

Consultation Response from KC, Highways Development Management

2021/94280 land at Lady Ann Road, Soothill, Batley, WF17 0PY

Erection of 65 dwellings with associated works

Date Responded: 31/03/23

Responding Officer: A Darwin

Responding Ref: HDC 13-10NE/14

RECOMMENDATION: Further information required

Further information is required regarding the following issues, which are detailed in the main body of the report:

- A Travel Plan with associated measures to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport is required;
- Amended site access and internal site layout proposals are required, together with a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and Designers Response (RSA Brief to be agreed with HDM in advance of the RSA's).
- A suitable link to PROW BAT/20/20 should be provided for pedestrian and cycle use;
- Amendments to the junction improvement proposals at the Lady Ann Road / Soothill Lane junction are required, together with Swept Path Analysis and a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and Designers Response (RSA Brief to be agreed with HDM in advance of the RSA's);
- Updated traffic modelling is required to take into account all major committed developments;
- Further information and / or amendments to the on-site parking provision (for all modes), is required.

Development Overview:

This is a full Planning Application for the development of 65 residential dwellings on land to the west of Lady Ann Road, Soothill, Batley, WF17 0PY.

The site is allocated in the Local Plan (Site HS74) for residential development, with an indicative capacity of 97 dwellings.

A number of planning applications (2017/91851, 2019/92462 & 2020/93071) have been submitted at the site for similar residential development proposals, which have either been refused or withdrawn, with one of the reasons for refusal being insufficient information relating transport and highways matters.

As identified in the previous HDM comments dated 20/01/22, this further planning application submission did not fully respond to all of the matters previously identified by HDM. As such, further supporting information has now been provided by the applicant. However, whilst the additional information is welcomed, and does address many of the points raised, there is still a lack of information and other matters that are still outstanding that are set out in this response below.

Reference to Plans/Documents:

The following additional transport related information has been provided in support of these proposals:

- Design & Access Statement dated 21/01/23;
- Transport Statement dated December 2022 ref. 1247/D;
- Proposed Site Plan - 10703-SELF-P-ZZ-A-M3-001 Rev B;
- Forward Visibility drawing 1247-102A;
- General Layout drawing 1247 PL 001;

- Kerbing and Surface Finishes drawing 1247 PL 002;
- Vehicle Tracking & Visibility – Refuse vehicle drawing 1247-101A;
- Long Sections Roads 1 and 2 drawing 1247 PL 003;
- Long Sections Roads 3 and 4 drawing 1247 PL 004;
- Lady Ann Road / Soothill Road junction improvement scheme drawing 1247-201C.

Policy:

Local Plan Policies – LP5, LP19, LP20, LP21, LP22, LP23, LP24; Kirklees Highway Design Guide SPD, Housebuilder Design SPD, NPPF.

Reference should also be made to the Councils latest S38 design guides, including the guidance entitled 'Emergency Access, Waste Management, Servicing and Deliveries – April 2020 (version 1)', which provide detailed requirements relating to the highway and development layouts.

Adoption Issues:

The internal layout shall be built to adoptable standards, as set out in the Kirklees Highway Design Guide SPD and Highways Guidance Note – Section 38 Agreements for Highway Adoptions March 2019 (version 1) and associated documents.

Following the previous HDM comments, the site layout has been developed further, which has addressed some of the concerns previously raised. However, there are still problems with the layout as currently presented, which mean that the layout is not currently to an adoptable standard (see specific design comments later in this response).

Accessibility and Sustainable Transport:

As the site is allocated in the Local Plan for residential development, the potential accessibility of the site was assessed as part of this process and is considered to be acceptable, subject to the development providing necessary improvements to public transport, walking and cycling.

As the development includes over 50 dwellings, a Travel Plan is required. However, whilst this was specifically requested in the previous HDM consultation response, this has not been provided. As such, the application is contrary to LP20 of the Local Plan.

Following consultation with the West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA), it is recommended that the development provides either a Sustainable Travel Fund or the Residential MCard scheme for the site. The cost of either option would be **£33,247.50** (£511.50 x 65 units), which equates to the cost of a bus only Residential MCards for each dwelling. The Travel Plan should confirm the specific measures that are to be incorporated at this site and how the Travel Plan Fund is to be utilised, for further consideration by HDM.

Kirklees Council will require a Travel Plan Monitoring Fee to be secured as part of the S106 agreement. For a development of this scale (classed as a 'small scale major residential development') the fee is **£10,000.00** (£2,000 per year for 5 years).

Public Transport:

Lady Ann Road is a bus route, which is served by the 212 bus service that operates between Dewsbury and Wakefield at a 60 minute frequency during the day Monday-Sunday (every 2hrs on Sundays). As confirmed by WYCA, the bus availability for the site is considered to be acceptable.

As confirmed by WYCA, the closest bus stop on Lady Ann Road is stop 16161 (for services towards Batley/Dewsbury), which would benefit from the installation of a Real Time Information battery display at a cost to the developer of **£10,000.00**. This improvement should be secured by S106 agreement.

PROW, walking and cycling:

Public footpaths BAT/20/20 runs along the northern boundary of the site and connects Howley Street to Primrose Hill to the west, with Lady Ann Road to the east. A new pedestrian link has been shown from the site to this PROW, which is welcomed. This will provide a direct link to Batley Town Centre, via Howley Street, which connects to Rutland Road via a manned/gated crossing of the Leeds-Manchester railway line, which is due to be replaced with a new footbridge and ramps that will further enhance this route.

However, whilst a pedestrian link has been shown from the site to Footpath BAT/20/20, it was previously requested that this route be widened to a minimum of 3m (with no steps), so that it can be provided as an adopted Bridleway link, to enable cyclists to safely use this route. This has not been proposed, and the route is still shown as a 2m wide footpath only connection. This is a missed opportunity and is not acceptable; and is contrary to LP20 of the Local Plan.

Within the vicinity of the site, Lady Ann Road has footways on both sides. Further to the south, the footway provision reduced to a single footway on the west side of Lady Ann Road, to the south of the Primrose Hill junction, before returning to footways on both sides to the south of the West Street junction. The footway on the west side of Lady Ann Road provides a continuous route to the Soothill Lane junction to the south, providing access to Batley Town Centre, and also provides access to Footpaths BAT/38/60 & BAT/38/30 that also lead to Batley Town Centre via subway links under the railway. The footway provision on Lady Ann Road is below the desirable minimum width of 2m, but as there does not appear to be scope to widen the footways, they are considered to be adequate to serve the development.

At the northern end of Lady Ann Road, there is a bridleway (within the Leeds district) that links to Timothy Lane to the north.

As previously requested by HDM, the applicant should consult with the Councils PROW Team to determine whether any wider improvements to the PROW network are necessary (in addition to the Bridleway Link to BAT/20/20 previously mentioned), to further facilitate and encourage pedestrian and cycle access at the development.

Vehicle Access:

The site includes a single point of access on the west side of Lady Ann Road, approximately 200m north of the Primrose Hill junction. The access is proposed to be 5.5m wide, with 2m footways on both sides. Following previous HDM comments, some improvements have been made to the access arrangements. However, these arrangements are still not acceptable for the following reasons:

- The junction includes a 6m radius on one side and a 10m radius on the other. This is not acceptable and 10m radii should be provided on both sides.
- The drawing indicated that 2.4x43m visibility splays are provided at the junction. However, the splay to the south appears to extend beyond the back of footway, and would be blocked by the boundary fence, which is not acceptable.
- A dropped crossing with tactile paving is proposed at the site access, which is acceptable in principle. However, the in-line location of the dropped crossing is not in accordance with good practice, and should be inset into the junction to reduce the crossing distance.

- No details of the bridge crossing over the beck have been provided, or details of the proposed/amended safety fencing that will be required.
- No Stage 1 Road Safety Audit & Designers Response has been provided (nor has an RSA Brief been agreed with HDM, which is necessary).

In light of the above, adequate information has not yet been provided to confirm whether the site access arrangements are acceptable, contrary to LP21 of the Local Plan.

Road Safety

As confirmed in the previous HDM consultation response, on-street parking takes place on the north side of Soothill Lane adjacent to the Lady Ann Road junction. This parking restricts visibility at the junction, which is below desirable minimum standards. Therefore, HDM previously requested that the applicant should investigate what improvements can be provided at the junction, which could include narrowing of the running carriageway on Soothill Lane from circa 6.2m to 6.0m (min. acceptable width for a bus route), which would then allow the Lady Ann Road give-way line to be brought forward and would improve junction visibility.

It was also suggested that 'No waiting' parking restrictions should also be provided for circa 10m either side of the junction, to further improve junction visibility. By narrowing the carriageway to 6m as suggested, this would also allow the narrow footway (circa 1m wide) on the northwest side of the junction to be widened slightly, to the benefit of pedestrian safety and accessibility. On the northeast side of the junction, it was also suggested that a kerb build-out could be provided to formalise the suggested 'No waiting' restrictions and on-street parking to the east, and would ensure that a consistent carriageway width of 6m is provided on Soothill Lane past the junction.

The applicant has now proposed an improvement at the junction, as shown on drawing 1247-201C, which is in general accordance with the above suggestions, and is welcomed. However, some amendments to the design and additional information are required, as follows:

- Junction visibility to the east has been shown through the parked cars, which will clearly not be available at all times. As such, the drawing should be amended to demonstrate the level of visibility that would be available to an on-coming vehicle 'in lane' (e.g. measures to the central hazard warning line of the carriageway).
- The drawing does not propose any 'No waiting' restrictions at the junction, which should be indicated on the plan;
- Parking bay markings should be shown in the layby to the east of the junction, to formal the parking arrangements adjacent to the build-out;
- No Swept Path Analysis (SPA), has been provided to confirm that HGV's and buses can still safely utilise the junction;
- No Stage 1 Road Safety Audit & Designers Response has been provided (nor has an RSA Brief been agreed with HDM, which is necessary).

In light of the above, adequate information has not yet been provided to confirm whether the proposed junction improvement is acceptable, contrary to LP21 of the Local Plan.

Site layout:

The applicant has proposed some improvements to the site layout, which are welcomed. However, following consultation with the Councils S38 Team, there are still a number of problems with the layout, which are as follows:

- At the internal priority junction opposite plot No. 6-7, 2.4x25m visibility splays have been shown. However, the splay to the north (it is noted that the plans shown north incorrectly) is restricted by the private parking spaces for Plot 57-59, and the subsequent visitor parking layby. This is not acceptable, and all visibility splays must be contained within the adopted highway and should not be blocked by parked cars.
- The road alignment between plot no. 1 to no. 36 is long and straight for circa 300m, which is likely to encourage high traffic speeds. This is not acceptable, and some form of speed reducing features must be incorporated, which may be vertical deflection features such as ramps, or landscaped buildouts etc. To achieve the required design speed of 20mph, speed reducing features should have a maximum spacing of 60m.
- The width of the visitor parking laybys have not been confirmed. However, these must be a minimum of 2.4m wide when adjacent to hard margins (2.0m is only acceptable when adjacent to a footway).
- Bin presentation points adjacent to the highway have not been shown. These need to be provided to ensure that private drives and paths are not blocked by bins on collection day, which is particularly important for the shared private drives and shared surface roads. It is noted that the bin carry distance for Plot 1 is in excess of 25m, which is not in accordance with standards. As such, the bins presentation points should be reviewed. The other comments relating to waste collection provided by the Councils Waste Strategy team dated 11/1/2023 should also be addressed.
- The private drives in front of plot no. 1 & 2 seems tight in width. This should be a minimum of 4.5m, and Swept Path Analysis (SPA) should be provided to confirm that the adjacent parking spaces are accessible.
- Rumble strips / ramps at the transition points at the start of private drives need to be introduced. Also, at the transition point between the traditional estate roads and the shared streets, rumble strips / ramps are required, and the footways need to extend beyond these features (See S38 standard details that confirm these requirements).
- For trees proposed within or adjacent to the highway corridor, root protection system needs to be provided with the landscaping plans.
- Full details of the sites attenuation requirements have not been provided. This information is necessary to ensure that the usage of oversized pipes is avoided, particularly within shared surface streets where there will be inadequate width available.
- The long sections show that a 30m section of the shared surface street has a gradient of 1:15. This is not acceptable, as the Council will not adopt shared surface streets that are steeper than 1:20.
- There are a number of unadopted footpath links proposed at the site. A number of these links connect to the highway in appropriate locations, such as within the visitor parking laybys, which is not acceptable.
- As confirmed earlier in this response, the site access design on to Lady Ann Road is not acceptable in it's current form.
- As confirmed earlier in this response, a min. 3m bridleway connection is required at the north end of the estate road to connect to PROW BAT/20/20. This must be a ramped (max. 1:20 gradient) link, with no steps, and should include bollards to prevent unauthorised motor vehicle use.
- No Stage 1 Road Safety Audit & Designers Response has been provided (nor has an RSA Brief been agreed with HDM, which is necessary).

In light of the above, an adequate layout has not been demonstrated, and there is a lack of adequate supporting information, contrary to LP21 of the Local Plan.

Parking:

The Transport Statement provided in support of the proposals suggests at paragraph 3.3 – 3.4 that:

- *'The level of parking provision on the site will be in general accordance with the suggested car parking requirements within Kirklees Council's Highway Design Guide.'*
- *'EV charging will be provided within the site as appropriate.'*
- *'Secure cycle storage facilities will be provided for the site, the type and location is to be agreed with the LPA.'*

The above is not considered to be an adequate response, and lacks adequate information regarding the proposals. Notwithstanding this, HDM have identified a number of issues with the parking arrangements, which are as follows:

- It is understood that Plot 57-63 are 3 bedroom units, so should be provided with 2 no. off-street parking spaces. However, only 1 off-street space per unit has been provided. Instead the applicant has proposed 7 no. layby spaces adjacent to these dwelling, which are contained within the adopted highway, and has suggested that these will be dedicated to these unit. This is noted acceptable, as these spaces cannot be dedicated to individual residents. Notwithstanding this, if these spaces were provided as shared communal spaces for all highway users, which could also be used by the adjacent residents, this may be an acceptable option (albeit this is not in accordance with the Councils Highway Design SPD). Therefore, the applicant should consider this matter further, and confirm how they wish to proceed in this regard.
- As previously stated, the 3 no. spaces proposed for plot 57-59 block visibility at the adjacent junction. This could be addressed by setting these spaces back, and then provided a 2m wide footway adjacent to the carriageway to contain the visibility splay (subject to the amendments to the adjacent visitor parking layby too).
- No details of the proposed garage dimensions have been provided, to confirm whether these meet the Councils minimum standards (See the Kirklees Council Highway Design SPD).
- Whilst the provision of visitor parking laybys (13 no.) is welcomed, this provision is still below Council guidance (1:4 spaces are required e.g. 16 no. spaces). As such, additional visitor parking spaces should be provided. It would be beneficial if this included 2 no. additional visitor parking laybys in the turning head adjacent to plot No. 39 to ensure that the turning head will not be blocked by any parked cars.
- No details of the EV parking provision have been confirmed.
- No details of the cycle parking provision have been confirmed.

In light of the above, adequate parking facilities for all users have not been demonstrated, contrary to LP22 of the Local Plan.

Construction Access Strategy

A Construction Management Plan (CMP) is required for the site and would need to be secured by planning condition. Specific conditions are also required relating to:

- Wheel washing facilities; and
- Carriageway and footway condition surveys (pre and post construction), to be undertaken jointly with the LHA.

Transport Statement:

A Transport Statement (TS) has now been provided in support of the proposals, as requested by HDM in the previous consultation response. Comments regarding the traffic impact assessment undertaken on the TS are as follows:

Based on the TRICS assessment included in the TS, the development has been estimated to generate the following weekday network peak hour development trips:

	AM Peak			PM Peak		
	Arrive	Depart	Total	Arrive	Depart	Total
Trip Rate	0.147	0.351	0.498	0.335	0.140	0.475
Traffic Generations	10	23	32	22	9	31

Proposed Trip Rates and Traffic Generations

The TS goes on to utilise higher weekday network peak hour development trips for the junction capacity assessments, as follows:

	AM Peak			PM Peak		
	Arrive	Depart	Total	Arrive	Depart	Total
Trip Rate	0.2	0.5	0.7	0.5	0.2	0.7
Traffic Generations	13	33	46	33	13	46

Proposed Trip Rates and Traffic Generations (Kirklees Council Rates)

The use of the above higher trip rates is noted, and HDM agrees that this provides for a robust assessment of development traffic impact.

Base traffic, traffic growth, committed development and development traffic distribution

The assessment includes up to date traffic count data obtained on 24th November 2022 at the Lady Ann Road / Soothill Lane junction and the Grace Leather Lane / Soothill Lane junction. This data appears to be adequate for assessment purposes and is acceptable.

Traffic growth has been applied to the base data utilising TEMPRO growth rates, to an assessment year of 2032. Whilst this approach is acceptable, no allowance has been given to specific committed development sites in the local area, which was specifically requested in the previous HDM consultation response. This includes no allowance for the major residential development site further to the east accessed from Soothill Lane (Reserved Matters application 2021/91731). As such, this and all other major committed development sites in the local area must be taken into account, to enable a robust assessment of traffic impact and operation. To minimise any further abortive work, the applicant is

encouraged to agree the full scope of the assessment with HDM in advance, including all committed development sites that need to be incorporated.

Development traffic distribution has been provided in the TS, using a census based gravity model. The approach is acceptable.

In summary, the assessment methodology used within the Transport Statement is mostly acceptable. However, the assessment needs to be updated to include all major committed development sites in the local area. Once this further assessment work has been provided, HDM will be able to consider the traffic impact of the development in more detail, and will be able to advise whether any additional mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Conditions/Section 106:

Conditions;

To be advised.

Section 106 Contributions/Requirements;

- Provision of 1 No. Real Time Information display at bus stop 16161 on Lady Ann Road - **£10,000**;
- Residential MCard Scheme or Sustainable Transport Fund, estimated at approximately **£33,247.50**;
- Travel Plan monitoring fee - **£10,000** (£2,000 x 5yrs).

Conclusion:

Further information required, see recommendation.