

**KIRKLEES COUNCIL  
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990  
HIGHWAYS DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT**

**PLANNING REF** 2018/62/91661/E0/GW  
**CATEGORY** Small Major

**PROPOSAL** OUTLINE PERMISSION FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND FACILITATING ENGINEERING OPERATIONS AND FULL PLANNING PERMISSION FOR ACCESS AND SPINE ROAD

**LOCATION** LAND AT WALKLEY TERRACE AND BRUNSWICK STREET, HECKMONDWIKE

**APPLICANT** VIDA ARCHITECTS LTD

**HDC Ref. No.** K9-10SE/64  
**Highway Officer** Mark Berry  
**O. S. Ref.** 219 231  
**Date Received** 19/07/2018  
**Target Date** 09/08/2018  
**Date Returned** 22/08/2018  
**Decision**  
**Route No.** B6117  
**Road Name** WALKLEY LANE  
**Adopted** Yes  
**Road Name** WALKLEY TERR  
**Adopted** Yes  
**Footpath** HEC/22/30, HEC/22/20  
**Footpath** HEC/22/10  
**Footpath** Prow emailed 30/7/18  
**Highway scheme** No

**Potential Committee** Yes

**Local Plan Allocatio** H2571

**Checked by / date** Anita Thomas 30/07/2018

Highways comments as follows

1,The proposed shared surface carriageway serving the proposed housing is relatively long and straight for a road of this type and with a carriageway width of 5.5m this road layout is unlikely to result in a design speed of 15mph. This type of road layout should be angular with alignment shifts. Consideration should be given to the provision of a footway to one side and redesign to include a restriction points. Footways should be 2.0m in width.

2,An independent road safety audit should be provided for the proposed road layout including the junction with Horton Street.

3,No chainages or gradients are shown on the longitudinal sections. The maximum acceptable gradient to a shared surface carriageway is 1 in 20. Scaling from the plans a 1 in 21 gradient is proposed. This should be confirmed and shown on the longitudinal sections.

The gradients need to be confirmed before we can make any comments regarding the greenway.

4,Swept paths should be provided to demonstrate that an 11.85m refuse vehicle can enter and exit the site from Horton Street and turn within the site. The reversing manoeuvre shown on the swept paths provided is too tight with the vehicle positioned hard against the kerb line. The proposed carriageway will require widening at this point.

5,The proposed visitor parking spaces are not well spaced along the length of the proposed road. They are also insufficient in size and the splays are insufficient. Visitor parking bays should be 6.0m at the rear with 30 degree splays.

6, It is proposed to provide 2 off-street parking spaces per dwelling which is only acceptable if the proposed dwellings have 3 or less bedrooms. Larger dwellings will require 3 off-street parking spaces.

7, If integral garages are to be considered as contributing towards parking provision they must provide internal dimensions of 3m x 6m.

8, No house types are provided and the parking strategy needs to be clarified.

9, Bin presentation points should be shown to be provided to each dwelling. These should be sited to allow bins to be presented without obstructing the highway or the access to driveways.

10, The footway shown between the site access and Brunswick Street to be dependent upon future planning consent should be included as part of the proposals for this site.

11, There is no pedestrian link to Wesley Terrace

Additional section 38 comment as follows:

1, The steep slope immediately adjacent to the visitor parking is unacceptable. Similarly the retaining wall proposal is unacceptable.

2, There are no pedestrian crossing facilities shown on the site plan drawing. There should be a pedestrian transition facility shown between traditional estate road and the shared surface areas. Where ramps are placed to demarcate different surfaces, the footways should continue beyond the ramp to provide for level pedestrian crossing of the carriageway. Where ramps or other traffic calming features are proposed, they should be positioned to avoid creating or exacerbating captive low points.

3, Any retaining features affecting the highway will require formal technical approval by the Council as the Highway Authority. I would recommend providing details of all proposed retaining features and underground storage facilities (including pipes) to my colleague Farhad Khatibi (Team Leader) in the structures section at the earliest opportunity, who will be able to advise you of the necessary requirements in more detail.

---