

MINUTES OF TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER GOVERNING BODY MEETING

Attendees:

Voting Members

Corporate Lead (Design & Asset Management) – Chair	CL(DAM)
Corporate Lead (Transportation)	CL(T)
Corporate Lead (Green Space & Street Scene)	CL(GSSC)

Other

Highways and Planning Solicitor (advisor)	H&PS
Engineering Team Manager (Traffic Engineering)	ETM
Traffic Engineer	TE
3no Work Experience Students (observing)	

1. Apologies

Assistant Director of Strategic Infrastructure is on leave.

As three voting members remain, the Traffic Regulation Order Governing Body (GB) meeting is quorate.

2. Matters arising

None.

3. Previous Minutes

ETM reported that the minutes from the 26 March 2005 and 18 June 2025 meetings are being finalised.

The agreed minutes from previous meetings are published [on the website](#).

4. Orders for Consideration

a) Todmorden Town Hall (TRO)

As a result of the ongoing refurbishment of Todmorden Town Hall, a new ramped/stepped access is being proposed ([see proposal drawing](#)).

As indicated, the proposed steps and ramp will encroach onto and obstruct the existing footway, moving the entry point adjacent to the carriageway. It is proposed that this section of carriageway is converted into footway. The existing carriageway currently has a Traffic Regulation Order for parking restrictions at this point, which needs to be removed.

An informal consultation (emergency services and affected Councillors etc.) took place between 18 June and 4 July.

Only two comments were received, both from Councillors, raising concerns that this may result in loss of parking opportunities for disabled drivers. Whilst the affected area of carriageway is not a disabled parking bay as such, it is only restricted by double yellow lines (No Waiting at Any Time), and so this does allow for blue badge parking and loading/unloading. Whilst it is unfortunate that this facility will be lost, other similar blue badge/loading facilities remain available nearby on Calder Street and School Street (orange lines on the plan).

Enforcement of current restrictions was also commented on, and this question has been passed on to the Parking Team for a response.

CL(GSSC) suggested that the affected section of footway should be “stopped up” (to remove highway status). H&PS to consider this and action as required.

The GB discussed the proposals and voted on whether the scheme should progress.

Outcome

It was unanimously agreed (by CL(DAM), CL(T) and CL(GSSC)) that the proposals can proceed to statutory consultation.

The TROGB:

- (i) Approves the progression of this 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.

b) Watkins Place/Osbourne Close, Lightcliffe (TRO)

These proposals were previously considered at the GB meeting in October 2024. Although there were some objections, all three elements were given approval to progress to statutory consultation, however, consideration of a proposed revision for Osbourne Close meant that a second informal consultation was required.

A second consultation (involving residents of Osborne Grove, Westfield, Park Terrace and affected frontagers on Wakefield Rd) took place between 3rd April and 25th April 2025.

11 responses were received as summarised in [Appendix A](#) below.

CL(GSSC) questioned whether a bus stop marking should be included on the northern side of the carriageway. ETM confirmed this would be considered before the statutory consultation.

The GB reviewed the comments received and considered the proposed responses.

In reviewing neighbouring streets, it was noted that white lines (H-Bars) have previously been placed at the junction of Wakefield Rd and Osbourne Drive, presumably as a quick way of providing an element of junction protection. As we are proposing similar works in the area, it is considered sensible to add enforceable protections here too. It is noted that these have not been informally consulted, but as the white lines have been there for a significant length of time, and no new restrictions would directly impact on anyone's parking, the GB considered it was not necessary to informally consult and this could be included in the statutory consultation.

The GB discussed these proposals and voted on whether the scheme should progress.

Outcome

It was unanimously agreed (by CL(DAM), CL(T) and CL(GSSC)) that all of the proposals can proceed to the statutory consultation.

The TROGB:

- (i) Approves the progression of this 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.

5. Any other business

None

6. Date of Next Meeting

13 August 2025 at 14.30

Appendix A – Watkins Place/Osbourne Close, Lightcliffe (Informal Consultation)

	Summary of comments received (in themes)	Number of mentions in responses	Proposed Governing Body responses to comments received
1	Please consider extending these junction protections to Westfield/Park Terrace	8	• This is probably a valid point, and it is proposed that these junctions are included in the next stage of the consultations. • Like the previous proposal, this would simply be 5m length either side of the junction to provide some sort of line of sight.
2	With these increased restrictions, where are we supposed to park?	2	• Firstly, parking on the highway is not a legal right, and it is a driver's responsibility to find a suitable place to park where other road users and pedestrians are able to pass/access freely. • Parking on the highway is tolerated as far as no concerns are raised. When concerns are raised, the Highway Authority will consider them as part of its network management duty under the Traffic Management Act 2004 and when exercising its functions under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (such as whether to make a TRO) as part of its duty to balance the specified considerations in section 122 of that Act. • In this case, we consider that the proposals protect public transport access, support good parking practice (as shown in rule 243 of the Highway Code), and affect a limited number of parking spaces which could reasonably be relocated further along the road.
3	Specific comment in support the proposals	1	• No comment required
4	"Keep Clear" markings could be used instead of parking restrictions (Osbourne Grove)	1	• "Keep Clear" markings are not legally enforceable and therefore are not always beneficial and they are generally targeted at moving traffic rather than parking. • As this may assist in maintaining clear access from the side roads, we will investigate adding this in addition for the next round of consultation.

Appendix A – Watkins Place/Osbourne Close, Lightcliffe (Informal Consultation)

	Summary of comments received (in themes)	Number of mentions in responses	Proposed Governing Body responses to comments received
5	Move the bus stop to negate need for DYLS?	1	The location of the bus stop is only part of the issue, and current parking behaviour still interferes with visibility from the side roads. Therefore, moving the bus stop would not alter the need for the parking restrictions.
6	Consider using mirrors instead of parking restrictions.	1	Mirrors are not normally erected on the public highway, as they can cause more problems than not having one, they can: - reflect light and interfere with a driver's vision. - reduce the ability to judge an oncoming vehicle's speed. - create an unreasonable dependence on the mirror. - if dirty, they can distort or restrict the view. - be an easy target for vandals and thus become a maintenance liability. - Previously, Department for Transport approval was required to erect mirrors on the highway. Since the introduction of the 'Traffic Signs Regulations General Directions 2016', local authorities now have the power to erect/grant permission to erect mirrors on the highway but should only do so when visibility is almost zero and when there have been a number of injury accidents that are attributable to a lack of visibility. That is not considered to be the case here.
7	Consider extending junction protection to Lightcliffe club	1	- This is probably a valid point, and it is proposed that these junctions are included in the next stage of the consultations. - Like the previous proposal, this would simply be 5m length either side of the junction to provide some sort of line of sight.