



## National Highways Planning Response (NHPR 22-12) Formal Recommendation to an Application for Planning Permission

From: Simon Boyle (Regional Director)  
Operations Directorate  
Yorkshire North East Region  
National Highways  
[Planningyne@nationalhighways.co.uk](mailto:Planningyne@nationalhighways.co.uk)

To: Kirklees Council (FAO Richard a Gilbert )  
[DCadmin@kirklees.gov.uk](mailto:DCadmin@kirklees.gov.uk)

CC: [transportplanning@df.gov.uk](mailto:transportplanning@df.gov.uk)  
[spatialplanning@nationalhighways.co.uk](mailto:spatialplanning@nationalhighways.co.uk)

**Council's Reference:** 2022/91477

**Location:** Land off Lindley Moor Road, Lindley, Huddersfield

**Proposal:** Hybrid Planning Application for the erection of an industrial unit for E(g)/B2 /B8 use with associated access, parking, groundworks and landscaping in conjunction with an outline application for mixed use development use class E(a), E(b), E(g), B2 and B8

**National Highways Ref:** 95504

Referring to the consultation on a planning application dated 11 July 2022 referenced above, in the vicinity of the M62 that forms part of the Strategic Road Network, notice is hereby given that National Highways' formal recommendation is that we:

- ~~a) offer no objection (see reasons at Annex A);~~
- ~~b) recommend that conditions should be attached to any planning permission that may be granted (see Annex A – National Highways recommended Planning Conditions & reasons);~~
- c) recommend that planning permission not be granted for a specified period (see reasons at Annex A);
- ~~d) recommend that the application be refused (see reasons at Annex A)~~

Highways Act 1980 Section 175B is not relevant to this application.<sup>1</sup>

This represents National Highways' formal recommendation and is copied to the Department for Transport as per the terms of our Licence.

Should the Local Planning Authority not propose to determine the application in accordance with this recommendation they are required to consult the Secretary of State for Transport, as set out in the [Town and Country Planning \(Development Affecting Trunk Roads\) Direction 2018](#), via [transportplanning@dft.gov.uk](mailto:transportplanning@dft.gov.uk) and may not determine the application until the consultation process is complete.

The Local Planning Authority must also copy any consultation under the 2018 Direction to [Planningyne@nationalhighways.co.uk](mailto:Planningyne@nationalhighways.co.uk).

<b>Signature:</b> 	<b>Date:</b> 13 October 2023
<b>Name:</b> National Highways Calder View House Peel Avenue Wakefield WF4 3GH	<b>Position:</b> Assistant Planning Manager

---

<sup>1</sup> Where relevant, further information will be provided within Annex A.

## Annex A National Highways' assessment of the proposed development

National Highways has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as a strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such we work to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.

### **Recommended Non-Approval**

Our previous review highlighted the need for further information which has recently been submitted by the Applicant for review. Subsequent to this we issued a further technical note to the Applicant dated 27 January 2023. This highlighted additional information for the Applicant to consider and address in a revised TA Addendum; which to date has not been received.

And, whilst I understand work is underway to model the development impact at M62 J24 until this is received these matters remain un-resolved and a further extension to our temporary non-determination recommendation is required.

For the avoidance of doubt, the following matters were included in our scoping response of 27 January 2023:

The following information has been provided by Paragon:

Email from Leigh Ogden (Paragon) dated 6th January 2023, with the following attachments;  
NOMIS Output;  
Distribution to the SRN; and  
Development Traffic – Unit P – First Principles

### **Email from Leigh Ogden**

The email from Paragon addresses JSJV's points in turn, and as such, for the ease of reference, JSJV will deal with these in the order in which they are presented.

- 1) In respect to the study area of the proposals in relation to the SRN, I attach the proposed distribution that stretches to Junction 23 M62 and Junction 24 M62 (see 2061-107). The distribution is based on the 2011 Census Information 'Location of usual residence and place of work' in accordance with the Transport Assessment (the NOMIS output is also attached). The distribution has identified that 18.85% of development traffic would travel to Junction 24 for access to and from the M62. There is no impact at Junction 23 as 6.52% of traffic would travel north/ west along New Hey Road.*

**JSJV Comment** – The information provided by Paragon shows that 18.85% of development traffic passes through M62 Junction 24, travelling via the eastbound on-slip and westbound off-slip in the morning and evening peak periods. Furthermore, it is shown that no traffic is routed via the slips of M62 Junction 23.

It is considered by JSJV that a key issue in the operation of M62 Junction 24 relate to the operation of the local road network roundabout, causing queuing on Blackley New Road. As such, this element of the junction will be a consideration in JSJV's thinking when reviewing the impact of the development proposals, which the information provided states that 63.96% of development flows will pass through.

The information provided is welcomed by JSJV as it provides more detail than provided within the TA, as well as identifying the study area in relation to the SRN. As such, it is considered by JSJV that a study area has been derived by Paragon that can be used to assess the impact of the development proposals on the local road network and SRN.

In addition, National Highways have a Aimsun model of M62 Junction 24, built in 2020 with a base year of 2017. As such, it is considered by JSJV that this model could be used as a starting point for assessment.

- 2) *It is intended to provide an Addendum to TA that will provide additional PIA information including Junctions 23 and 24 as per the distribution diagram attached. The study period will be extended to provide at least 5 (non-covid years).*

**JSJV Comment** – This is welcomed by JSJV, however, given the above, it is not considered necessary to include M62 Junction 23 within the study area for PIA as it is not considered that the development proposals will have a material impact on this junction, therefore the existing safety situation at this location does not need to be assessed by Paragon.

- 3) *The TRICS output is considered to be robust based on the same uses at similar locations. However, we now have end user information that will be included within the Addendum to TA. The Addendum will include this information and methodology of determining potential traffic based on first principles. The end user currently employ 68 people, with 2 shifts split evenly between the work force to allow 24 hour operations. There are staggered start and end times for the shifts (6am and 6:30am morning) and (6pm and 6:30pm evening). The NOMIS website has also been utilised to determine method of travel to work for the E02002300 Kirklees 030 area giving an output of 71.6% single occupancy car use. Given the start and finish times of the end user, the network peak hours (between 8am and 9am, and between 5pm and 6pm) should not be significantly affected. Using first principles approach this would provide a reduction when compared to the TRICS output (see table below showing amended traffic generations for all proposed uses). The development traffic has been applied to the distribution and diagram 2061 108 attached provides the likely impact on the SRN for all uses (full and outline application). As can be seen from the diagram, the entry slip to eastbound M62 at Junction 24 would accommodate an additional 10 trips during the morning peak and 22 trips during the evening peak hours. The exit slip from westbound M62 Junction 24 would accommodate 14 trips during the morning peak and 23 trips during the evening peak. These increases are not significant or material and would not be distinguishable from the daily fluctuations in flows on the SRN.*

**JSJV Comment** – A traffic flow diagram has been produced by Paragon to demonstrate the flows generated by Unit P through the study area. This is welcomed by JSJV, as it shows the number of trips accessing the SRN – M62 Junction 24 – in the morning and evening peaks; namely 24 two-way trips in the morning peak and 45 two-way trips in the evening peak. Furthermore, there are 61 two-way trips in the morning peak and 101 two-way trips in the evening peak passing through the Ainley Top roundabout, as discussed above.

As such, JSJV do not agree with the conclusion reached by Paragon that the increase in flows is not significant, given the two-way flows stated alongside the JSJV consideration that a key issue in the operation of M62 Junction 24 relate to the operation of the local road network roundabout, causing queuing on Blackley New Road.

- 4) *The Addendum to TA will include a first principles approach to car parking with shift changes and modal split being considered.*

**JSJV Comment** – This is welcomed by JSJV.

- 5) *The Addendum to TA will include reference to Circular 02/2013 as the approach proposed should adhere to this guidance.*

**JSJV Comment** – This is welcomed by JSJV, however, Circular 02/2013 has now been replaced by DfT Circular 01/2022, and this should be used instead by Paragon to guide the preparation of the Addendum.

- 6) *This is accepted, please see 3 above.*

**JSJV Comment** – Noted by JSJV.

- 7) *Only the end user is known for Unit P. The other units are included within the outline application. There is no alternative but to use the TRICS database for the Outline uses*

**JSJV Comment** – Noted by JSJV.

- 8) *The TRICS data shall be revisited for Units F and G as part of the Addendum, and a justified output shall be used to provide a robust assessment.*

**JSJV Comment** – Noted by JSJV.

- 9) *Drive Thru facilities are not proposed for the site as part of the Outline application and it is not agreed to apply these onerous rates to the development. However, it is proposed to provide an explanation/ justification within the Addendum for supporting the TRICS output.*

**JSJV Comment** – Noted by JSJV.

- 10) *As per 9 above, drive thru facilities are not representative of the proposed Outline development.*

**JSJV Comment** – Noted by JSJV.

- 11) *As per 9 above, the TRICS output will be interrogated again and explanation/ justification provided within the Addendum to TA.*

**JSJV Comment** – Noted by JSJV.

- 12) *The total trips have been adjusted based on first principles (see 3 above). Further justification of the TRICS output will be provided within the Addendum to TA.*

**JSJV Comment** – Noted by JSJV, however, JSJV's comments regarding point 3) should be addressed by Paragon within the Addendum.

- 13) *The study area has been increased to SRN (see attached). This will be fully explained within the Addendum to TA.*

**JSJV Comment** – This is welcomed by JSJV, although it has been established by JSJV that only M62 Junction 24 needs to be considered within the study area for the development proposals.

- 14) *The Addendum shall expand on the distribution to SRN for each proposed use.*

**JSJV Comment** – This is welcomed by JSJV, although it has been established by JSJV that only M62 Junction 24 needs to be considered within the study area for the development proposals.

*15) Travel Plan – this appears acceptable.*

**JSJV Comment** – Noted by JSJV.

I will re-visit this recommendation no later than 29 February 2024.

### **Standing advice to the local planning authority**

The Climate Change Committee's [2022 Report to Parliament](#) notes that for the UK to achieve net zero carbon status by 2050, action is needed to support a modal shift away from car travel. The NPPF supports this position, with paragraphs 73 and 105 prescribing that significant development should offer a genuine choice of transport modes, while paragraphs 104 and 110 advise that appropriate opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport should be taken up.

Moreover, the build clever and build efficiently criteria as set out in clause 6.1.4 of [PAS2080](#) promote the use of low carbon materials and products, innovative design solutions and construction methods to minimise resource consumption.

These considerations should be weighed alongside any relevant Local Plan policies to ensure that planning decisions are in line with the necessary transition to net zero carbon.