
Sent: Thursday, August 17, 2023 12:33 PM

Cc: Highways DevelopmentControl <Highways.DevelopmentControl@kirklees.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: 2023/91835 | 2023/20930 | HDC 7-12NE/8 | location Cliff Hollins Lane, East Bierley, BD12 7ET

I have now reviewed the new car park access proposals associated with the above, in consultation with our S38 team.

In principle, the new car park access is acceptable. However, additional information / clarification is required on a number of matters, and some amendments are necessary.

A summary of the issues that need to be addressed are as follows:

- 2.4x43m visibility splays are proposed at the site access, which are acceptable in principle. However, the splays are not shown fully on the plan. Therefore, a clearer plan is required that demonstrates the full extent of the visibility splays, and confirms that the full width of the major carriageway can be observed. The plan should also show the relationship with the other accesses located on the spine road, to ensure that adequate junction spacing is available, and junction visibility is not compromised by the adjacent accesses.
- Swept Path Analysis is required to demonstrate that large cars can pass at the site access junction and on entry to the car park, with adequate clearance from kerbs and between passing vehicles (min. 0.5m).
- The junction radii at the site access are different on either side. These should be amended to provide the same size radii on both sides, and should be a minimum of 3m (subject to swept path analysis, which may require a combination of larger radii or a slightly wider access).
- Dropped crossing and tactile paving to be shown at the site access, in accordance with Kirklees Council standard details (<https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/regeneration-and-development/pdf/highways-standard-details.pdf>).
- The site access gradients should be confirmed with a long section. The gradient must be in accordance with the Councils Highway Design SPD (<https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-policy/pdf/highway-design-guide-spd.pdf>), including the initial 10m section of the access road including a preferred maximum gradient of 1:40 (or absolute maximum of 1:25).
- Drainage proposals at the site access should be confirmed. These arrangement should ensure that surface water from the spine road does not drain into the site drainage, and visa-versa. It is noted that integrated kerb drainage (e.g. beany blocks) or channel drains should not be used, due to issues with ongoing maintenance.

- Road marking and signage details to be confirmed. This should include give-way markings, warning triangle and signage at the site access, combined cycle/footway signage on either side of the access, and internal speed limit signage and roundels.
- Forward visibility for outbound vehicles on approach to the site access junction appears to be sub-standard and may be blocked by the proposed landscaping and fences. Similarly, visibility for pedestrians/cyclists crossing the site on the combined cycle/footway in the south to north direction will have insufficient visibility to traffic exiting the car park access. Therefore, sufficient forward and pedestrian visibility must be demonstrated, based on the proposed design speed of the site access road (a design speed of 15mph may be appropriate, which would require forward visibility of 17m, and a posted site speed limit of 10mph). Landscaping/fence treatments should then be confirmed, to ensure that unobstructed visibility is achieved at all times when the access is in use.
- The car park gates should be set a minimum of 6m into the site access to allow a large car to wait off the running carriageway of the spine road. In accordance with the above bullet point, the gates/fences and posts will need to be amended to ensure that they do not block visibility.
- Confirmation to be provided of any other vehicles that may need to use the site access. Should this include fire tenders (and high reach appliances), which is expected (as this is the only access that will allow access to the north side of the building), then swept path analysis for these vehicles is also required.
- Confirmation to be provided regarding the associated changes to the on-site parking provision (all types/modes), and other site layout amendments. At present, it appears that the number of EV charging spaces has been reduced by the revised arrangements, which is a concern. It is also unclear how these wider changes to the site layout are to be agreed, as they are currently outside of the scope of the current redline boundary for this application.

Hopefully the above points are self-explanatory. However, should the applicants designer wish to discuss any of the above points, I would be happy to discuss.

Kind Regards

Adam Darwin FIHE
Group Engineer – Highway Development Management