DCAdmin

Subject: FW: 2017/94247 and 2017/94248 Applications for discharge of conditions (lighting) at Leeds Road Retail Park, Huddersfield
Attachments: 23C1F92A001711E881F700A0C6000017.pdf

From: Richard Hume
Sent: 15 March 2018 14:06
To: John Ritchie <John.Ritchie@kirklees.gov.uk>
Subject: 2017/94247 and 2017/94248 Applications for discharge of conditions (lighting) at Leeds Road Retail Park, Huddersfield

Hi John

I refer to the email below from Brian Edgecombe of YES Engineering dated 9 March 2018. In the email he provides detailed reasons for the proposed levels if illuminance at the two drive through areas that appeared to be excessively illuminated. I consider that his explanation provides sufficient justification for the proposed levels of illuminance.

I therefore now recommend that the lighting scheme as detailed in:-

- the submitted plan by Kingfisher lighting dated 5 Dec 2017 (Dwg No. D30413/JB/F) together with
- the attached document received from NJL Consulting "Response to KC Pollution and Noise Officer" which provided details of the hours of use of the lighting and
- the email below from Brian Edgecombe of YES Engineering dated 9 March 2018

collectively provide a satisfactory Lighting scheme as required for:-

- Application 2017/94247 for discharge of condition 7 of application 2016/92574 and
- Application 2017/94248 for discharge of condition 8 of application 2016/92385

I therefore recommend that the lighting shall be installed, operated and maintained in accordance with the information contained in those documents.

Regards

Richard
RICHARD HUME
Environmental Health, Officer Pollution & Noise Control

Kirklees Council (Environmental Health), Flint Street, Fartown, Huddersfield, HD1 6LG
tel: 01484 221000 - Automated switchboard ask for Richard Hume or key 70909

This email and any attachments are confidential. If you have received it in error - notify the sender immediately, delete it from your system, and do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way. Kirklees Council monitors all emails sent or received.

From: Brian Edgecombe [mailto:bedgecombe@yeseng.co.uk]
Sent: 09 March 2018 17:51
To: Richard Hume <Richard.Hume@kirklees.gov.uk>; John Ritchie <John.Ritchie@kirklees.gov.uk>; Hollie Barton <Hollie@njlconsulting.co.uk>; Nick Pleasant <NickPleasant@njlconsulting.co.uk>

Cc: Neil Wilkinson - Coda Building Consultancy Limited (Neil.Wilkinson@codabc.co.uk) <Neil.Wilkinson@codabc.co.uk>; Gordon Adams <gadams@yeseng.co.uk>
Subject: RE: 2017/44/94248/W - Leeds Road Retail Park, Huddersfield

Dear Richard
We have been asked to respond to your email below in relation to the discharge of the lighting condition.
YES Engineering are the Engineers for the project.
We note your agreement to the proposals other than the two drive though lanes.
We have previously provided information from the BS-EN 12462-2 which shows guidance on levels of lighting and we also provided an example document from another Authority which required car parking lighting levels to achieve 30 lux average and from your email below I can see that you have seen this information. For reference the following extract is repeated.

Table 5.6 — Fuel filling stations

Ref. no.	Type of area, task or activity	$\bar{E}_m$ lx	U_o –	GR_L –	R_a –	Remarks
5.6.1	Vehicle parking and storage areas	5	0,25	50	20	
5.6.2	Entry and exit driveways: dark environment (i.e. rural areas and suburbs)	20	0,40	45	20	
5.6.3	Entry and exit driveways: light environment (i.e. cities)	50	0,40	45	20	
5.6.4	Air pressure and water checking points and other service areas	150	0,40	45	20	
5.6.5	Meter reading area	150	0,40	45	20	

We do not consider the average lighting levels of 35.89 lux and 43.13 lux to be excessive and we consider that the drive through warrants greater levels of lighting compared to a carpark for the following reasons:
The drive throughs have signs to read and have sign boards close to the road, along with order points and collection windows, which the driver needs to be close to whilst avoiding the protection bollards. When visiting drive throughs there is plenty of scrapping evidence on protection bollards to suggest that this is not easy for all drivers. This level of driver tasks is assisted by greater levels of lighting. As a direct comparison, we consider the fuel filling station guidance above to be relevant. This shows average lighting levels of 50 lux at access points with levels of 150 at the pumps. In comparison, the drive through levels are well below these levels and, therefore, cannot be described as excessive.
We would also point out that the average lux levels have been determined over the hard standing areas only. From closer inspection of the plotted lux levels it can be seen that the use of directional light fittings effectively concentrates the lighting and lux levels drop sharply away from the pavement. Had the zone considered the average over the full width of the drive through zone i.e. including the adjacent strip of land to the boundary then the lux levels reported would have been much lower. We also note that lighting levels at the foot path edge are much reduced with the maximum showing as 25 lux.
We hope that the above has help to provide greater context to support the proposals to allow this condition to be discharged. We would be pleased to discuss this further.

Regards

Brian Edgecombe
Director

London: **75 East Road, London N16AH**
Midlands: The Moat House, 133 Newport Road, Stafford ST16 2EZ
Phone +44 (0) **2075 660060,** & (0) 1785 229626
Mob +44 (0) 7883 024053
Fax +44 (0) 2034 753726
bedgecombe@yeseng.co.uk
www.yeseng.co.uk

Please consider the environment before printing this email.
YES Engineering is the trading name of YES Engineering Group Limited (Registered Number 08500802)
Registered Office: 75 East Road, London N1 6AH