Consultation Response from KC,
Highways Development Management

2024/92043 Fearnley Street/Fall Lane/Brooks Yard, Westtown, Dewsbury

Discharge condition 5)temporary access road) on previous permission 2024/90513 for construction of temporary access road to provide vehicle access to a temporary parking area for residents of Brooks Yard for the duration of the works to upgrade the adjacent Transpennine railway, along with removal of the temporary access road and reinstatement of the grassed area once railway works are completed

Date Responded: 5th August 2024
Responding Officer: C Dows
Responding Ref: K14-9SE/10

Recommendation: Further information required, Condition 5 should not be discharged

Submission Documents:
Stage 1 Road Safety Audit, Document No. 002, Issue 01
RSA Designer Response – Dated 04/07/2024
Visibility at Fall Lane Access Road Junction – (series of photographs)
Temporary Haul Road – Long Section, Drawing No. W3B-T-073, Revision P02

Condition 5 - Prior to commencement of development, the following details associated with the proposed temporary access road, as shown on the preliminary site layout plan Drawing No. 7722-30 Rev P0, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include:
- Vertical alignment of the access road
- Junction visibility splays, and their treatment at the access road/Fall Lane junction
- Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) based on an Approved RSA Brief
- Designers Responses and Agreed RSA Action, covering all aspects of these works.

Thereafter the access road shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained and maintained until completion of the Transpennine Route Upgrade works in this area as granted by the Network Rail (Huddersfield to Westtown (Dewsbury) Improvements) Order 2022 which require severance of the existing residents access, or as otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason- This is a pre-commencement condition to ensure the free and safe use of the highway, in the interest of highway safety and amenity and to accord with Policies LP21 and LP22 of the Kirklees Local Plan.

The submitted documents and information have been reviewed and HDM offer the following comments.

- **Vertical alignment of access road**; The long section provided appears to effectively follow existing ground levels, whilst not ideal the existing ground is relatively level, and the alignment is considered adequate for the temporary nature of the access. The alignment falls towards Fall Lane, the drawing fails to demonstrate what measures will be in place to prevent surface water runoff discharging on to the adopted highway (Fall Lane), details of drainage proposed need to be provided. The long section drawing submitted refers to Drawing No.7722-26 Rev.C0 for sections 'AA' and 'CC', this drawing has not been submitted. It is noted that a marked up copy of the plan is

included in the Road Safety Audit (RSA), to denote problems identified in the RSA. The marked-up plan includes Sections 'AA,' 'BB' and 'CC.' Sections 'BB' and 'CC' show a crossfall of 1:40 and are considered acceptable. Section 'AA' indicates the use of steel road plates with ramped asphalt transitions to bridge the footway at the access junction with Fall Lane. Whilst the use of this type of access arrangement may be appropriate in some temporary situations it is not considered acceptable in the proposed location for an access that is expected to be operational for in the order of 2 years. It is noted that the RSA identifies some of the deficiencies with the proposed arrangements. A formal dropped vehicular crossing or kerbed radii type junction should be provided.

- **Junction Visibility;** to address this element of the condition the submission includes a series of photographs, whilst these are a visual representation they are not acceptable to address the requirements of the condition. The achievable visibility splays should be clearly shown and measured on a plan in the industry standard format, as set out in Manual for Streets (Section 7.7 – Visibility Splays at Junctions), with an 'X' distance of 2.4m.

- **Stage1 Road Safety Audit (RSA);** As required by the condition the RSA brief was agreed with the Highway Authority. The RSA identifies 5 problems, which include the proposed ramped asphalt transition used to bridge the kerb face, which will extend into the and carriageway in the order of 1 metre, and the need for measures to prevent surface water runoff from the access road discharging on to Fall Lane, issues raised previously in these comments.

- **Designer's Response;** The Designer's Response provided to address the problems raised by the RSA has been reviewed. It is considered that Problems 1.2 to 1.5 can be satisfactorily addressed and that the solutions proposed are considered appropriate. It is considered that Problem 1.1 as set out below together with the Auditor's recommendation has not been satisfactorily addressed and that the Designer's proposed solution is not acceptable.

***"Problem 1.1** - The kerb face at this location is less than the typical kerb height of 0.1m to 0.125m and is estimated at around 0.05 – 0.06m. A typical gradient of 1 in 20 over 50mm rise would produce a ramp length of 1.0m (less any reduction caused by the cambered road profile). The concern is that a ramp of these dimensions would create a hazard in the wheel track of vehicles and in particular cyclists / powered two wheelers who would need to negotiate the leading and trailing edges of the ramp in conjunction with the carriageway long fall and cross fall on the ramp. This could lead to a cyclist or riders of powered two wheelers becoming unseated or swerving to avoid the ramp obstruction. Alternatively, cyclists / powered two wheelers could endeavour to go round the obstruction forcing passing vehicles into the hatched area or head on into a cyclist using the contra flow cycle lane.*

***Recommendation**: Provide dropped kerbs and adjust the footway surface level. Alternately, if this cannot be accommodated because of the services in the footway provide road markings to taper the running lane passed the transition ramp together with appropriate traffic management measures on the assumption that there is sufficient lane width taking in to account the mix of vehicles including cyclists / powered two wheelers and the proximity of the contra flow cycle lane."*

The view of HDM is that the use of steel road plates with ramped asphalt transitions is not an acceptable access solution for an access that is expected to be operational for in the order of 2 years and that a formal dropped vehicular crossing should be provided. The proposed traffic management and white lining solution may be acceptable, subject to confirming lane widths (vehicle running lane and contraflow cycle lane) and vehicle tracking, as a one-off short-term solution just to get heavy plant on site, which I understand is programme critical. Notwithstanding, a longer-term permanent access solution, e.g. dropped crossing, will be required for the duration of the works.