



Haigh Huddleston & Associates

Civil & Structural Engineering Consultants

Unit 4, Midgley Business Park, Bar Lane, Midgley WF4 4JJ

t 01924 574074 e info@haighhuddleston.co.uk

STAGE 1 ROAD SAFETY AUDIT **OVERSEEING ORGANISATION RESPONSE** **REPORT**

FOR

SECTION 38 WORKS

ON

ROWLEY LANE, FENAY BRIDGE

Date: MAY 2025

Ref: E23/8060/JM/004A

Introduction

Haigh Huddleston Associates Ltd have been appointed as designers for the Section 38 works at above residential development. This report has been prepared in accordance with GG119 as a response to the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit undertaken by Local Transport Projects on April 2025.

Project Details

Report Title	Section 38 Agreement Works, Rowley Lane, Fenay Bridge, Huddersfield Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
Date:	April 2025
Document Reference and Revision:	LTP/24/6133 – Final Issue 1
Prepared By:	Local Transport Projects
On Behalf of:	Kirklees Council

Authorisation Details

A Road Safety Audit Brief was approved by Steve Blackmore on 5th March 2025 of Kirklees Council and was provided to the Audit Team. A copy of the signed Audit Brief is included in the Appendix.

Key Personnel

Overseeing Organisation:	Anne Binks Kirklees Council
RSA Team:	Tony Kirby & Ryan Penn Local Transport Projects
Design Organisation:	Jamie McBride Haigh Huddleston Associates Ltd

Road Safety Audit Decision Log

Each problem raised by the Safety Audit team has been listed, along their recommendations and the response of the design organisation and overseeing organisation:

Problem 2.1.**Location:** Road 2 at junction with Road 1**Summary:** Absence of North-south pedestrian crossing point

Stage 1 – Observations & Recommendation	Observations – Although uncontrolled pedestrian crossing points (dropped kerbs and tactile paving) have been provided at the site access junction, no such facilities are proposed north-south across the mouth of Road 2. Unless crossing at private driveway locations, mobility impaired pedestrians who wish to cross Road 2 will have to cross a full height kerb which could result in tripping and subsequent injury to them. Recommendation – It is recommended that an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing point (dropped kerbs and tactile paving) is provided across the mouth of Road 2.
Designers Response	Drawings to be updated to incorporate a pedestrian crossing in accordance with RSA recommendation.
Overseeing Organisation Response	Agreed.
Agreed RSA Action	Drawings to be updated to incorporate changes.

Problem 2.2.**Location:** Footways on Road 1 and Road 2 at transition from conventional street with footways on both sides to shared surface treatment**Summary:** Risk of pedestrian trip/fall injuries due to lack of suitable connection between footway and carriageway

Stage 1 – Observations & Recommendation	Observations – At the transition from conventional street with footways on both sides to shared surface treatment, it is assumed that the intention is for pedestrians to continue their journeys on carriageway. However, there appears to be a 30mm bull nosed kerb proposed at the footway/shared surface interface. A kerb with even a reasonably small upstand could increase the risk of pedestrian/trip fall injuries and may physically prevent those in wheelchairs/mobility scooters from accessing the shared surface area. Recommendation – It is recommended that a suitable flush transition between conventional footway and shared surface areas is provided.
Designers Response	In accordance with RSA recommendation, drawings to be updated to incorporate a flush kerb at the top of ramps to allow pedestrians to transition onto the carriageway.
Overseeing Organisation	Agreed.

Response	
Agreed RSA Action	Drawings to be updated to incorporate changes.

Problem 2.3.

Location: Locations where pedestrian access to private properties is provided across a kerbed area

Summary: Risk of pedestrians tripping/falling over kerbs and sustaining injury due to lack of flush access to properties

Stage 1 – Observations & Recommendation	Observations – At several locations within the site where no footway exists, pedestrian access to/from residential properties involve the negotiation of a bull nosed kerb with a 30mm check. A kerb with even a reasonably small upstand could increase the risk of pedestrian/trip fall injuries and may physically prevent those in wheelchairs/mobility scooters from accessing their properties. Recommendation – It is recommended that a flush (0-6mm) route for pedestrians be provided to all properties.
Designers Response	Many of the highlighted sections form the primary access for both vehicles and pedestrians onto driveways. The layout design has currently been carried out in accordance with Kirklees Council design guidance and adoption criteria which stipulates a 30mm kerb upstand should be used on block paved carriageways. Incorporating flush kerbs at all property/driveway entrances would lead to extended lengths of carriageway with 0/6mm kerb upstand. This would encourage vehicles to drive along the hard margin. The use of kerb upstands is also important in channelling surface water flow to road gullies during storm events.
Overseeing Organisation Response	Agree with the Designer, a 30mm kerb upstand is required for driveways as per our standard detail. For pedestrian dropped kerb crossings a kerb upstand of 6mm is required.
Agreed RSA Action	Provision of 30mm kerb upstand will need to be provided for all driveways and 6mm kerb upstand will need to be provided at pedestrian dropped crossings. This will need

	to be provided in updated dwgs.
--	---------------------------------

Problem 2.4.

Location: Road 5 at south western extents

Summary: Risk of pedestrians tripping/falling over kerbs and vehicle slips due to material being pulled onto carriageway.

Stage 1 – Observations & Recommendation	Observations – On the drawings provided there appears to be a footway link proposed from the shared surface turning head to the land to the south, although no details of the proposed treatment are provided. There appears to be a 30mm bull nosed kerb proposed which could represent a trip hazard for pedestrians and may physically prevent those in wheelchairs/mobility scooters from accessing the path. In addition, if the path (expected to be unadopted) is unbound and of crushed stone type material then over time this material could be dragged onto the carriageway creating a future slip hazard, particularly for two wheeled vehicles. Recommendation – It is recommended that a flush (0-6mm) route for pedestrians be provided to any adjacent footways, and that any surface be bound for the initial two metres from the back of carriageway to reduce the chance of material being dragged onto the carriageway.
Designers Response	In accordance with RSA recommendation, drawings to be updated to incorporate a flush kerb in line with the footpath link to allow pedestrians to transition onto the carriageway.
Overseeing Organisation Response	Agreed.
Agreed RSA Action	Drawings to be updated to incorporate changes.

Problem 2.5.

Location: Various dropped kerb locations

Summary: Risk of pedestrian slips / falls due to steep gradient

Stage 1 –	Observations – Some roads within the S38 area have a
------------------	---

Observations & Recommendation	significant gradient, and at proposed informal dropped crossings, uphill sides could potentially be greater than 10% over localised lengths, creating slip hazards and difficulties for pedestrians and people with reduced mobility. The potential gradients could be a particular problem for people in wheelchairs or mobility scooters when making the 90 degree turn to use crossings. Recommendation – It is recommended that double transition kerbs are installed on uphill sides where necessary to assist footway gradients.
Designers Response	In accordance with RSA recommendation, drawings to be updated to show double transition kerbs on uphill sides where necessary to assist footway gradients.
Overseeing Organisation Response	Agreed.
Agreed RSA Action	Drawings to be updated to incorporate changes.

Problem 2.6.

Location: *Proposed parking lay-by areas*

Summary: *Risk of pedestrian slips / falls*

Stage 1 – Observations & Recommendation	Observations – No vehicle swept path analysis has been provided for the proposed parking lay-bys. As such, it is not clear if vehicles can suitably enter / exit the parking bays. There is a 600mm hard margin proposed at the back of proposed lay-bys and if a vertical feature (e.g. fence or wall) is provided at the boundary there may be insufficient space for vehicle occupants to exit the vehicle, increasing the risk of trips / falls. Recommendation – It is recommended that appropriate vehicle swept path assessments are undertaken for the proposed parking lay-bys and an assessment of vehicle access on the highway boundary side. If required, their design should be suitably modified to accommodate the vehicle and pedestrian access requirements.
Designers Response	Swept path analysis to be provided for cars entering / existing the parking bays. The parking bays are 2m in width and are all located in shared surface areas. It is therefore expected that cars will be parked partially in the carriageway which can also be used by

	pedestrians for access.
Overseeing Organisation Response	Disagree. Our adoption standards require a minimum 1 metre wide hardstanding to the rear of the visitor parking bays to enable safe loading into the vehicle from this side. In addition our minimum visitor parking bay dimensions are 2.5 metres wide by 6 metres in length and the design also fails this adoption standard requirement. Please amend the layout to provide these minimum dimensions before planning approval is granted.
Agreed RSA Action	Provide 1m wide hardstanding to the rear of the visitor parking bays to enable safe loading into the vehicle from this side. Provide minimum visitor parking bay dimensions of 2.5 metres wide by 6 metres in length.

Problem 2.7.

Location: *Proposed 3.0m retaining wall at the western end of Road 2*

Summary: *Risk of vehicles/pedestrians falling down a significant embankment potentially resulting in high severity injuries for vehicle occupants/pedestrians*

Stage 1 – Observations & Recommendation	Observations – Road 2 slopes downhill in an east-west direction and at its western end a 3.0m retaining wall is proposed. Prior to the retaining wall there would appear to be a 30mm kerb check followed by an edging kerb, both of which provide minimal vehicle restraint, and then an approximate 800mm drop to the retaining wall. The treatment at the retaining wall is unclear but, based on the level information provided, it appears that there could be a 3.0m drop beyond the retaining wall. If this is the case, it is unclear if any vertical parapet treatment or similar is proposed at the retaining wall to prevent errant vehicles (or pedestrians) from falling down the embankment. If there is no suitable restraint, high severity injuries could be expected for vehicle occupants/pedestrians falling down the embankment. Although not located within the S38 area, it is noted that the only restraint between the private drive serving plots 41-44 and the retaining wall appears to be a 100mm kerb. Similarly, the Local Area for Play (LAP) is located close to the retaining wall, though some walls of between 0.3-0.6m in height do appear to be proposed in this area. Recommendation – It is recommended that appropriate vehicle and pedestrian restraint measures are provided at the
--	---

	western end of Road 2 between the back of the adopted highway and the hazard to ensure that all road users are adequately protected from the significant drop. As part of this, an assessment should also be made as to whether similar measures are required at the private drive serving plots 41-44 and at the LAP, with any such measures provided as appropriate.
Designers Response	A Vehicle restraint system (VRS) is to be used at the end of Road 2. Although outside the adoptable carriageway, it is also recommended that a VRS system should be incorporated into the retaining wall design alongside private drives. In areas of public open space the retaining wall should incorporate a railing/fence to prevent pedestrians falling from the top of the wall.
Overseeing Organisation Response	Agreed.
Agreed RSA Action	Drawings to be updated to incorporate changes.

Design Organisation Statement

On behalf of the design organisation, I certify that:

- 1) The RSA actions identified in response to the road safety audit problems in this road safety audit have been discussed and agreed with the Overseeing Organisation.

Name:	Jamie McBride BSc. Hons
Signed:	
Position:	Director
Organisation:	Haigh Huddleston Associates Ltd
Date:	30.04.25

Overseeing Organisation Statement

On behalf of the Overseeing Organisation, I certify that:

- 1) The RSA actions identified in response to the road safety audit problems in this road safety audit have been discussed and agreed with the Design Organisation; and
- 2) The agreed RSA actions will be progressed.

Name: Steve Blackmore	
-----------------------	--

Signed:	
Position: Principal Engineer	
Organisation: Kirklees Council	
Date: 12 th May 2025	