

**KIRKLEES METROPOLITAN COUNCIL
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
HIGHWAYS DEVELOPMENT CONTROL KP20H**

PLANNING REF 2016/60/92181/W0/AW
CATEGORY Small Major

PROPOSAL OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR
ERECTION OF RESIDENTIAL
DEVELOPMENT (116 DWELLINGS)
AND FORMATION OF NEW
ACCESS TO WOODHEAD
ROAD(SHLAA SITE)

LOCATION LAND OFF WOODHEAD ROAD
HONELY
HOLMFIRTH
HD9 6PR

HDC Ref. No. K3-49/7
Highway Officer Alistair McMurray
O. S. Ref. 147 111
Date Received 14/07/2016
Target Date 04/08/2016
Date Returned 07/09/2016
Date Received 14/07/2016
Target Date 21/07/2016
Date Returned 15/11/2016

APPLICANT BRADLEY STANKLER PLANNING

Route No. A6024
Road Name WOODHEAD ROAD
Adopted Yes
Footpath HOL 31-40
Footpath prow emailed 14/7/16
Highway scheme No

Checked by / date Sam Lewis 14/07/2016

Preamble

This proposal consists of the erection of a residential development of some 116 dwellings and a newly proposed access. This is an outline application with all matters reserved other than "Access".

In line with this, Highways Development Management is commenting upon the proposed access strategy as presented within this application. All other comments relating to the wider proposed development are "in-principle" and "without prejudice".

The application site in question originally formed part of a wider "Provisional Open Land" allocation off Woodhead Road and the application site itself is already subject to an outline planning consent for circa 51 residential dwellings (application 2013/93373). This outline planning consent includes for a dedicated vehicular access taken directly from A6024 Woodhead Road located approximately 100m to the north of the junction of Woodhead Road/Smithy Place Lane.

The wider allocation now forms part the Draft Local Plan for some 207 residential dwellings.

There is a discrepancy between the application forms that states 116 proposed dwellings and the conceptual plans contained within the submitted Transport Assessment that includes for circa 150 dwellings; however the application is outline with all matters reserved apart from Access. As such, the details as contained within the submitted Transport Assessment (WSP October 2015) are being considered.

This application states that should this proposal be given approval, then this would supersede the quantum of development and associated access proposals as approved in 2013.

This outline application proposes a simple priority junction with the development and Woodhead Road as the primary vehicular access.

Pre-application discussions for this proposal took place with Highways Development Management in

August 2015. As part of those discussions, a range of highways/traffic/transport items were considered including that of access.

Highways Development Management confirmed (as part of those pre-application discussions) that ideally, the application site would be served (for vehicular traffic) through the approved adjacent site (application 2013/93373) which already had a consented and acceptable junction design to serve both developments.

It was stated that the principle of accepting an additional access onto Woodhead Road would rely on the achievability of the appropriate vehicular visibility splays relative to the 85th %ile wet weather speeds and with the same junction design which included central islands and a dedicated right turn lane and retention of the existing cycle lane as per the consented adjacent scheme (application 2013/93373).

Access Proposals

This application proposes a singular vehicular access to serve a conceptual site layout of some 150 residential dwellings via purpose built simple priority junction taken directly off Woodhead Road circa 40m to the south of the junction of Woodhead Road and Smithy Place Lane.

The proposed simple priority junction is of 8m in radii width with 2m wide pedestrian footways serving both sides of the carriageway. The applicant is asked to confirm the proposed gradient of the proposed access and to demonstrate its suitability in this regard.

The submitted Transport Assessment states that due to the width of the A6024 Woodhead Road in this location, a junction design including central islands and a dedicated right turn lane cannot be achieved as per the approved layout for the adjacent site and as such, a simple "Give Way" priority junction is proposed and "...is, in terms of capacity, adequate to accommodate the future year base flows on the A6024 Woodhead Road and the traffic forecast as a result of the development proposals on the site".

Vehicular visibility splays of 2.4m x 120m can be achieved and this would be appropriate for 85th %ile wet weather speeds which have been recorded as below 43mph.

Visibility however has been measured to the centreline of the carriageway and the submitted Transport Assessment states that due to the solid white line markings on the highway there should be therefore no overtaking from vehicular traffic on the southbound carriageway along Woodhead Road approaching the proposed junction and therefore visibility to the centreline is considered appropriate in this instance.

The submitted Transport Assessment states that the layout for the adjacent approved access also applied a centreline visibility measurement and not the kerblines and that given the Council are prepared to accept visibility to the centreline then this creates a precedent for measuring visibility from this access.

Highways Development Management raises a significant concern with regards to vehicular visibility splays being measured to the centreline. Although it is accurate that the Council accepted visibility splay measurements to the centreline for the approved adjacent scheme, this was acceptable as the adjacently approved junction scheme contains central islands which act as a physical constraint to vehicles crossing the centreline. It is not acceptable to simply rely on carriageway markings as a means to preventing vehicles from crossing the centreline and as such vehicular visibility splays for the proposed junction would need to be measured to the kerblines.

In line with this, Highways Development Management raises an objection to the proposal in this regard on the grounds of an unacceptable junction arrangement and its detrimental impact upon highway safety for all users.

Notwithstanding the above, Highways Development Management also raises significant concerns with the principle of the proposed access strategy.

The layout of the approved adjacent scheme's access junction which incorporates a Ghost Island dedicated right lane and physical central islands was considered appropriate for the development and in order to serve the development associated with this proposal.

Although it is noted that the operational capacity assessments contained within the submitted Transport Assessment demonstrate that the proposed simple priority junction would operate within its theoretical capacity limits, its fails to adequately assess the overall impact and operation of the proposed junction arrangement.

Vehicles waiting to turn right into the proposed development are likely to inhibit the free flowing movement of traffic for vehicles travelling southbound along Woodhead Road.

The proposed simple priority junction arrangement makes no provision for pedestrian crossing movement towards the opposing carriageway to the existing footway running adjacent to Woodhead Road, in the form of central reserve islands. This creates a significant safety risk to pedestrian activity in this location, and creates a barrier for accessibility.

In addition, the proposed simple priority junction arrangement interferes and results in the removal for a large length of the existing cycle way along Woodhead Road on the development side of the carriageway.

Although it is noted that a simple priority junction would fall within the likely thresholds contained within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges - TD 42/95 for vehicular traffic in terms of minor arm and major arm AADT flows, the design fails to address the needs of all road users and as such, a simple priority junction in this location is considered unsuitable for the grade of highway and nature of development associated with its introduction.

The access scheme for the neighbouring proposal was considered acceptable in this regard.

In line with the above, Highways Development Management raises a further objection to this proposal on the grounds that the proposed access is unsuitable for the highway and development in this location in that that it would cause a detrimental impact upon the safety and efficiency of the local highway network for all users.

Although the submitted Transport Assessment states that if this proposal were to be given approval, then it would supersede the outline approval given to the adjacent site. In planning terms however, both applications could come forward subject to their relevant approvals and this raises a further highways concern with regards to the access proposals.

It would be unsatisfactory from a highway safety view to have two adjacent vehicular accesses in such a proximity serving similar, not unsubstantial residential developments of such different grades. Driver perceptibility of the highway layout would be degraded at a detrimental impact upon highway safety.

Assessment Parameters

Highways Development Management raises concerns with regards to the assessment parameters that are contained within the submitted Transport Assessment and clarification is sought on the

following matters:

The TEMPRO traffic growth figures contained within Table 5.1 differ from those agreed at pre-application stage and contained within the Transport Assessment's Appendix A.

The trip rates and resultant traffic generation figures contained within Table 5.2 differ (AM Peak Arrivals) from those agreed within Appendix A.

The traffic generation calculations contained within Table 5.2 appear to be incorrect. (AM Peak Departures, PM Peak Arrivals and Departures).

This feeds through the assessment and as such the total trip generation estimates contained within paragraph 5.3.5 appear to be incorrect.

Consultation

PROW has been consulted upon the proposal and has made the following comments:

Application is outline with access reserved – although the A6024 is mentioned in the application title, it is not absolutely clear that the only access currently to be considered/decided is the new junction for the estate road to the A6024.

PROW therefore would make some comments now that may be more relevant to later stages, and when the layout is more than indicative.

Robinson Lane is identified as retaining walking and riding – it currently carries a recorded public footpath, PROW would look for it to be both dedicated as public bridleway and improved within the application site boundaries.

It is noted that bollards appear to be proposed either side of the estate road as it would cross Robinson Lane – the junction details would need to be agreed. Little detail of any private access right effect is submitted, although the proposals acknowledge such use.

Robinson Lane within the development to be upgraded/dedicated (as e.g. a public bridleway), providing enhanced, off road, multi-use connectivity for riders and cyclists, with appropriate junction design/treatment.

Adequate separation of garden close to the definitive footpath line would be sought.

Path interface with raised table (or other road surface change) should not cut across the path. Crossing points should link appropriately with constructed path on each side.

Land carrying public footpath – physical barrier required to prevent overdriving/parking between back of carriageway kerb/footway/layby and the land corridor carrying the public footpath. i.e. physical prevention by e.g. kneerail, birdmouth fence, or bollards, all to satisfaction of LHA.

Paths indicated by peck lines in submissions are not necessarily the definitive line.

Paths may well be acceptable to construct over alignments other than the definitive line as long as the definitive line is kept open and available and unencumbered by any development (e.g. grass surface, no obstructions).

Details of formal physical construction of path routes would be required.

Appropriate hard construction will be required across the site to the satisfaction of LHA.

Improvements to the public rights of way and general highway network (for non-vehicular use) outside the site may also be expected and necessary. E.g. appropriate and commensurate improved non-vehicular connectivity to Honley and Brockholes centres.

Improvements may include, inter alia, widening, surfacing, reconstruction, street lighting, drainage etc.

Full details to address above points should be submitted at appropriate points in the planning process.

Path works may be included in formal submissions regarding the provision of public highway works in connection with s38/s278 HA 1980.

Further access provision may be appropriate for the land area crossed by the estate road, before it reaches Robinson Lane.

Scheme for public path user safety to be submitted, agreed and implemented at relevant trigger points, controlled by condition.

Preamble

This proposal consists of the erection of a residential development of some 116 dwellings and a newly proposed access. This is an outline application with all matters reserved other than "Access".

In line with this, Highways Development Management is commenting upon the proposed access strategy as presented within this application. All other comments relating to the wider proposed development are "in-principle" and "without prejudice".

The application site in question originally formed part of a wider "Provisional Open Land" allocation off Woodhead Road and the application site itself is already subject to an outline planning consent for circa 51 residential dwellings (application 2013/93373). This outline planning consent includes for a dedicated vehicular access taken directly from A6024 Woodhead Road located approximately 100m to the north of the junction of Woodhead Road/Smithy Place Lane.

The wider allocation now forms part the Draft Local Plan for some 207 residential dwellings.

There is a discrepancy between the application forms that states 116 proposed dwellings and the conceptual plans contained within the submitted Transport Assessment that includes for circa 150 dwellings; however the application is outline with all matters reserved apart from Access. As such, the details as contained within the submitted Transport Assessment (WSP October 2015) are being considered.

This application states that should this proposal be given approval, then this would supersede the quantum of development and associated access proposals as approved in 2013.

This outline application proposes a simple priority junction with the development and Woodhead Road as the primary vehicular access.

Pre-application discussions for this proposal took place with Highways Development Management in August 2015. As part of those discussions, a range of highways/traffic/transport items were considered including that of access.

Highways Development Management confirmed (as part of those pre-application discussions) that ideally, the application site would be served (for vehicular traffic) through the approved adjacent site (application 2013/93373) which already had a consented and acceptable junction design to serve both developments.

It was stated that the principle of accepting an additional access onto Woodhead Road would rely on the achievability of the appropriate vehicular visibility splays relative to the 85th %ile wet weather speeds and with the same junction design which included central islands and a dedicated right turn lane and retention of the existing cycle lane as per the consented adjacent scheme (application 2013/93373).

Access Proposals

This application proposes a singular vehicular access to serve a conceptual site layout of some 150 residential dwellings via purpose built simple priority junction taken directly off Woodhead Road circa 40m to the south of the junction of Woodhead Road and Smithy Place Lane.

The proposed simple priority junction is of 8m in radii width with 2m wide pedestrian footways serving both sides of the carriageway. The applicant is asked to confirm the proposed gradient of the proposed access and to demonstrate its suitability in this regard.

The submitted Transport Assessment states that due to the width of the A6024 Woodhead Road in this location, a junction design including central islands and a dedicated right turn lane cannot be achieved as per the approved layout for the adjacent site and as such, a simple "Give Way" priority junction is proposed and "...is, in terms of capacity, adequate to accommodate the future year base flows on the A6024 Woodhead Road and the traffic forecast as a result of the development proposals on the site".

Vehicular visibility splays of 2.4m x 120m can be achieved and this would be appropriate for 85th %ile wet weather speeds which have been recorded as below 43mph.

Visibility however has been measured to the centreline of the carriageway and the submitted Transport Assessment states that due to the solid white line markings on the highway there should be therefore no overtaking from vehicular traffic on the southbound carriageway along Woodhead Road approaching the proposed junction and therefore visibility to the centreline is considered appropriate in this instance.

The submitted Transport Assessment states that the layout for the adjacent approved access also applied a centreline visibility measurement and not the kerblines and that given the Council are prepared to accept visibility to the centreline then this creates a precedent for measuring visibility from this access.

Highways Development Management raises a significant concern with regards to vehicular visibility splays being measured to the centreline. Although it is accurate that the Council accepted visibility splay measurements to the centreline for the approved adjacent scheme, this was acceptable as the adjacently approved junction scheme contains central islands which act as a physical constraint to vehicles crossing the centreline. It is not acceptable to simply rely on carriageway markings as a means to preventing vehicles from crossing the centreline and as such vehicular visibility splays for the proposed junction would need to be measured to the kerblines.

In line with this, Highways Development Management raises an objection to the proposal in this regard on the grounds of an unacceptable junction arrangement and its detrimental impact upon highway safety for all users.

Notwithstanding the above, Highways Development Management also raises significant concerns with the principle of the proposed access strategy.

The layout of the approved adjacent scheme's access junction which incorporates a Ghost Island dedicated right lane and physical central islands was considered appropriate for the development and in order to serve the development associated with this proposal.

Although it is noted that the operational capacity assessments contained within the submitted Transport Assessment demonstrate that the proposed simple priority junction would operate within its theoretical capacity limits, it fails to adequately assess the overall impact and operation of the proposed junction arrangement.

Vehicles waiting to turn right into the proposed development are likely to inhibit the free flowing movement of traffic for vehicles travelling southbound along Woodhead Road.

The proposed simple priority junction arrangement makes no provision for pedestrian crossing movement towards the opposing carriageway to the existing footway running adjacent to Woodhead Road, in the form of central reserve islands. This creates a significant safety risk to pedestrian activity in this location, and creates a barrier for accessibility.

In addition, the proposed simple priority junction arrangement interferes and results in the removal for a large length of the existing cycle way along Woodhead Road on the development side of the carriageway.

Although it is noted that a simple priority junction would fall within the likely thresholds contained within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges - TD 42/95 for vehicular traffic in terms of minor arm and major arm AADT flows, the design fails to address the needs of all road users and as such, a simple priority junction in this location is considered unsuitable for the grade of highway and nature of development associated with its introduction.

The access scheme for the neighbouring proposal was considered acceptable in this regard.

In line with the above, Highways Development Management raises a further objection to this proposal on the grounds that the proposed access is unsuitable for the highway and development in this location in that it would cause a detrimental impact upon the safety and efficiency of the local highway network for all users.

Although the submitted Transport Assessment states that if this proposal were to be given approval, then it would supersede the outline approval given to the adjacent site. In planning terms however, both applications could come forward subject to their relevant approvals and this raises a further highways concern with regards to the access proposals.

It would be unsatisfactory from a highway safety view to have two adjacent vehicular accesses in such a proximity serving similar, not unsubstantial residential developments of such different grades. Driver perceptibility of the highway layout would be degraded at a detrimental impact upon highway safety.

Assessment Parameters

Highways Development Management raises concerns with regards to the assessment parameters that are contained within the submitted Transport Assessment and clarification is sought on the following matters:

The TEMPRO traffic growth figures contained within Table 5.1 differ from those agreed at pre-application stage and contained within the Transport Assessment's Appendix A.

The trip rates and resultant traffic generation figures contained within Table 5.2 differ (AM Peak Arrivals) from those agreed within Appendix A.

The traffic generation calculations contained within Table 5.2 appear to be incorrect. (AM Peak Departures, PM Peak Arrivals and Departures).

This feeds through the assessment and as such the total trip generation estimates contained within paragraph 5.3.5 appear to be incorrect.

Consultation

PROW has been consulted upon the proposal and has made the following comments:

Application is outline with access reserved – although the A6024 is mentioned in the application title, it is not absolutely clear that the only access currently to be considered/decided is the new junction for the estate road to the A6024.

PROW therefore would make some comments now that may be more relevant to later stages, and

when the layout is more than indicative.

Robinson Lane is identified as retaining walking and riding – it currently carries a recorded public footpath, PROW would look for it to be both dedicated as public bridleway and improved within the application site boundaries.

It is noted that bollards appear to be proposed either side of the estate road as it would cross Robinson Lane – the junction details would need to be agreed. Little detail of any private access right effect is submitted, although the proposals acknowledge such use.

Robinson Lane within the development to be upgraded/dedicated (as e.g. a public bridleway), providing enhanced, off road, multi-use connectivity for riders and cyclists, with appropriate junction design/treatment.

Adequate separation of garden close to the definitive footpath line would be sought.

Path interface with raised table (or other road surface change) should not cut across the path. Crossing points should link appropriately with constructed path on each side.

Land carrying public footpath – physical barrier required to prevent overdriving/parking between back of carriageway kerb/footway/layby and the land corridor carrying the public footpath. i.e. physical prevention by e.g. kneerail, birdmouth fence, or bollards, all to satisfaction of LHA.

Paths indicated by peck lines in submissions are not necessarily the definitive line.

Paths may well be acceptable to construct over alignments other than the definitive line as long as the definitive line is kept open and available and unencumbered by any development (e.g. grass surface, no obstructions).

Details of formal physical construction of path routes would be required.

Appropriate hard construction will be required across the site to the satisfaction of LHA.

Improvements to the public rights of way and general highway network (for non-vehicular use) outside the site may also be expected and necessary. E.g. appropriate and commensurate improved non-vehicular connectivity to Honley and Brockholes centres.

Improvements may include, inter alia, widening, surfacing, reconstruction, street lighting, drainage etc.

Full details to address above points should be submitted at appropriate points in the planning process.

Path works may be included in formal submissions regarding the provision of public highway works in connection with s38/s278 HA 1980.

Further access provision may be appropriate for the land area crossed by the estate road, before it reaches Robinson Lane.

Scheme for public path user safety to be submitted, agreed and implemented at relevant trigger points, controlled by condition.

Additional Obs 15/11/2016

Following the above comments, the applicant has submitted a Transport Assessment Technical Note

(WSP 3rd October 2016) addressing the above issues. The following additional comments are provided in response to this technical note and deal with the issues in turn.

Access Proposals

The submitted Technical Note (as with the original Transport Assessment) continues to rely on the modelling of the proposed simple priority junction and the safety record of Woodhead Road in order to demonstrate the acceptability of a simple priority junction serving the local highway network in this location. In addition, it also relies upon associated factors such as carriageway width restraints and the presence of solid white lines in order to determine a departure from standards with regards to visibility requirements for vehicular visibility splays at the site access.

The objection raised with regards to visibility standards does not change. The presence of solid white lines is not sufficient to be able to take visibility measurements to the centreline. In order for visibility to be measured to the centreline than a physical feature preventing vehicles from crossing the centreline is required.

Notwithstanding the above, the submitted technical note has provided an alternative access arrangement in response to the objections raised resulting in a signal controlled layout being proposed.

The proposed signal controlled layout incorporates a right turn pocket and signal controlled pedestrian crossing facilities.

This office raises a question on point of clarity in that how the carriageway width was considered insufficient for a right turn lane for a priority junction, but is considered sufficient for a right turn facility for a signal controlled layout?

A LINSIG (LINcolnshire SIGnals) model has been undertaken in order to demonstrate the operational performance of the proposed junction and the electronic model files have been provided to this office for validation.

Highways Development Management confirms that the modelling methodology is acceptable (though we note that arrival/departure data from the TA has been utilised that is slightly inaccurate).

Highways Development Management confirms that the proposed signal priority junction would operate well within theoretical capacity limits.

Notwithstanding the objections raised with the initial simple priority junction arrangement which are still valid, Highways Development Management raises significant concerns with regards to the principle of a signalised junction serving the proposed development and in this location.

The minor arm flows from the proposed development are considered too low for a signalised junction to be a suitable arrangement and this would set an unacceptable precedent in terms of providing an over-engineered solution because problems exist with providing a suitable junction layout for the nature of the highway in question and the volume of additional traffic associated with the proposed development.

Notwithstanding this, there are a number of concerns raised with regards to the proposed signalised layout and its impact. The submitted technical note does not provide a plan demonstrating the northbound visibility to the back of the maximum predicted queue from the signals. There is a clear danger in this location that vehicles travelling northbound could collide with standing traffic.

Despite the 40mph speed limit, experience dictates that vehicle speeds are higher in this location and

a fully appraised scheme would include a speed survey in order to determine the forward visibility to the signals.

It is considered that a signalised junction would be largely unexpected in terms of driver perceptibility in this location on a rural road of this nature and that warning signs would not be sufficient to highlight its presence.

There are additional concerns with regards to the level of tree foliage in the vicinity which could also block visibility of the signals during the summer months.

Off-Site Highways Works

Following a site visit with a number of parties in August, the applicant has also studied the impacts of signalising the existing zebra pedestrian crossing situated on New Mill Road adjacent to the junction with Brockholes Lane.

The conclusions of the technical note with regards to the impacts of signalising the crossing would result in a number of detrimental issues to the surrounding infrastructure including the loss of effective footway width due to the required street furniture; carriageway reduction would result in a higher risk of vehicle collisions and conflict reducing safety and efficiency.

Highways Development Management agrees with the findings that the best solution would be to improve to the existing crossing arrangement by relaying the existing carriageway markings and relaying the carriageway surface with high friction surfacing materials.

Conclusion

In line with the above, Highways Development Management continues to raise significant concerns with regards to this application proposal and raises a significant objection with regards to a proposed signalised access junction layout as provided within the submitted technical note.

On behalf of
S. Sampson - Group Engineer
Highways Development Control

HDC REF