

## Minutes of a meeting of the Keighley Area Committee held on Thursday, 18 August 2016 at Council Chamber - Keighley Town Hall

Commenced        6.00 pm  
Concluded        7.25 pm

### Present – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	THE INDEPENDENTS	INDEPENDENT
Ali Brown Mallinson BM Smith	M Slater Bacon Farley	Hawkesworth	K Hussain

### Councillor Ali in the Chair

#### 13. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

No disclosures of interest in matters under consideration were received.

#### 14. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

#### 15. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

(a) In accordance with the provision at Part 3B, Paragraph 6 of the Council's Constitution the following public question was presented:

*"We the residents of Bar Lane Riddlesden urgently need residents parking on Bar Lane. I am aware that a problem has already been registered with concerns of non customers parking all day outside the Post office and this is due to the fact that non residents are parking on Bar Lane which has a knock on effect to where residents then park. I have spoken to most of the residents with vehicles and they welcome residents parking including the local businesses with a limited time for the stop off to the businesses. We have an increasing problem with none customers and none residents parking on Bar Lane which is infuriating the residents. An example of this is up to 3 cars that belong to a business on Bradford Road parking on the road and the cars are left up to a month at a time.*



*There are walkers and cyclists leaving vehicles whilst on the canal for long periods at a time and even people leaving their vehicles whilst catching the buses on the main road to Bradford.*

*I have made several calls to various people in order for me to obtain details for a petition to enable residents parking on Bar Lane. I was informed that this is the beginning of the process and I will be attending the meeting on Thursday evening with a representative of the local businesses who is also a resident on this road.*

*I'm sure you understand the problem and how infuriating it is making the residents and that we see there is no way to control this without residents parking”.*

**In accordance with provision at Part 3B, Paragraph 6 of the Council's Constitution the Chair advised that a written response to the question would be provided as follows:-**

*“Thank you for your question and attendance at the Keighley Area Committee on Thursday 18 August 2016 regarding a Residents' Permit Parking Scheme on Bar Lane, Riddlesden.*

*We have resolved to request that the Area Traffic Team investigate Bar Lane for suitability for a Resident Permit Parking Scheme. The findings of that investigation will be presented at a future meeting of the Committee. If the scheme is viable we will have to determine if it is possible to source funding within existing budgets or look elsewhere for the funds. If finance is sourced we will, hopefully, be able to run this concurrently with the other Traffic Regulation Order on Bar Lane.*

*We look forward to a successful outcome for you”.*

(b) In accordance with the provision at Part 3B, Paragraph 6 of the Council's Constitution the following public question was presented:

*“Can you please tell me what the Council's response is to the following statement?*

*Residents to Glen Lee Lane have attended various council meetings regarding traffic calming to Glen Lee Lane. At these meetings we were told that a budget would be made available to fund the same, in 2016 financial year. We are now informed that this is not the case, can you please respond with reasons, and why money has already been spent to investigate the need for the measures, which was gathered and when looked at was obvious it was a necessity for the safety of road users, residents and pedestrians using the lane. They have put a weight restriction sign at the top and bottom informing not suitable for heavy traffic, yet we still have 20-30 ton trucks speeding regularly, cars speeding and other cars mounting pavements to avoid accidents.*

*Speeding on a road with blind corners, steep incline/decline, on a road that is only 15 foot wide is a danger to all users. We are informed that there is a meeting on*



*18th August, we would like this matter to be discussed and firm answers given on what is actually going to happen. I await your quick response”.*

**In accordance with provision at Part 3B, Paragraph 6 of the Council's Constitution the Chair advised that a written response to the question would be provided as follows:-**

*“Thank you for your question and attendance at the Keighley Area Committee on Thursday 18 August 2016 regarding Glen Lee Lane.*

*Whilst funding for a project was never guaranteed in the 2016 financial year funding was made available to progress an investigation the results of which were subsequently brought back to the Area Committee for consideration in October 2015. The recommendation of that report and subsequent resolution of the Committee was:-*

*“That Glen Lee Lane be included on the list of traffic calming/management scheme candidates to be considered annually by the Committee for possible inclusion within its future programme of works”.*

*Glen Lee Lane was then added to the list of outstanding requests for the Area Committee for possible inclusion in a future programme. The Committee has to make very difficult decisions for the Keighley Parliamentary district around priorities given that there is a heavily reduced budget. There are compelling priorities and currently 70% of the Committee budget is determined by evidence around casualties leaving very little for other priorities in the district.*

*Please do have the confidence that the Council and the Area Committee does take this matter very seriously and we hope that we can accommodate Glen Lee Lane in a future capital programme”.*

**Overview and Scrutiny Area: Environment and Waste Management  
Action: Strategic Director, Regeneration**

**16. BRIDGE LANE, ILKLEY - OBJECTIONS TO TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER**

The report of the Strategic Director, Regeneration, (**Document “F”**) considered objections which had been received to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to introduce 24 hour Resident Permit Parking, together with one hour parking for non-permit holders on Bridge Lane, Ilkley.

Document “F” reported that there were currently two parking bays on Bridge Lane, Ilkley that had Residents Parking Restrictions, overnight only, from the hours of 6pm to 8am. Residents had reported that they were finding it increasingly difficult to park outside or near their properties outside of those hours. They had, therefore, requested that 24 hour Residents Parking Restrictions be introduced. In order to help all road users, a Traffic Regulation Order to introduce 24 hour Resident Permit Parking, together with 1 hour parking



for Non-Permit Holders had been proposed.

A location plan identifying Bridge Lane, Ilkley and the existing and proposed waiting restrictions were identified within the plan, attached to the report as Appendix 1.

Members were reminded that they had approved, on 23 July 2015, funding for the proposed TRO as shown on Appendix 1 of Document "F". The proposed TRO had been formally advertised on 18th February 2016 for a three week period and had resulted in the receipt of three formal objections. Those objections along with officer comments were tabulated in Appendix 2 to Document "F"

It was explained that there was currently no provision in the order for 'Special Permits'. Those were discretionary permits issued by Highways on the basis that there was available capacity for parking. Those discretionary permits could be issued to non-residents, residents in adjacent streets, or businesses.

An operational garage business on Bridge Lane had objected to the original proposal (detailed in Appendix 2). It was explained that if a two hour (or three hour) no return restriction (instead of the proposed one hour no return restriction), in the three car parking bay outside the garage was included in the order, then that would accommodate the objectors needs. This would allow up to three hours for non residents to park.

'Special Permit' provision in the order would allow the highways office to issue parking permits at their discretion (based on capacity and the need to park at location). Legal Services had advised that if there was a wish to include that element in the proposed TRO, consent from the residents of Bridge Lane who currently hold parking permits, would be required. A meeting with the residents of Bridge Lane took place on Thursday 4th August and the residents had collectively agreed to the inclusion of 'Special Permits' within the order. That agreement had since been confirmed by email. The 'Special Permit' would also enable an elderly person currently residing in an address which would not qualify for resident parking to park and residents were in full support of that provision.

#### **Resolved -**

**That the objections be overruled, and the proposed TRO to change the existing overnight Residents Permit Parking to 24 hours, together with 1 hour parking for Non-Permit Holders with the inclusion of 'Special Permits', on Bridge Lane, Ilkley, as shown on Drawing No. TDG/THN/AK/103212/CON-1A (attached as Appendix 1 to this report) be approved, sealed and implemented as formally advertised, and the objectors be advised accordingly.**

**Overview and Scrutiny Area: Environment and Waste Management  
Action: Strategic Director, Regeneration**

#### **17. PETITION - LAWKHOLME LANE, KEIGHLEY**



Previous references: Council Minute 88 (2014/15) and Keighley Area Committee Minute 7 (2015/16)

Members were reminded that a petition was referred to the Committee by Council at its meeting on 24 March 2015 and had been considered by Members on 25 June 2015. At that time Members had requested that the Strategic Director, Regeneration, monitor the impact of the School Crossing Patrol and provide a report in six months time. In response to that request the Strategic Director, Regeneration, presented **Document "G"**.

It was explained that school patrol warning signs had been erected at two locations on Lawkholme Lane at the junction of East Avenue and Victoria Avenue. The locations of the signs were shown on Appendix 1 to the report.

An Engineer had visited Lawkholme Lane on several occasions following the introduction of the School Crossing Patrol Officer, and that provision, along with the other measures, appeared to have had a positive effect on vehicle speeds.

It was reported that by waiting for a significant gap in the traffic flow, the School Crossing Patrol Officer attempted to keep vehicle queues to a minimum, thereby reducing instances of congestion and potential driver frustration. Parents and children were fully aware that they had to wait until the School Crossing Patrol Officer told them they could cross. It had been noted that even upper school children were using the School Crossing Patrol Officer to cross the road which it was felt emphasised its usefulness. Residents also knew the School Crossing Patrol Officer as she was a local and that seemed to help the situation.

Members were assured that the site would be monitored on a regular basis, to ensure that it continued to provide a safe and controlled crossing facility.

A Member reported that there was a lack of signage indicating the 20mph limit leading up to the roundabout. In response it was agreed to ensure that appropriate signage was in place.

**Resolved –**

**That the report be noted.**

**Overview and Scrutiny Area: Environment and Waste Management  
Action: Strategic Director, Regeneration**

**18. PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER (TRO) TO INTRODUCE NO WAITING AT ANYTIME RESTRICTIONS ON THORNHILL ROAD, STEETON**

The report of the Strategic Director, Regeneration, (**Document" H"**) considered objections received from local residents to a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to introduce no waiting at anytime restrictions on Thornhill Road, Steeton.



Members were reminded that planning approval had been granted for construction of 220 dwellings on land situated off Thornhill Road, Steeton. Under the terms and conditions of the planning approval, and the Section 106 agreement, the developer was required to promote a TRO with a view to introduce “No Waiting At Any Time” restrictions.

Those restrictions were considered necessary to address road safety concerns raised in relation to increased traffic volumes on the adjacent highway network. It was explained that a number of visitors using the hospital were parking in the area and discussions were being held about the impact that the charges for hospital parking were having on residential sites.

A location plan depicting Thornhill Road, Steeton and the existing and proposed waiting restrictions were identified within the plan, attached to Document “H”.

The proposed TRO was formally advertised on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2015 for a three week period and resulted in the receipt of three formal objections. Those objections along with officer comments were also contained in Document “H”.

Members questioned if there were resources remaining from the S106 agreement to investigate and rectify concerns about drivers using the area at busy times to avoid the heavier traffic on the main roads. A Ward Member reported that it had been muted at the meeting where planning approval had been gained that a one way system may be introduced. In response that Member was asked to discuss the issue separately with the Strategic Director so the situation could be investigated.

Measures to prevent parking on a section of Elm View near to a natural gas station and where the pavement was particular wide were questioned. It was explained that the proposals under discussion would prevent waiting in that area and to the rear of the footway.

#### **Resolved –**

**That the objections be overruled and the proposed Traffic Regulation Order, as shown on Drawing Number TDG/THN/102203/TRO-1D, attached at Appendix 1 to Document “H” be approved, sealed and implemented as formally advertised and the objectors be advised accordingly.**

**Overview and Scrutiny Area: Environment and Waste Management  
Action: Strategic Director, Regeneration**

#### **19. FREESTANDING TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS CURRENTLY BEING PROCESSED WITHIN THE KEIGHLEY AREA COMMITTEE BOUNDARY AND PROPOSED NEW STARTS FOR 2016/17.**

The Strategic Director, Regeneration, presented a report (**Document “I”**) which identified the Freestanding Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) currently being processed within the Area Committee Boundary and proposed new starts for



2016/17.

**Members were advised that it was not feasible to implement all outstanding requests for TRO's as total cost (staff time, legal costs, advertising and construction costs) would greatly exceed available resources. Therefore, there was a need to prioritise which Orders were to be approved in the current financial year 2016/2017.**

Appended to Document "I" were details of those Orders which were currently being processed where previous Committee approval had been granted. Those items may have previously been reported to the Executive Committee, or this Area Committee. Members were requested to reaffirm their approval to progress and implement those schemes in 2016/2017.

Appendix 2 to the report detailed the locations, which were recommended for processing during the 2016/2017 financial year, at an estimated cost of £20,000. Appendix 3 revealed other locations where TRO's had been requested.

A Member explained that a resident, whose request for No Waiting restrictions included on Appendix 1, was now selling that property and it was agreed to look into what stage that request had reached.

Disabled parking provision currently being processed at Rawdon Road was raised and it was questioned if this would prevent coach drop off arrangements outside of school term times. It was questioned if signage could be erected to allow coaches to use that areas during school holiday periods. The Strategic Director agreed to investigate if the legislation would allow for those arrangements. He questioned why the provision in the tourist centre could not be utilised for that purpose and was advised that area was only suitable for small 'hopper' buses.

The arrangements for schemes included on the lists, but not processed within five years, were queried. In response it was explained that some schemes had remained on Appendix 3 in error and should have been removed if not processed within five years.

An Ilkley Ward Member requested that consultation be undertaken with him and his ward colleagues before finances were committed to schemes in the Ilkley area included in Appendix 3.

Proposals at Wharfe View Road, Ilkley to address congestion problems were raised. It was explained that those measures had not been processed but it was expected that they would feature in more strategic schemes being considered in the area.

Members questioned why a request received from a Judge in 2011 regarding sight line problems at Broomhill Avenue had not been processed. It was stressed that residents were concerned about the lack of progress. The Strategic Director was unable to explain why that scheme had not been selected in 2011 and it was agreed that the Member raising the issue would provide further details to allow the request to be investigated further.

The rationale for recent requests from bus operators being prioritised more highly than schemes received some time ago was questioned. Concerns that bus



operators may remove services if they could not utilise turning areas were reported. Members were assured that lists compiled were not set in stone and that Members may adjust them to accommodate immediate priorities.

The requirement, and subsequent, cost incurred advertising TRO's in the Telegraph and Argus was discussed and measures to reduce those costs were suggested. A view that many residents of the Keighley area would not read the Telegraph and Argus newspaper was expressed and it was suggested that the use of alternative channels of communication should be explored. Members were advised that investigations had been undertaken previously to explore ways alternative methods to publicise the schemes. The legislative requirements for TROs to be publicised was explained and it was agreed that Members' views would be raised with the City Solicitor.

It was questioned if the schemes selected for progression in 2016-17 would be implemented in 2017. In response it was explained that it was expected that those schemes would be completed by April 2017.

Customer parking problems experienced by a shop in the vicinity of the post office at Bar Lane were raised and it was requested that the limited waiting restrictions recommended for that area be extended to include that shop. In response it was explained that the cost of that suggestion could be prohibitive but the feasibility would be investigated.

The inclusion in Appendix 2 of waiting restrictions at Laycock Lane were questioned by a Ward Member who was concerned that neither her or ward colleagues had been made aware of the request. It was explained that the request had been received before the Chair of the Committee, who would ordinarily be consulted, had been appointed. It was acknowledged that consultation could have been undertaken, however, it had been felt to be inappropriate when a Chair was not in place. Difficulty with buses being unable to turn in that location had been raised and the issue had been included for consideration as it was feared that bus services would be missed. Consultation had been undertaken with the West Yorkshire Combined Authority but nothing had been decided. The concern that Ward Members had not been consulted was acknowledged.

For clarity a Member explained that Glen Lee Lane was in the Keighley East Ward.

Concern at the use of acronyms in the report was raised and it was requested that these be annotated in future reports.

#### **Resolved -**

- (1) That the commitment to the previously approved and ongoing schemes as detailed in Appendix 1 to Document "I" be confirmed.**
- (2) That the Traffic Regulation Orders shown in Appendix 2 to Document "I" be approved for processing and implementation from the Traffic Regulation Orders Capital budget for 2016/2017.**
- (3) That the Traffic Regulation Orders selected from Appendix 2 of Document "I" be prepared and advertised.**
- (4) That any valid objections to the advertised Orders be submitted**





**to this Committee for consideration or, in the event of there being no valid objections, the Orders be sealed and implemented as advertised.**

- (5) That the Strategic Director, Regeneration, be requested to investigate the feasibility of extending the limited waiting restrictions and the request for residents only parking on Barr Lane, Riddlesden.**

**Overview and Scrutiny Area: Environment and Waste Management  
Action: Strategic Director, Regeneration**

## **20. DEVOLVED BUDGET - SAFER ROADS SCHEMES**

The report of the Strategic Director, Regeneration, (**Document “J”**) sought approval for a programme of Safer Roads Schemes for the Keighley area for the 2016/17 financial year.

The report revealed the total budget for the Bradford district for the 2016-17 financial year was £825,000. The split between the five constituencies was determined based on the 2011 census population figures and resulted in a total budget of £153,450 for the Keighley Area. The apportionment of that allocation was £110,000 for Casualty Reduction Schemes (detailed at Appendix 2- Priority List - to Document “J”) and £43,450 for other community priority schemes (listed in Appendix 3) as resolved by the Executive on 16 April 2013

Killed or Seriously Injured (KSI) statistics on the A65 Leeds Road were discussed. A view that those injuries occurred because of site lines and parking issues as opposed to speed was expressed. It was acknowledged that it may seem inappropriate for that stretch of road to have speed restrictions of 20mph, however, the poor site lines, parking issues and proximity of a local school had been the rationale for that restriction.

Members raised concern about the impact on site lines because of residents parking on pavements in that location and on Bolling Road.

A delay to the implementation of Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) and lining improvements on Oakworth Road was questioned. In response it was explained that issues due to increases in the connection charges had now been rectified.

It was questioned why Members had not been informed of a scheme at Moor Lane/Skipton Road and Silsden Road/Main Street Addingham. It was explained that elected members would be informed prior to the parish councils. A protocol was currently being drafted as to how parish councils would support Keighley Area Committee issues. Members were assured that all schemes would be approved be made by area committees.

A  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile queue of traffic, earlier that day, at Brook Street/New Brook Street on



the A65 into Ilkley was reported. It was explained that the issue could be addressed with the traffic lights being tweaked and the incident would be investigated.

Maintenance requirements for Vehicle Activated Signs were discussed and concerns raised that the Department of Transport funding did not provide for that maintenance. It was questioned if the Committee should continue to approve the installation of those signs if funds for maintenance were not available. It was agreed that a discussion be facilitated with the Portfolio Holder, Regeneration, Planning and Transport, to investigate an alternative source of maintenance costs.

**Resolved –**

- (1) That the programme of Casualty Reduction Schemes for 2016/17 listed in the Priority List contained in Appendix 2 to Document “J” be approved.**
- (2) That the proposed programme of Traffic Management Schemes for 2016/17 listed in Appendix 3 to Document “J” be approved.**
- (3) 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 the local Ward Members.**
- (4) 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.**
- (5) That the Strategic Director, Regeneration, be requested to discuss with the Portfolio Holder, Regeneration, Planning and Transport, the on going maintenance costs of the Vehicular Activated Signs (VAS) in the district.**

**Overview and Scrutiny Area: Environment and Waste Management  
Action: Strategic Director, Regeneration**

**21. ANNUAL UPDATE ON ROAD SAFETY IN THE KEIGHLEY CONSTITUENCY**

Previous reference: Minute 23 (2015/16)

The report of the Strategic Director, Regeneration (**Document “K”**) provided an update on current casualty levels and trends in the Keighley constituency and on the Road Safety Education, Training and Publicity Initiatives aimed at reducing



casualties.

Members questioned the engagement with schools by wards depicted at Appendix 4 to Document “K”. The colour coding was explained. The schools in red were monitored more intensely; those in blue did not require as much contact and the service had regular contact with the schools depicted in black.

It was noted that casualty statistics in the area were improving and it was questioned if that was because of the work undertaken with schools. It was explained that there had been a slight increase in pedestrian incidents since 2014. The recent Pokémon craze was raised and concern about pedestrians studying their mobile devices rather than observing road safety were debated. The Strategic Director reported that the issue was of national concern and would be considered with West Yorkshire Combined Authority colleagues.

Incidents of mobile phone use causing distraction to pedestrians were also discussed and it was explained that flashing kerb trials were being considered to warn pedestrians that they were approaching a road. Theatre in education events were also being arranged for year 7 pupils. In response to questions it was explained that events would focus on distractions and contributory factors to accidents. It was agreed to send a copy of the publication “Getting There Safely” to the Ward Member raising that issue.

A Member reported that he had requested more involvement with the service some years previously but felt that Ward Members were still not updated sufficiently or involved in activities being undertaken in their wards. The potential for six monthly updates was discussed, however, it was suggested that it may be more appropriate to instigate communication on a less formal basis. The limitations of the very small team of officers was acknowledged and it was agreed that an open day would be arranged by the Service to which Members would be invited.

**Resolved –**

- (1) That the information contained in Document “K” in respect of casualty trends and Road Safety activities in the Keighley Constituency be noted.**
- (2) That the evidence based approach to determine Road Safety priorities continue to be supported.**

**Overview and Scrutiny Area: Environment and Waste Management  
Action: Strategic Director, Regeneration**

**22. STREET LIGHTING COLUMN REPLACEMENT SCHEME**



Previous reference: Minute 49 (2014/15)

The report of the Strategic Director, Regeneration (**Document “L”**) informed Members of the requirement to replace street lighting columns that had been identified as non-compliant. That was that they were in need of urgent replacement due to their age and condition based upon the findings of inspections carried out during reactive maintenance visits.

It was reported that the funding required for the Priority 1 schemes identified at Appendix 1 to Document “L” was £79,341 and in response to questions it was explained that the cost equated to approximately 34 ten metre steel columns.

Members raised concerns that despite reports of lights not working repairs were taking weeks to be carried out. In response it was explained that repairs should be undertaken within a 10 day target.

A Member referred to problems which had occurred previously when street lights had been installed outside of residents’ homes in inappropriate positions – i.e. outside of bedroom windows. He requested that plans be sent to Ward Members prior to implementation so that they could consult with residents and sort out issues at an earlier stage. It was agreed that the request be conveyed to the street lighting design team.

**Resolved -**

- (1) That the Priority 1 street lighting column replacement schemes listed in Table A of Appendix 1 to Document “L”, be implemented.**
- (2) That the Strategic Director, Regeneration, be requested to discuss with the appropriate Ward Members, prior to implementation, the street lighting column replacement schemes in their Wards.**

**Overview and Scrutiny Area: 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 Keighley Area Committee.**

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

