

## Minutes of a meeting of the Shipley Area Committee held on Wednesday 16 March 2016 at Bingley Town Hall

Commenced 1800

Concluded 1945

**PRESENT – Councillors**

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	GREEN
Barker	Ross-Shaw	Love
Davies		
Ellis		
Heseltine		
Townend		
Whiteley		

Observers: Councillor Val Slater (Housing, Planning and Transport Portfolio Holder)  
Councillor M Pollard

**Councillor Heseltine in the Chair****68. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

The following disclosures were made in the interest of transparency:

- (i) Councillor Love disclosed that he was Chair of Environment and Waste Management Overview and Scrutiny Committee in relation to the petition requesting a 20mph zone on Well Heads and A644 Brighouse Road adjacent to Keelham Primary School (Minute 72).

**ACTION:** *City Solicitor*

**MINUTES****69. Resolved –**

**That the minutes of the meeting held on 27 January 2016 be signed as a correct record.**



## 70. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

There were no appeals submitted by the public to review decisions to restrict documents.

## 71. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no questions submitted by the public.

## 72. PETITION REQUESTING '20MPH ZONE' ON WELL HEADS AND A644 BRIGHOUSE ROAD ADJACENT TO KEELHAM PRIMARY SCHOOL, WELL HEADS

Bingley Rural  
Thornton & Allerton

The Strategic Director of Regeneration submitted **Document "AH"** which considered an e-petition requesting the introduction of a '20mph zone' on the section of Well Heads and A644 Brighouse Road running adjacent to Keelham Primary School. The petition expressed concern regarding traffic speeds within the vicinity of the school and made a specific request for the introduction of a Home Zone.

The petition was presented to Full Council on 19 January 2016, where it was resolved that it be referred to the Bradford West and Shipley Area Committees for their consideration. On 24 February 2016, and in accordance with the Full Council resolution of 19 January 2016, a petitions report regarding the request for a 20mph zone on Well Heads was presented to the Bradford West Area Committee. At that meeting it was resolved that:

- (1) That Shipley Area Committee be requested to look favourably upon this petition and act to address the concerns raised, which are shared by the Bradford West Area Committee, in particular, to have regard to the implementation of a '20mph zone'.*
- (2) That Officers continue to pursue all options with a view to improving road safety measures at that section of Well Heads and A644 Brighouse Road running adjacent to Keelham Primary School, Well Heads.*
- (3) That, in addition to the lead petitioner being informed accordingly, he also be formally praised for his community spirit and the arduous work undertaken to bring this subject matter to the attention of the Council.*

In introducing the report, the Principal Engineer emphasised that it was evidence-based, stating that there had been no traffic collisions resulting in personal injury recorded for the five year period ending 31 December 2015, therefore the site was not a priority area for a 20 mph zone, however there were other measures that could be considered to address the petitioners' concerns.

The lead petitioner addressed the Committee and stated that he had led on the petition in his capacity as the Road Safety Ambassador for Keelham Primary School. He described the school as small, with an admission number of 120, situated on a busy corner with no car parking facilities on site resulting in cars parking on the road side. He spoke of the school's walking bus which purposely avoided the busy road corner of Well Heads and Brighouse Road due to the speeding traffic. He stated that in 2012 the local newspaper reported that more than £12m for road safety schemes had been stalled and one of the

outstanding schemes had been to introduce flashing warning signs at a cost of £6,000 to reduce speeding near Keelham Primary School; it was four years on and the scheme was still awaited. With reference to the speed survey in the officer's report, he stated it was evident that drivers were regularly breaking the speed limit. He stated that he was in discussions with MP Naz Shah, local Councillors and Keelham Primary School in relation to widening the junction mouth to make it safer. Although the report stated there had been no accidents within a five year period, it had been confirmed at Bradford West Area Committee that a hit and run accident had occurred but had not been recorded. He also stated that he had witnessed an accident on 8 March 2016 which was reported to the Police. He considered it unacceptable that a life should be lost before action would be taken and it was down to luck that there had not been a fatality at the junction. He concluded by urging the Committee to support road safety improvements outside Keelham Primary School and stated that it was evident it took the issue of road safety for school children seriously as many schools within the area had seen improvements e.g. Sandal Primary in Baildon had a 20 mph zone.

The Chair asked a number of questions to which the Principal Officer reported that the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds were the highest speeds recorded; not all vehicles reported in the same column within the report were doing that speed. With regard to enforcement, it was stated that Police resources were already stretched and discussions were being undertaken with the Police to consider how best to maximise their resources across West Yorkshire. The location had not previously been prioritised for traffic calming measures due to its low accident rate. Officers could only go by the accident information recorded by the Police. He asked Members to be mindful of higher priority schemes for 20 mph zones within the Shipley constituency and stated that there were other types of measures that could be explored at this location other than a 20 mph zone which would cost less.

A Member commented that there was often a mobile speed camera on Brighouse and Denholme Gate Road therefore he considered there was a concern regarding speeding traffic in the vicinity. The Principal Officer agreed and stated that the cameras were used where there was evidence of speed related accidents.

The position of the school in the Bradford West Area Constituency and the highway being located in the Shipley Area Constituency was referred to.

With regard to the smaller scheme alluded to by the Principal Officer it was stated that ownership could be given to the school to design the scheme and it could be installed with the school as a 'gateway treatment'. It could possibly include rumble strips, extra street lighting and a Vehicle Activated Sign. The cost would be approximately £5,000 as opposed to £20,000 that would be required for a 20mph zone. Members were agreeable to this and requested the Principal Officer approach the Bradford West Area Committee to ask them to contribute to this scheme. A Member suggested that in addition to the smaller scheme, the request for a 20mph zone be placed on the Committee's list of schemes to be considered should funding become available for non-accident related schemes in the future.

The Housing, Planning and Transport Portfolio Holder addressed the Committee and spoke of the reports tied in with this issue relating to the transportation of animal by-products by Omega Proteins that had previously been considered by the Environment and Waste Management Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Those reports had considered HGV movements at the Well Heads/Brighouse Road junction. The corner of the junction was narrow and HGVs often drove over the pavement, at a risk to pedestrians. She reported that she had been involved in discussions to look at the possibility of widening the

road but this would involve using land belonging to the school to allow for a pavement but she had been advised that the Schools Governors were not in favour of this option; however the land belonged to the Council and advice was being sought from Asset Management on this matter. In response, the Principal Engineer provided an update that there had been further talks with the School Governors and they were now in favour of this option. The Vice Chair of Governors was in attendance at the meeting and concurred with this view.

A Member emphasised that there were two issues that needed addressing; the turning of HGVs into the junction and the speeding of vehicles, relating to the petition.

It was clarified that the reference in the report to the existing pedestrian link between Well Heads and Brighouse Road referred to the school's walking bus.

#### **Resolved –**

- (1) **That a scheme incorporating a 20mph zone on the section of Well Heads and Brighouse Road running adjacent to Keelham Primary School be added to the Committee's list of schemes to be considered should funding become available for non-accident related schemes.**
- (2) **That the Principal Highways Officer be requested to undertake further discussions with Bradford West Area Committee with a view to progressing a jointly funded scheme (Approx £5000 in total, £2,500 from each Committee) to address road safety issues outside the school.**
- (3) **That the Principal Highways Officer be requested to undertake a discussion with Keelham Primary School regarding a financial contribution towards the scheme (outlined in resolution (2) above).**
- (4) **That the Housing, Planning and Transport Portfolio Holder be requested to pursue discussions with Asset Management to progress the diversion of the footpath at the corner of Brighouse Road and Well Heads on to the school site land to make the junction safer.**
- (5) **That the lead petitioner be informed accordingly.**

#### ***OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: Environment and Waste Management ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration***

#### **73. 26 OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER FOR PARKING RESTRICTIONS WITHIN BAILDON VILLAGE AND ITS SURROUNDING AREAS**

**Baildon**

The Strategic Director of Regeneration submitted **Document "AI"** which considered 26 objections received from local residents/businesses to a Traffic Regulation Order to introduce parking restrictions in and around Baildon village.

The Principal Engineer stated that there had been lengthy discussions and work had been ongoing for the past two years to put the proposed scheme together. The proposed Traffic Regulation Orders would facilitate car parking where possible and the free passage of vehicles taking into account the needs of businesses, residents, visitors and commuters. Members were reminded that any changes to the restrictions proposed could be reduced

but not increased without re-advertisement. Large scale drawings of the proposals were tabled.

A number of objectors to the scheme addressed the Committee and made the following comments:

Objector one lived on Bank Walk and objected to the parking restrictions on Bank Walk and Bank Crest which she considered would cause parking problems and would inconvenience her and her neighbours. She considered the restrictions were not required as currently parked cars at the location slowed down the traffic.

Objector two lived on Hallcliffe and objected to it being the only road going out of Baildon town centre which had not been considered for any restrictions. She stated that the road narrowed, it was poorly lit and there was only a footpath on one side; when two cars passed each other, one drove over the pavement due to the narrowness of the road. She often heard traffic travelling at high speeds.

Objector three lived on Langley Lane and raised concerns about the lack of parking that would be available to residents if the proposed restrictions were implemented. He considered that if the proposals were implemented they would displace 80 vehicles with the potential for obstructions to other residents' driveways.

Objector four referred to the parking restrictions proposed for West Gate. He spoke of the inconsiderate and dangerous parking that took place outside 32-38 Westgate and the absence of Council Wardens enforcing parking restrictions. He considered that the parking facilities opposite numbers 35-43 Westgate needed altering to residents only permit parking; the officers comment in the report stated that these properties had off street parking available to them at the rear side, but this only applied to numbers 37 and 39. He considered the proposals did not adequately consider residents' parking needs.

In response to the comments made by objectors, the officers stated that:

- The proposed restrictions for Bank Walk would protect the sight lines.
- The restrictions were proposed following previous complaints from residents.
- It was possible to reduce the length of the double yellow lines on Bank Crest.
- The proposed parking restrictions on Langley Lane were 8.00–9.30am and 2.30–4.00pm Monday to Friday to coincide with school start and finish times and particularly to allow the school bus better access to Coverdale Way which it had struggled to do.
- Council Wardens would be deployed where needed.

A Member commented that if restrictions had been proposed for Hallcliffe there was a danger that traffic would speed up on the already narrow road.

The Chair stated that a Residents Only Parking Permit could be considered in a future review along with any other concerns flagged up by residents.

A discussion took place about the powers of enforcement that the local authority had and the possibility of them being strengthened by central government. It was explained that Council Wardens currently had the powers to enforce parking restrictions but fines for parking too close to a junction were issued by the Police. The Principal Engineer was requested to liaise with the Police to ensure adequate enforcement of the restrictions.

Following consideration of the objections it was;

**Resolved –**

- (1) That the proposed Baildon TRO (as shown within Drawing No. TGD/THN/102329/TRO-1B (attached as Appendix 1 to Document “AI”) be approved, sealed and implemented as formally advertised subject to the following amendments:
- (a) The proposed single yellow line on Langley Lane be reduced in length;
  - (b) The proposed 2 hours short-stay parking on Jenny Lane be omitted between Heather Road and Heygate Lane;
  - (c) The proposed double yellow lines on Bank Crest going towards Bank Walk be reduced in length, but be long enough to protect sightlines at the junction.
- (2) That the objectors be advised accordingly.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: Environment and Waste Management**  
**ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration**

74. **OBJECTIONS TO ADVERTISED 20MPH ZONE** Wharfedale  
**(COMPRISING TEN ROUND TOP ROAD HUMPS)**  
**ON THE EXISTING 20MPH LENGTH OF MOOR ROAD,**  
**BURLEY WOODHEAD**

The Strategic Director of Regeneration submitted **Document “AJ”** which sought the decision of the Committee regarding objections received to the advertised 20mph zone (comprising ten round top road humps) on Moor Road, Burley Woodhead.

The Principal Engineer tabled large scale drawings of the existing road humps, the scheme as originally advertised and the revised scheme and gave an overview of the report. The revised proposals contained seven road humps and three roundels.

A supporter of the scheme addressed the Committee and spoke in favour of the proposed 20mph speed limit as an effective method of traffic calming for the area.

A Member who was also a Ward Councillor for the Wharfedale area stated that, following discussion of this issue at the Committee’s meeting on 11 November 2015 and production of the revised proposals, he had consulted with residents. Some were in favour of and some were against the proposals, but he had not received a response from 86 residents.

Members were informed that the advisory sign for HGVs would remain on Bingley Road and that the height of the proposed road humps would only vary to the height of the existing ones by 1 or 2mm.

**Resolved –**

- (1) That the objections relating to the proposals as originally advertised and as shown within drawing No. TDG/THN/102345/CON-1B (attached as Appendix 2 of Document “AJ”) be overruled and the revised proposals as shown on drawing

No.TGD/THN/102345/CON-1C (attached as Appendix 3 of Document "AJ") be approved and;

- (2) That the proposed traffic calming scheme as shown on drawing No.TGD/THN/102345/CON-1C (attached as Appendix 3 of Document "AJ") becomes an extension of the existing adjoining 20mph zone on Moor Road, Burley Woodhead (as outlined in Appendix 1 of Document "AJ").
- (3) That the lead petitioner and objectors be advised accordingly.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: Environment and Waste Management  
ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration**

75. **PETITION REQUESTING REMOVAL OF EXISTING TWO HOUR SHORT-STAY ON-STREET PARKING ON CEDAR STREET, CROSSFLATTS** **Bingley**

The Strategic Director of Regeneration submitted **Document "AK"** which considered the petitioners' request to remove the existing two hours short- stay on-street parking facilities from the existing Resident Only Persons Parking (ROPP) scheme on Cedar Street, Crossflatts.

The Principal Engineer provided a summary of the report.

The lead petitioner addressed the Committee to state concerns over the increase in traffic in the area over the past few years and the car parking difficulties local residents were experiencing; commuters using the station were parking all day on Cedar Street and drivers with parking permits were parking on Cedar Street when their permits were for other streets.

In response to the above concerns, the Chair stated they were enforcement issues and asked the Principal Officer to pursue stronger enforcement of the restrictions. He stated that a ROPP would cost in the region of £6,000 to advertise and implement and he suggested the scheme be put on hold until a review was undertaken of the wider area and that this scheme be considered for inclusion at that time.

**Resolved –**

- (1) That the concerns of the petitioners be noted and no further action be recommended on this matter at this moment in time, although the petitioners' request be reconsidered when an appropriate parking review is being undertaken.
- (2) That the lead petitioner and signatories be advised accordingly.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: Environment and Waste Management  
ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration**

76. **OBJECTION TO PROPOSED SPEED LIMIT  
ORDER TO INTRODUCE A 20MPH ZONE ON A  
SECTION OF SUN LANE, BURLEY IN WHARFEDALE**

The Strategic Director of Regeneration submitted **Document “AL”** which considered one objection received to the advertised proposal to introduce a 20mph zone on the existing one-way section of Sun Lane (between its junctions with Main Street and West View Road) in Burley in Wharfedale.

The Principal Engineer provided a summary of the report.

Following consideration of the objection, it was;

**Resolved –**

- (1) **That the proposals (as outlined in Appendix 1 of Document “AL”) be approved, sealed and implemented as formally advertised.**
- (2) **That the objector be informed accordingly.**

***OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: Environment and Waste Management  
ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration***

77. **HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE NON-CLASSIFIED ROADS  
AND SURFACE DRESSING ALLOCATION FOR SHIPLEY  
CONSTITUENCY- 2016/17**

All Wards

The Strategic Director of Regeneration submitted **Document “AM”** which provided information on the Capital Highway Maintenance funding element of the Local Transport Plan for 2016/17 and made recommendations on the allocation for Non-Classified road resurfacing schemes and Surface Dressing sites in the Shipley constituency.

The Principal Engineer stated that there had been some revisions to Appendix 2 of Document “AM”; a revised version (Appendix 2A) was tabled containing budget estimates. An updated version of Appendix 1 was also tabled showing updated cost figures currently totalling £462,000 for Highway Maintenance Capital Programme works undertaken in 2015/16. Members were recommended to approve the proposed programme of works for 2016/17 as outlined in Appendix 2A and Appendix 3.

In response to a Member’s question it was stated that savings on budget estimates could not be carried forward to the following year; budget estimates varied between schemes and were dependant on the condition of the roads and the extent of works required.

A Member asked for reassurance that areas where traffic calming measures were planned would not be resurfaced prior to those measures being put in place. In response, it was stated that there was better co-ordination between the Maintenance and Traffic teams to ensure this did not happen.

A Member informed the Principal Engineer that there was a development proposed on Springhurst Road, Shipley which was currently on the reserve list, and therefore asked that no resurfacing work take place there.



**Resolved –**

**That the proposed programme of works for 2016/17 as shown in Appendix 2A (as tabled at the meeting) and Appendix 3 of Document “AM” be approved.**

***OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: Environment and Waste Management  
ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration***

Chair

**Note: These minutes are subject to approval as a correct record at the next meeting of the Committee.**

minutes\SAC16March

THESE MINUTES HAVE BEEN PRODUCED, WHEREVER POSSIBLE, ON RECYCLED PAPER