restrictions extending as in No.1 above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be unusual to leave a gap in the restrictions and could encourage parents to continue to park on Longfellow Court and particularly in front of the driveway, which they may risk doing as they will be sat in their vehicles waiting for their children. This property has a garage and an off-street parking space. • The GB agreed with the TE recommendation to leave restrictions as they are proposed.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Another response from a different resident of Longfellow Court. Supports the proposals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OK
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident of Longfellow Court - Would also like the restrictions omitting in front of their driveway, or residents only parking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See response to No.2. • In terms of resident only parking, this type of restriction is not normally used where there is very short-term parking/disruption, which is the case outside most schools. • The GB agreed with the TE recommendation to leave restrictions as they are proposed.
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident of Westfield Terrace – Object to DYL's on Red Acre Lane, as doesn't feel it will deter parents from using the street. Requests residents only parking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DYL's are not proposed to deter parents, they are intended to keep the junction clear for visibility/manoeuvring onto Burnley Road. • See no. 4 re resident only parking.

Appendix A – Longfellow Court/Red Acre Lane

	Summary of comments received.	Governing Body responses to comments received/Notes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a 'school street' operating in this area which restricts access to the road. • The GB agreed with the TE recommendation to leave restrictions as they are proposed.
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Westfield Terrace – Objects to DYL's on Red Acre Lane. Proposed restrictions are in front of this property and would leave it with no parking. No-one with a disability would be able to live here. He feels the restrictions should be just 2m long to stop parking near the footway and it should also be residents only parking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 metres is considered insufficient. The 7 metres proposed is already a compromise to achieve maximum parking for residents, without compromising safety and a betterment of what we have (The Highway Code, rule 243 states you should not park within 10m of a junction). • A resident/visitor with a disability would be able to stop on the DYL's so may find it easier to load/unload etc. Additionally, there is no designated disabled space, so anyone can park here. • It is noted that there is no right to park outside of a property on the public highway. • The GB agreed with the TE recommendation to leave restrictions as they are proposed.

Appendix B – Phase 2 On street parking P&D Changes

	Comments/Objection	Summary of officer responses during consultation
1	The parking spot you mention on your proposal is legally owned by us as stated on the land registry certificate. We also require to park our vehicle on this spot 24 hours a day. Please advice what we are supposed to do and what would happen to our private parking space when the order comes into place.	The Highway Adoption Order for Central Street, Salem Street, Hilton Street & Salem Street was signed in June 2017, and a subsequent Highway Improvement scheme was carried out to bring the roads up to the correct standards of adoption. Whilst you might own the subsoil, the road itself is now adopted by the Highway Authority. Property Deeds often make the resident responsible for the subsoil up

Appendix B – Phase 2 On street parking P&D Changes

	Comments/Objection	Summary of officer responses during consultation
	So regards to the above order I would have to object. I will not allow Calderdale council to use my space without good reason and a fair agreement.	to the centre of the highway. This does not count as ownership of the highway as the Council maintain the surface. The current proposal for the length of parking bays on Central Street, at the rear of your premises is for the restriction to be shared between residents and pay and display users. Eligible residents will be entitled to apply for resident parking permits which can be used to park their vehicle in these spaces, at all times. No further response received
2a	This issue ideally should be considered at a meeting of the Todmorden Town Council Development Committee. Would it be acceptable please for to submit its feedback on 7 November?	Based on the information you have given; we would consider it reasonable to extend the period by 1 week to allow for responses. Please ensure comments by 7th November 2024 so that they can be considered.
b	The Town Council Support the proposal in regard to the Review of Parking Charges	
3a	I'd like to express my objection on the removal of free 1 hour parking on Valley Road in front of the Hebden Bridge doctors. It's a nightmare trying to find a space in the tiny car park they have - but thankfully I've always found a space in the free 1 hour stretch. Please consider residents of Hebden Bridge and not just the tourists. The council is slowly choking Hebden Bridge with inadequate parking and extortionate parking charges for locals, who are just trying to park to pick up their children from school or pick up a prescription or to use other amenities. It's not just a tourist town.	I would confirm that the removal of these spaces, or changing the current restrictions in these spaces is not part of these proposals, and therefore the spaces will remain exactly as they currently are.

Appendix B – Phase 2 On street parking P&D Changes

	Comments/Objection	Summary of officer responses during consultation
b	<p>Thank you for clarifying this.</p> <p>Although please could my last paragraph regarding my objection to increase parking charges still be counted, as really do worry that Hebden bridge is always considered for tourists and not locals, who will be paying these increases the most often.</p> <p>I understand it's a hard balancing act, but just my view as a local young family.</p>	<p>Thank you for your response – I will assume your objection to be no longer relevant to the proposed advertised changes based on this acknowledgment.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed increase to parking charges, these were considered and approved by Cabinet on 12 June 2023.</p> <p>The report set out a number of measures to help the Council plan the future supply of parking across the borough, to manage present demand for parking spaces in Halifax, Hebden Bridge and Brighouse, to facilitate investment in the ticket machine infrastructure, and to ensure that it can be “fleet of foot” in responding to changes in the local parking market.</p> <p>The report included a small number of changes to tariffs and charging hours to reflect recent shifts in demand for spaces and to introduce a measure of consistency for ‘premium’ kerb space across the borough. We understand that increasing parking charges is never popular, but pricing is the most effective way to manage kerb space, and a town centre clogged up with vehicles is not going to be a safe, vibrant, and economically successful place. This also helps to reduce congestion and associated pollution, which together with some move towards active travel solutions can also help to bring about further public health benefits.</p> <p>The report also updated Cabinet on the individual parking strategies that are being developed for each of the six towns in the borough. These will be used in part to determine the future approach to parking, both as a means of encouraging modal shift (towards more sustainable forms of transport) and freeing up space in the town centres to ensure that there is more regular turnover (moving longer stays from on street towards the pay and display car parks).</p>

Appendix B – Phase 2 On street parking P&D Changes

	Comments/Objection	Summary of officer responses during consultation
		<p>Like many Councils up and down the country Calderdale is facing some significant financial challenges and, like many neighbouring Councils, is having to look at all opportunities to try and ensure that we can continue to provide services to vulnerable people and to maintain the services that people have come to expect from their Council.</p> <p>Whilst we do note your concerns, the anomalies with parking charges in both Hebden Bridge and Brighouse were deemed necessary to bring them more in line with the approach elsewhere. On-street charges should generally be set higher than off street charges. We accept that these changes will be unpopular with some motorists but some of the income generated will be invested back in to upgrading the ticket machines.</p>
4	<p>I was already upset that you are removing parking along Burnley Road anyway, especially seemingly before the new car park is even ready.</p> <p>You ignored me when I told you my concerns. I said that as a disabled person who needs to often visit Hebden Bridge for the medical centre and for the chemist, any reduction to parking overall puts more pressure on what remains.</p> <p>I explained that I had been late recently for an important medical appointment due to not being able to get parked. That is already happening before you remove more parking. I can't schedule my appointments for days when it's not sunny so I can guarantee that tourists won't be taking up half the available parking....</p> <p>I hold a blue badge and I already have enough difficulties (see above).</p> <p>Now I wish to object that you are apparently *further* reducing parking . You claim you are allowing some disabled parking near</p>	<p>For some time now, Central Street, Hilton Street, Fielding Street and Salem Street have had some problems with parking. These problems are generally caused by vehicle congestion, often from businesses, shoppers, and/or commuters. Although a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) exists to control parking, some of the associated signing and lining has been missing for some time, hence some restrictions have not been enforced. Historically, these were missing due to the surface condition of the road, but some restrictions were not remarked following the resurfacing/adoption of the road(s), which was completed in 2017/18.</p> <p>As a result of this, indiscriminate/unregulated parking takes place, which can make access difficult for other vehicles and unsafe for pedestrians, particularly school children attending the local infant & nursery school. To improve parking practices in this area, we are proposing to standardise restrictions in this area to ensure they are fit for purpose, managed, and balance the needs for all road users.</p>

Appendix B – Phase 2 On street parking P&D Changes

	Comments/Objection	Summary of officer responses during consultation
	<p>Central Street. Yet your map is useless because it doesn't show either how many parking spots there are in that area at present or how many there will be with your "proposed" scheme!</p> <p>So therefore you're not actually properly explaining to anyone what effect your plans will have. I would argue that you're also not taking proper account of the needs of disabled people. You might be discriminating against disabled people by removing so much parking.</p> <p>I insist that you consider adding some more disabled parking places, if you persist in these plans. Any removal of parking is indirectly discriminatory towards people who have absolutely no choice by way of their medical reasons, to use a car. In law you would have to show that your plans are a fair and reasonable means of obtaining another goal which does not discriminate against disabled people.</p> <p>You already removed the spots I used to park in on market street and I wasn't even aware of it until it was too late to say anything.</p> <p>I actually think almost everyone in Hebden Bridge is pretty disgusted with you and you'll mostly be getting voted out.</p>	<p>Disabled parking provision has been included in this scheme and will be reserved specifically for Blue Badge holders, operational all days, between the hours of 8.00am – 8.00pm. The proposed bay will be approximately 18m in length providing parking for around 3/4 vehicles (depending on the vehicle size), as shown on the attached plan. Hopefully, you will agree this is an improvement on the current provision of disabled parking in the immediate vicinity.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that Blue Badge holders are permitted to park in all on and off street pay and display spaces, free of charge, for as long as required, provided a valid Blue Badge is clearly on display in their vehicle. Parking on double yellow lines is also permitted for up to 3 hours where there is no loading ban in place indicated by kerb blips (time clock must be displayed and set at arrival time).</p>
5	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed parking changes in Hebden Bridge that will see increased charges and decreased long stay spaces.</p> <p>I own a business in Hebden Bridge and the majority of my staff work flexibly to wrap around school drop off or travel from hill top communities or as far as Leeds - your proposals will impact on their ability to carry out their jobs - and for some - their ability to both work and support their children forcing them to choose between one or another.</p>	<p>For some time now, Central Street, Hilton Street, Fielding Street and Salem Street have had some problems with parking. These are core central streets and experience problems generally caused by vehicle congestion - often from businesses, shoppers, and/or commuters. Although a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) exists to control parking (short stay), some of the associated signing and lining has been missing for some time, hence some restrictions have not been enforced. Historically, these were missing due to the surface condition</p>

Appendix B – Phase 2 On street parking P&D Changes

	Comments/Objection	Summary of officer responses during consultation
	<p>The increase in short stay parking and reduction of long stay means there will be a reduction in parking spaces for people who work in Hebden Bridge and will make visiting for more than an hour hard, reducing overall spend in the town. This is at a time when public transport is being reduced in our area and further reduction in parking for the area is suggested.</p> <p>The suggestion of removing free parking by the Drs surgery feels to be really unnecessary. Sick and elderly people deserve to be able to access the NHS without having to worry about charges.</p> <p>I also find the difference in parking charges between Hebden and Todmorden to be an unfair tax for those already fighting to stay in an increasingly expensive town that they have lived in all their lives.</p> <p>The proposed changes will have a negative impact on workers in the town, women trying to get back into work and the elderly. I am not sure who the current council represents - but it doesn't seem to be the working people.</p>	<p>of the road, but some restrictions were not remarked following the resurfacing/adoption of the road(s), which was completed in 2017/18.</p> <p>As a result of this, indiscriminate/unregulated parking takes place, which can make access difficult for other vehicles and unsafe for pedestrians, particularly school children attending the local infant & nursery school. To improve parking practices in this area, we are proposing to standardise restrictions to ensure they are fit for purpose, managed, and balance the needs for all road users. Alternative long stay parking will remain available in the town centre on Valley Road, Hangingroyd Lane, Old Gate and off street car parks.</p> <p>It should be noted the Council is not obligated to provide parking places, on or off street, free or chargeable. There is no legal right to park, and commuter parking is not uncommon.</p> <p>We note your email refers to the free to park, time limited spaces outside the Medical Centre on Valley Road being removed. It can be confirmed that the removal of these spaces, or changing the current restrictions in these spaces is not part of these proposals, and therefore the spaces will remain exactly as they currently are to support visitors to the Medical Centre.</p>
6	<p>I would like to raise a few concerns with your proposed parking changes in Hebden bridge, as what about blue badge holders who can't walk long distances and needs the vehicle near their destination like the health centre for example for safety reasons. And if they have to walk long distances it may be detrimental to them which may lead to a slip, trip or fall, which then you'll be criminally responsible for under the Health and safety act which you could be sued for as you chose to restrict parking without thinking it through properly, and the consequences you'll then face as a result, like an increase in customer complaints for example.</p>	<p>Blue badge holders can park in all pay and display parking areas, on or off street, free of charge and without time limit. This includes the 1 hour parking bays proposed in this scheme on Central Street. Blue Badge holders are also permitted to park in the short stay limited waiting bays outside the Health Centre without time limit. We are providing additional allocated disabled parking as part of these proposals on Salem Street. It should also be noted that the current TRO (though not currently enforced) restricts parking to 1/2 hours around the Central Street area.</p>

Appendix B – Phase 2 On street parking P&D Changes

	Comments/Objection	Summary of officer responses during consultation
	<p>My other concern is in regards to the parking by Central Street being restricted, as people need to park near their workplace longer than 1h pupil transport will need longer due to the welfare of the pupils as then it's not a rush for them and a stress for the school staff, which will have a detrimental effect on their emotional wellbeing in time which will be in breach of the HSAWA 1974 and management of health and safety regulations 1999.</p> <p>I am sure as a council you don't want any incidents to happen but it will be a high potential if these new parking restrictions do go ahead without it being properly thought through.</p>	<p>Our view is that the GB's decision whether to change the current parking arrangement, and thereby potentially increasing pedestrian use of the roads to and from destinations, is outside of the scope of the HSAWA 1974 & H&S Regs 1999.</p>
7	<p>I am objecting on the grounds of pupil safety - Central Street school is an infant school which includes an ARP - an Autism Resourced Provision supporting 10 children with Autism. The ARP children arrive at Central Street in 2 minibuses.</p> <p>Because of their sensory needs, emotional needs and Autism, the children find this transition in the morning very difficult and some of them require 1 to 1 or even 2 to 1 support to get them safely into school. They need to be as close to the door as possible.</p> <p>We already have to battle with traffic wardens twice a day in order to park safely to help our ARP pupils at the beginning and end of the day. I have applied for dedicated parking for the ARP transport a few months ago and have heard nothing.</p> <p>These are children with disabilities - and we are concerned that the changes to parking on Central Street puts these learners at an even greater disadvantage and compromises their safety and well being.</p>	<p>Both schools are in very constrained areas, with large demands for parking. We have been considering what options we have to be able to deal with these issues at both schools and have the following proposals: -</p> <p>We are aware of the loading issues, and the use of existing "loading/pull-in area". Investigating this further, the use of the loading area is complicated by its narrow width and the presence of the School Keep Clear (SKC) markings, vehicles parked in the bay generally will also sit on the SKC markings and therefore should rightly be subject to enforcement.</p> <p>We appreciate the wish to use the loading area more effectively and therefore propose to adjust the restrictions in the area by removing the existing SKC restriction and replace them either side of the loading area with "No Waiting at any time and No Loading at any time" restrictions (giving effectively the same restrictions as the SKC) as shown on the drawing. It is also proposed to restrict parking in the loading area to "Loading Only" and operating at all times. This will</p>

Appendix B – Phase 2 On street parking P&D Changes

	Comments/Objection	Summary of officer responses during consultation
	<p>We are also concerned about more general access to the school building, e.g. for visitors and contractors (and staff) supporting our school.</p> <p>Many of our parents and staff are concerned about the proposed changes; I would welcome a conversation with someone to make our concerns clear.</p>	<p>allow vehicles to load/unload there for a period of 30 minutes (no return within 2 hrs), and this area should then be protected against other parking activities.</p>