

From:
Sent: 24 January 2023 18:07
To: DCAdmin
Cc: Nick Hirst
Subject: Planning Application 2020/93954 - Road Widening
Attachments: road widening.pdf

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good evening,

Please find attached a personal comment concerning the revised housing development off Lingards Road.

I ask that my personal details are not made public.

Kind regards

I've recently been told, by KMC, that Lingards Road could be termed a Connector Street.

If that were the case, it would mean the minimum carriageway width would be 6.75m.

Something, I'm sure, residents would eagerly welcome.

It would also mean, '*On-street parking [would] be provided by laybys and carriage widening*'.

I'm sure that too would be welcomed by residents, as this application, and planners, seem happy to keep the road exactly the width it is, except near the proposed junction.

Residents say, the road needs widening because the proposed dwellings that would stand adjacent to the road would bring traffic problems, as has already been explained in comments concerning this application.

Even if Lingards Road was deemed a Local Residential Street or a Shared Surface Street, it should still benefit from the same laybys and carriageway widening.

That being evident, in Kirklees' own Highways Design Guide SPD (*see extract above*), it makes me question why it is that planners appear to be ignoring the prospect of widening the road.

Presumably, planners know what their own guidance is.

Presumably, planners are willing to follow their own guidance.

Presumably, management are willing to follow their own guidance.

Presumably, the council want the planners to follow their own guidance.

So what's preventing it?

Why are existing residents, of Lingards Road, being denied what they have been told to expect?

The road width and the application are inextricably linked.

If the application is not *fit for purpose*, it cannot be supported or approved.

It is not *fit for purpose* if it fails to deliver what KMC have told residents they will receive.

Through this application, and by design, on street parking would become an issue on Lingards Road.

Failing to address it now is not going to make it disappear.

It needs addressing, as an integral part of this application.

Table 1: Summary of Residential Street Types

Type	A	B	C
Title	Residential Connector Street	Local Residential Street	Shared Surface Street
Potential number of dwellings	300 - 700	200 - 300	An amount generating no more than 100 VPH
Alignment	Curvilinear	Curvilinear	Angular with alignment shifts
Design speed	25 mph	20 mph	15 mph
Speed restraint feature separation (Maximum)	100 metres	60 metres	40 metres
Forward visibilities (Minimum)	33 metres	25 metres	23 metres
Centreline radius (Minimum)	35 metres	20 metres	Based on vehicle tracking
Cross -section	2 metre footway - verge - carriageway - verge - 2 metre footway	2 metre footway - carriageway - 2 metre footway	hard margin - carriageway - hard margin
Carriageway width (Minimum)	6.75 metres	4.8 - 5.5 metres (5.5 metres for 50+ units)	4.8 - 5.5 metres
Crossfall	Balanced either side of centreline	Uniform fall across carriageway	Uniform fall across carriageway
Pedestrian provision	Segregated	Segregated	Shared
Verges	1.2 metre grassed verge between footway and carriageway on both sides	Desirable but generally not required	0.6 metre wide hard margin on both sides (except where a footway is provided)
On-street parking	On-street parking to be provided by laybys and carriageway widening	On-street parking to be provided by laybys and carriageway widening	On-street parking to be provided by laybys and carriageway widening