

Minutes of a meeting of the Shipley Area Committee held on Wednesday, 27 July 2016 at Bingley Town Hall

Commenced 6.00 pm
Concluded 8.00 pm

Present – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	GREEN
Heseltine Shaw Davies Riaz Townend Whiteley	Greenwood Ross-Shaw	Love

Councillor Heseltine in the Chair

23. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

- (i) During consideration of the Lysander Way Estate, Cottingley proposals (Minute 27) Councillor Greenwood disclosed in the interest of transparency that her brother worked at Cottingley Village Primary School.
- (ii) During consideration of the Carlton Road, Shipley petition (Minute 29) Councillor Ross-Shaw disclosed in the interest of transparency that he may have been on the Keighley and Shipley Planning Panel when the application for a property on Kirkgate, Shipley was approved for conversion to a residential dwelling.

ACTION: City Solicitor

24. MINUTES

That the minutes of the meetings held on 15 and 29 June 2016 be signed as a correct record (previously circulated).



25. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

26. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no questions submitted by the public.

27. OBJECTIONS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER FOR PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS - LYSANDER WAY ESTATE, COTTINGLEY

The Strategic Director of Regeneration submitted **Document “M”** which presented five objections received to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order relating to proposed waiting restrictions within the Lysander Way Estate, Cottingley.

The Principal Engineer provided a summary of the report and tabled large scale drawings of the proposals and photographs of the highway.

An objector to the proposals addressed the Committee. She stated she was a parent of a child that attended Cottingley Village Primary School and was concerned about child safety if the proposals were implemented as parents would have to park further away from the school and children would need to cross more roads to access the school; there was also a lack of crossing facilities to aid this. She stated that parents often dropped their children off at school on their way to work and it was not always possible to walk to school. She urged that adequate parking solutions be put in place.

Another objector addressed the Committee to state that parents of children attending the school had not been consulted and no alternatives for car parking for parents had been put forward.

An objector and resident within the vicinity of the proposed scheme addressed the Committee. He considered the proposed scheme to be crude and that it would require some residents to unreasonably move their cars twice a day during term time. He urged that the scheme be amended. He also stated that other residents were unaware of the impact of the proposals.

An objector and resident within the vicinity of the proposed scheme addressed the Committee to state that he considered the meeting to be one-sided and questioned why all residents of Lysander Estate had not been informed of the meeting.

An objector and Chair of Governor’s at Cottingley Village Primary School addressed the Committee. He stated that parents of children affected by the proposals had not known about the scheme and the school had not received written notice of this meeting. He informed Members that the school had received



two letters from residents and three from parents asking the school to object to the proposals and a petition had been handed to the school signed by 50 parents against the proposals too. The school had received one letter asking it to support the proposals. He suggested that the plans be suspended so that other alternatives could be explored as the restrictions proposed would only push the problem to another area of Cottingley.

The Principal Engineer confirmed that notices had been erected to advertise the proposals for four weeks on 13 May 2016 and that he had emailed the school within the following week to inform them and had spoken to a staff member at the school to ensure the email had been received. He suggested that parents, in conjunction with the school, could consider a yellow bus service or walking bus as alternative options. The Chair of Governor's of the school responded that the school already had those facilities in place.

In response to comments relating to residents not being aware of this meeting, the Principal Engineer stated that the letter which had gone to residents initially on 6 May 2016 (Appendix 1 of Document "M") to inform them of the proposals had stated that objections would be presented to this Committee for consideration and all objectors had been informed of the meeting.

A Member queried whether any other forms of traffic restrictions had been considered e.g. making the estate access only. In response, the Principal Engineer explained that this option had been considered but would be difficult to enforce due to the size of the estate; he also stated that the area did not meet the policy criteria for residents' only parking permits. A Member queried whether the area could be considered under an exception for residents' only parking permits as had been done near some sports grounds in Bradford. The Principal Engineer stated that he would need to seek legal advice on this matter.

In response to a Member's question, the Principal Engineer stated that a similar scheme to the one proposed was in place outside a school on Wagon Lane, Bingley and no complaints had been received.

The Chair spoke of the need to consider highway safety outside of the school primarily. He referred to the narrowness of Cottingley Cliffe Road and that pedestrians had to walk on the road when cars were parked on the footpath. He questioned whether part of the scheme relating to Cottingley Cliffe Road could be implemented whilst the proposals for Lysander Way Estate were reviewed but was informed that this was not possible.

Resolved –

- (1) That consideration of the proposals contained in Document "M" be deferred to allow time for discussions to be held with Cottingley Village Primary School to consider alternative options and that a further report be submitted to the Committee.**

- (2) That the objectors be informed accordingly.**



OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: Environment and Waste Management

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

28. SALTAIRE JUNCTION IMPROVEMENT SCHEME - OBJECTION TO PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS ON HIRST LANE

The Strategic Director of Regeneration submitted **Document “N”** which considered one objection received following the advertisement of proposed waiting restrictions on Hirst Lane, Saltaire.

The Principal Engineer provided a summary of the report.

The objector to the proposals addressed the Committee. She stated that no waiting at any time restrictions had already been imposed on the other side of the road and that the proposed restrictions would leave no parking space outside her property. She stated that the T junction at Hirst Lane/Clarence Road was unsafe and that HGVs approached it too fast.

In response to questions raised regarding why additional restrictions were being proposed since the original approved design, the Principal Engineer stated that, due to parked vehicles, some longer vehicles were having difficulties in turning left at the give way junction of Hirst Lane and Clarence Road. The proposals were to ease the manoeuvring of longer vehicles and reduce the risk of damage to parked vehicles.

A discussion ensued regarding the lack of a give way sign at the Hirst Lane and Clarence Road junction.

Resolved –

- (1) That the objection to the proposal to ‘No Waiting At Any Time’ restrictions, as shown on plan no. HDB/CM//101307/TRO-1B, attached as Appendix 1 to Document “N”, be overruled. That the orders be sealed and implemented as advertised and the works be implemented.**
- (2) That consideration be given to the introduction of a ‘Give Way’ sign and/or improved road markings on Hirst Lane, Saltaire.**
- (3) That the objector be notified accordingly.**

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: Environment and Waste Management

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration



29. PETITION REQUESTING THE INTRODUCTION OF TRAFFIC MEASURES ON CARLTON ROAD, SHIPLEY

The Strategic Director of Regeneration submitted **Document “O”** which considered a petition requesting the introduction of traffic calming, a residents permit parking scheme, and the introduction of a ‘One-way’ traffic system or ‘Point Closure’ (ie. physical closure) on Carlton Road, Shipley.

The Principal Engineer provided a summary of the report and corrected a typing error; the title of the second table in Appendix 3 of Document “O” should read ‘Speed and Volumetric Survey Results for Carlton Road, Saltaire (uphill i.e. towards Bingley Road).

The lead petitioner addressed the Committee and spoke of the increased traffic on Carlton Road since the completion of the Saltaire Roundabout Improvement works. She stated that the petitioners wanted to improve safety and that the junction with Bingley Road was particularly unsafe and narrow; there had been an accident at that location in the previous week. She stated that the traffic was particularly bad at school times and that HGVs used Carlton Road as a cut through. She spoke of a recent planning application to convert a property to a residential dwelling on Kirkgate, Shipley which had been approved by the Council without full consideration being given for car parking. She urged the Committee not to note the concerns as recommended but to continue to monitor the situation and consider the area as a whole, rather than in isolation.

In response to questions raised, the Principal Engineer stated that:

- The accident record showed that there had been one accident over the last three years of slight severity involving a car travelling Shipley bound.
- All but one property on Carlton Road had off street parking.
- The Planning department had assessed the car parking in relation to the approved planning application and had considered it to be a sustainable location alongside a major bus route.
- The recorded speeds as outlined in the report did not indicate that speeding was a problem.

A Member stated that Carlton Road should not be considered in isolation and was concerned that some of the 85th percentile speeds (as shown in Appendix 3 of Document “O”) were above the speed limit. He questioned how high the speeds had to be before they were considered adequate for traffic calming measures. In response, the Principal Engineer stated 24 mph; he suggested in the first instance that additional painted 20mph roundels could be implemented as a traffic calming measure. The Member added that there was a HGV ban being considered for Carlton Road, Dallam Road and Tower Road and that the concerns raised by the petition should not be dismissed.



Resolved –

(1) That Carlton Road be included on the list of traffic management scheme candidates to be considered annually by this Committee for possible inclusion within its future programme of locally determined works, and if included within the works programme, that the surrounding area be considered holistically.

(2) That the lead petitioner be advised accordingly.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: Environment and Waste Management

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

30. STREET LIGHTING COLUMN REPLACEMENT PROGRAMME

The Strategic Director of Regeneration submitted **Document “L”** which sought to advise the Area Committee regarding the replacement of street lighting columns determined as non compliant and the subsequent recommendations as to how the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan Funding allocation was most effectively utilised.

The Senior Engineer provided a summary of the report.

The Chair requested that further information about how the Local Transport Plan Funding allocation was determined per constituency and the amount of funding for each be circulated to Members.

A Member stated that the scheme listed in Table B of Appendix A for Windhill Old Road was in the Idle and Thackley Ward in Bradford East, not the Windhill and Wrose Ward. She also stated that it would be beneficial for Members to be informed of the category 1 and 2 schemes within their Wards.

A Member stated that there had been problems with the new lamps introduced in Baildon and that some lamps were covered by trees which should have been cut back. In response, the Senior Engineer stated that there had been less maintenance carried out due to budget cuts; he stated that trees would be cut back if required before any further implementation works were carried out.

Resolved –

That the Priority 1 street lighting column replacement schemes listed in Table A of Appendix 1 of Document “L” be implemented.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: Environment and Waste Management

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration



31. ANNUAL UPDATE ON ROAD SAFETY IN SHIPLEY

The Strategic Director of Regeneration submitted **Document “P”** which sought to update Members on current casualty levels and trends in Shipley and on the Road Safety education, training and publicity initiatives aimed at reducing these casualties.

The Casualty Reduction and Road Safety Partnership Manager circulated colour copies of the appendices to the report and highlighted school that had and had not been engaged with.

The Chair stated that it was ultimately up to schools to engage with the road safety initiatives being offered to them and that schools should take them up.

A Member referred to the road casualty figures for the Shipley Constituency (Appendix 2 of Document “P”) and noted that, compared to 2010 figures, they were not improving.

The Chair stated that he had seen the list of reasons for road traffic accidents in the constituency and requested that a few of them be circulated to Members so they could see the various factors behind their causes. He also thanked the staff delivering the road safety training.

Resolved –

- (1) **That the information in respect of casualty trends and Road Safety activities in Shipley be noted.**
- (2) **That the Shipley Area Committee continues to support the evidence based approach to determine Road Safety priorities.**

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: *Environment and Waste Management*

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

32. DEVOLVED BUDGET - SAFER ROADS SCHEMES

The Strategic Director of Regeneration submitted **Document “Q”** which sought approval for a programme of Safer Roads Schemes for the Shipley Area for the 2016/17 financial year.

The Principal Engineer provided a summary of the report and in response to Members’ questions reported that:

- The previously funded safer road scheme for Church Street, Bingley was on hold due to issues that had arisen in Trinity All Saints CE Primary School implementing the Section 278 and Section 106 agreements.
- The second tier consultation method as outlined in paragraph 4.6 of the report was currently in place, as previously agreed by the Committee. Members



were being consulted to determine whether proposed traffic schemes were likely to give rise to strong public opinion and therefore required local residents' views being sought via a questionnaire. Statutory advertising of schemes would always take place.

A Member expressed her disagreement about the way the funding had been split between the five constituency areas by the Executive which she considered should have been distributed on an area basis rather than by population.

A Member requested that the proposed locally determined scheme for Main Street, Wharfedale (outlined in Appendix 4) concerning speeding also include consideration of parking issues.

Officers were requested to provide additional information to a Baildon Ward Councillor on the funded scheme for Cliffe Lane/Cliffe Lane South as outlined in Appendix 1 to the report.

A Member stated that one of the schemes listed for the Windhill and Wrose Ward in Appendix 4 of the report should be stated Willowfield Crescent, not Willow Crescent and requested the data in relation to it.

A Member requested officers to check whether the two schemes listed in Appendix 3 of the report in relation to junction improvements at Bingley Road with Nab Wood Cemetery could be merged into one scheme to save on resources.

A discussion took place about the amount of time schemes should be kept on the outstanding list of traffic measures requests for consideration. It was agreed that officers would send Members all outstanding schemes for their Ward for them to consider which to leave on and remove; schemes would not be removed from the list without consultation with Ward Members.

Officers were requested to check whether the proposed scheme in Appendix 2 of the report relating to the junction of A650 Canal Road with Frizinghall Road was within the Shipley or Bradford West constituency.

Resolved –

- (1) That the previous programme of outstanding Safer Roads Schemes programme for 2015/16 as listed in Appendix 1 of Document “Q” be re-approved.**
- (2) That those Casualty Reduction schemes (to form part of the Shipley Area Committee’s 2016/17 Safer Roads Schemes programme) as outlined in Appendix 2 of Document “Q” be approved.**
- (3) That those Locally Determined schemes (to form part of the Shipley Area Committee’s 2016/17 Safer Roads Schemes programme) as outlined within Appendix 4 of Document “Q” be approved and that any amendments to the list of schemes be carried out in consultation**



with Ward Members.

- (4) That any Traffic Regulation Orders, or any legal procedures linked to the processing of traffic calming measures or pedestrian crossing facilities which are necessary to implement the chosen schemes be approved for processing and advertising subject to the scheme details being agreed with local Ward Members.
- (5) That any valid objections to the advertised Traffic Regulation Orders, traffic calming or pedestrian facilities be submitted to this Area Committee for consideration or in the event of there being no valid objections the Traffic Regulation Orders be sealed and implemented and the traffic calming or pedestrian facilities be implemented as advertised.

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 Shipley Area Committee.

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

