

From: Richard Peach
Sent: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 08:54
To: Jon Beeson; Baily Hargreaves; Tim Davis; Charlotte Shaw

Subject: RE: Netherton Updates.

Hi Jon,

Thank you for providing the latest Site layout, I can confirm that my previous comments regarding junction visibility have been addressed and I have updated the **IN/01/A & IN/02/A** drawings accordingly – which are attached.

With respect to the swept path analysis, please find attached the updated **ATR/01/C & ATR/02/C** which have also been updated to display the latest Site layout. Please note that when these drawings are submitted to the Council, it may be beneficial to use the supporting information provided in my email below (dated 17th October).

I trust this is satisfactory.

Kind regards,

Richard

Richard Peach
Transport Planner
Optima Highways & Transportation



CONFIDENTIAL

This e-mail is confidential to the person(s) to whom it is addressed. If you have received a copy in error, please delete it without disclosing its contents and inform the sender by return email.

Email communications cannot be guaranteed to be secure, or free from computer viruses, therefore Optima Highways and Transportation Consultancy Ltd does not accept legal responsibility for this message or its contents. The recipient is responsible for checking this message for viruses and verifying its authenticity and any views or opinions presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Optima Highways and Transportation Consultancy Ltd.

Registered address - Leigh House 28-32 St Paul's Street, Leeds, LS1 2JT
Company Registration Number: 07328946

From: Richard Peach
Sent: 17 October 2025 10:49
To: Jon Beeson; Jon Dunbavin; Michael Nickson

Subject: RE: Netherton Updates.

Hi Jon,

Further to your email below, please find attached the updated swept path analysis and visibility drawings in PDF and CAD format. We had previously undertaken the requested swept path analysis, junction and forward visibility on Rev C of the Site Layout however, after checking Rev D of the Site layout this morning, our findings remain the same which are as follows:

Junction & Forward Visibility

- For the junction visibility, drawing '25041/IN/01' shows the visibility splays at each junction which have been tested in respect of a 20mph design speed (2.4m x 25m) and, in most cases, can be achieved satisfactorily within the adopted highway;
- As highlighted by the Council's S38 team, the visitor parking spaces adjacent to Plots 30 & 53 are slightly impacted by junction visibility and should be located further away from the junctions;
- At the junction adjacent Plot 17, a tree falls within the visibility splay and we would recommend this is relocated;
- Junction visibility has also been tested at the junction adjacent to Plot 3. As this is a shared surface street, we have tested for a 15mph design speed (2.4m x 17m) in accordance with the Council's highway design guide and we would argue that all traffic will be turning left at this junction so will need to slow down to carry out this manoeuvre. However, even allowing for this reduced visibility splay there would be an impact on the parking space of Plot 3 if the splay is measured to the kerb line. Nonetheless, it is advised in MfS2 and is indicated by the Council that it is acceptable to measure visibility to the nearside wheel track rather than the kerb edge, meaning that the 17m visibility splay can avoid the parking space of Plot 3; and
- With respect to forward visibility, we have tested this along the bend adjacent to Plots 40/41 and works satisfactorily for a 20mph design speed (25m) – this is shown on the attached '25041/IN/02' drawing.

Swept Path Analysis

- We have carried out the requested swept path analysis for the standard 11.85m Kirclees refuse vehicle to demonstrate that it can manoeuvre satisfactorily within the southernmost turning head and around parked cars throughout the layout– this is shown on the attached '25041/ATR/01/B' drawing;
- We have found that parked vehicles would not impede access for refuse vehicles throughout the layout and a refuse vehicle and large car can pass simultaneously along straighter sections of the layout. However, at bends, we believe it is not necessary to accommodate a refuse vehicle and large car passing simultaneously as this will result in an unnecessarily wide carriageway around the bends. In addition to this, the Council state within their highways design guide that '*where adequate forward visibility is provided between oncoming vehicles, it may be possible for large vehicles to wait until a bend is clear and to use part of the opposite lane when turning*', this approach is also supported by MfS;
- Furthermore, widening has already taken place around the bend increasing the standard carriageway width from 5.5m to 6.1m (this widening was agreed with the Council within the previous '2023/93503' planning application) and, as the carriageway width throughout the Site aligns with standards set out within their design guide, it is unnecessary and undesirable to provide any further widening as this would disbenefit pedestrians, the visual appearance of the Site and create an even more highways dominated layout (something that MfS and other similar guidance seeks to avoid) – I trust on this basis the tracking provides sufficient information that demonstrates that refuse vehicles can access the entire site and where necessary pass parked vehicles; and
- With respect to delivery vehicle swept path analysis, this works satisfactorily and is shown in the attached '25041/ATR/02/B' drawing.

I trust this is satisfactory.

Kind regards,

Richard

Richard Peach
Transport Planner
Optima Highways & Transportation

