

**Consultation Response from KC,  
Highways Development Management**

**2024/92713 adj, Forrest Way, 1 A, Longfield Road, Heckmondwike, WF16 9EJ**

**Erection of detached dwelling**

**Date Responded: 28-1-2025.**

**Responding Officer: Mark Berry.**

**Responding Ref: 9-11SE-1.**

This application seeks approval to the erection of a 5 bedroomed detached dwelling at land adjacent to Forrest Way, 1 A, Longfield Road, Heckmondwike.

Two off-street parking spaces are shown to the frontage of the proposed dwelling.

Access and parking arrangements to the existing dwelling Forrest Way are unchanged by these proposals.

Site History

2008/93544 erection of 12 dwelling - Withdrawn

2009/91311 erection of 11 dwellings - Refused. It was considered that the increase in vehicular traffic on the lane to the rear of Longfield Road would be detrimental to pedestrian and vehicular safety contrary to Policy T10 of the adopted Kirklees Unitary Development Plan.

2010/91444 for the erection of 11 dwellings - Refused but approved at appeal.

This proposal did however include a condition requiring a scheme detailing improvements of the existing access road, including the details of its junction with Cemetery Road.

2022/93390- approved but against highways advice -- The Planning Officers report as follows:

*"It is noted that KC Highways Development Management (HDM) have objected to the proposal on the basis that the Kirklees Highway Design Guide states that new development serving more than five dwellings (or any existing private road which will serve more than five dwellings after completion of new development) should be laid out to an adoptable standard and be able to be offered for adoption. The width of Cemetery Road, therefore, would need to be widened to a minimum of 5.5 metres along its full length and be constructed to an adoptable standard.*

*Due to the constraints of the site, and the proximity of the access to neighbouring properties, it is not possible for the applicant to widen the access. This being said, the applicant has stated that they would be resurfacing the road as part of the proposal and widening the T-junction where it meets Cemetery Road. It would be a 4.8m width with a 6m radii off the southern side. This does not meet the required visibility splays in the strictest terms, however the applicant has stated they would be providing a mirror to overcome this*

*Overall, it is considered, on balance, that the public benefit of providing five new dwellings, and*

*bringing a currently vacant site into use, overcomes the potential harm to highway safety as a result of the proposal”*

Highways Development Management (HDM) comments as follows

As stated in the Highways consultation response attached to the 2022 permission “The site is accessed via Cemetery Road, which is an unadopted highway and is unsurfaced and poorly maintained. The width of the road is approximately 3m along its full length which means that that two vehicles cannot pass each other and, therefore, two-way traffic flows cannot be achieved causing conflict between vehicles accessing/egressing the site. As a result, it is considered that intensifying the use of this substandard road would be detrimental to highway safety at this location and could not be supported by Highways Development Management”.

In addition to the above, the recommended standards for Emergency Access are as follows:

there should be a minimum carriageway width of 3.7 m between kerbs.

there should be vehicle access for a pump appliance within 45 m of single-family houses.

a vehicle access route may be a road or other route; and

Turning facilities should be provided on cul-de-sac roads/driveways exceeding 20m in length

As far as this proposal is concerned the carriageway width is less than 3.7m and turning facilities are not provided.

No improvements are proposed to the section of Cemetery Road leading to the site.

Only 2 off-street parking spaces are shown to the frontage of the proposed dwelling. 3 is the recommended standard for a 5 bedroomed house.

Given the above HDM have little option other than to conclude that this proposal results in intensifying the use of this substandard road which would be detrimental to highway safety at this location and could not be supported.