

**Consultation Response from KC, Highways Development Management (HDM)****2025/92776 land at, Eastfield, Shepley, Huddersfield, HD8 8HB****Outline application, with all matters reserved, for residential development with associated open space, landscaping, drainage infrastructure and associated works****Date Responded: 26/03/26 | Responding Officer: A.Darwin | Responding Ref: 12-39/22****RECOMMENDATION:**

Further information and amendments are required, as summarised below (see main text for full details):

- Access arrangements for the retained farmland to be confirmed;
- Updated indicative DYL proposals at Lea Drive / Abbey Road junction to be provided (to be finalised once updated traffic modelling completed);
- Travel Plan to be updated, including more detailed accessibility review;
- Updated Traffic modelling to be provided, taking into account updated accessibility review / proposals, robust / Vision-led assessment methodology and omission of one-way proposal on Knowle Park Avenue.

**Development Overview:**

Planning permission is sought for a residential development on agricultural land accessed from Eastfield, Shepley. The submission information indicates that the site has a developable area of 3.47 Ha (as confirmed on Land Use Parameter Plan P25-0749\_DE\_001\_0101 dated 03/12/25), and that this may accommodate up to 110 dwellings (this equates to a development density of 32 dwellings per hectare (dph)).

The supporting Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan (TP) have been based on the above indicative scale of development. However, to ensure an efficient use of land, it would normally be expected that a development density of 35 dph is achieved. Whilst it is appreciated that a lower scale of development (e.g. the suggested 110 dwellings) may ultimately be proposed, given that the application is in outline only, the higher density of up to 35 dph should be utilised for transport assessment purposes, to ensure a robust assessment is undertaken. Therefore, the assessments should be updated to consider this higher development density, which would equate to up to 121 dwellings (35 dph x 3.47ha).

The supporting information indicates that 35% of the proposed dwellings would be provided as affordable housing. At this outline planning stage, it is not known the type / mix of housing that would be proposed. However, it is envisaged that the housing mix for the affordable and open market units are likely to be broadly similar (as required by Council policy). Therefore, for assessment purposes, the proposed tenure of the dwellings is not considered to significantly affect the transport implications of the proposals (e.g. a lower trip rate should not be used for the affordable housing use).

The proposals were subject to a pre-application enquiry in 2025. As part of this enquiry, the applicant submitted a scoping study note that included various queries relating to transport matters. HDM provided feedback on the applicants scoping study note, with the HDM responses included in Appendix B of the submitted Transport Assessment report. The applicant has taken into account some of the pre-application feedback provided by HDM. However, there are various issues where further information / amendments are required – see further comments below.

**Reference to Documents:**

- Transport Assessment (by AMA dated 25<sup>th</sup> September 2025);
- Travel Plan (by AMA dated 25<sup>th</sup> September 2025);
- Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (by AMA dated 9<sup>th</sup> September 2025);
- Planning Statement (by Banks Property, undated).

### **Access and Road Safety**

Access to the development site is currently provided by a gated access at the southern end of Eastfield. This access is proposed to be upgraded by an extension of Eastfield to serve the proposed residential development. This is acceptable in principle, and further details will need to be agreed at the reserved matters stage and secured by condition.

The existing site access also serves further agricultural land to the south and west of the development site that is within the same land ownership. It is unclear from the submission information how this undeveloped agricultural land would continue to be served following development. However, it appears that the land may also benefit from an existing access via Lea Head. Further clarification is required from the applicant on this matter, confirming how the continued access to the undeveloped farmland will be maintained following development.

Access to the wider highway network is gained via existing residential streets, including Eastgate, Lea Drive and Knowle Park Avenue. These streets include circa 5.5m wide carriageways, with 1.8m footways on both sides, are street lit and subject to a 30mph speed limit. The existing street geometry is not in full accordance with current design guidance, including a lack of visitor parking bays and traffic calming features. As such, HDM advised the applicant at the pre-application stage to investigate these issues further and propose a package of traffic calming features that should aim to achieve a design speed of 20mph (e.g. features with a spacing of 60m, in accordance with the Kirklees Highway Design Guide SPD). It was recommended that the preferred option for traffic calming features would be speed tables at junctions and other appropriate locations, rather than speed cushions. No such features have currently been proposed. Therefore, it is recommended that a package of traffic calming features is secured by a pre-commencement planning condition, with the preliminary arrangements identified at the reserved matters stage, which should complement features proposed within the development. Whilst the details of these traffic calming features can be secured by condition, the expectation is that the following would be proposed:

- Raised tables (with associated footway / kerb / dropped crossing alterations) at the Eastfield / Knowle Park Avenue, Eastfield / Lea Drive and Knowle Park Avenue / Lea Drive junctions.
- Full width raised table (minimum 5m long) features on Eastfield on the 100m length between the Knowle Park Avenue and Lea Drive junctions, and on the 130m length of Knowle Park Avenue between the Lea Drive and The Knowle junction.

To consider the on-street parking demand of residents on the local residential streets, the applicant has obtained over-night parking surveys, which were undertaken on Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> and Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> June 2025 (the survey data was not included in original TA, but has subsequently been submitted). The survey data indicated that only minimal on-street parking occurred over-night within the residential streets that serve the site (6 and 7 vehicle were recorded on the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> of June respectively). Therefore, this does not indicate significant issues relating to on-street parking by existing residents, which would impact access to/from the development site.

However, based on HDM's on-site observations and as raised in numerous public comments, significant on-street parking occurs on the adjacent residential streets at school drop-off / pick-up times. This appears to predominantly occur on Stonecroft Gardens due to the footpath link that is available to Shepley First School, but also occurs on the initial section of Lea Drive between the Stonecroft Gardens and Abbey Road junction. As such, the development has proposed double yellow lines (DYL) for the initial 15-20m length of Lea Drive from its junction with Abbey Road, to ensure that on-street parking does not impact the operation of the junction, which would be intensified in use following development. The Council Highway Safety Team have confirmed that these localised DYL proposals are acceptable in principle, with the extent of any DYL restrictions subject to the formal Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) and associated public consultation process in due course, should the development proceed. These DYL proposals would also include the Lea Drive / Abbey Road junction itself (see further comments below relating to this junction). To enable the DYL TRO to be pursued, a Section 106 of contribution of **£10,000** will need to be secure to the development.

At the pre-application stage, HDM highlighted a number of physical and operational constraints on The Knowle and at the The Knowle / Abbey Road junction that would effect vehicular access to the development site. This included the following issues (which are not necessarily an exhaustive list):

- Sub-standard stagger distance and ghost island arrangements at The Knowle / A629 Abbey Road / Yew Tree Road junction;
- Below standard carriageway width on The Knowle. This includes sections between Knowle Park Avenue and the A629 Abbey Road that are only circa 4.5m wide, which is insufficient to allow HGV's (e.g. those accessing Shepley Spring) to pass cars, and is only sufficient to allow cars to pass at slow speed.
- Restricted forward visibility for vehicles turning left into The Knowle from Abbey Road, which makes it difficult to observe oncoming traffic heading towards the A629 (e.g. northwestbound traffic).
- Potential visibility constraints at the Knowle Park Avenue / The Knowle junction.

At the pre-application stage, HDM suggested that the applicant should consider the above issues in more detail and determine whether any mitigation measures could be delivered by the development, to ensure that safe and efficient access could be maintained along The Knowle. This included a suggestion that a one-way system could be investigated on the northern section of Knowle Park Avenue, which would make it exit only from Knowle Park Avenue to the Knowle. This option was suggested as it would have diverted inbound traffic to the existing and proposed residential development served by this route, to the Lea Drive / Abbey Road junction instead. This would then reduce the number of vehicles meeting on the narrow section of The Knowle, and reduce the risk of vehicles being held up and blocking back towards Abbey Road. However, HDM also advised that this option was unlikely to be popular with existing residents, and local views should be sought by the applicant as part of any public consultation exercise they intended to carry out in advance of the submission.

The applicant has now proposed a one-way system on Knowle Park Avenue. However, this has been proposed in the opposite direction to that suggested by HDM. The rationale provided by the applicant for this, is due to their view that there is restricted visibility at the Knowle Park Avenue / The Knowle junction. HDM have checked the visibility splays at this junction based on the topographical survey information provided with the submission. This indicates that visibility splays in excess of 2.4x28m (measured to the nearside wheeltrack position) are available at the junction, which are adequate based on the recorded speed data provided in the TA (19-22mph at ATC 2 and ATC 3). Therefore, the applicant's rationale for providing the one-way route in the southbound direction is not accepted by HDM.

Notwithstanding the above, it is now apparent that there are significant local concerns regarding making Knowle Park Avenue one-way (these concerns would be valid, whichever direction a one-way system was proposed). The most significant concern that has been raised relates to the potential impact of the proposal during icy/snow conditions, due to the steep gradient on the initial section of Lea Drive (up to 1:8 based on the submitted topographical survey data). Local residents have highlighted that snow / ice can make Lea Drive unusable for many people during these adverse weather conditions, with residents needing to use the less steep (circa 1:16) route via Knowle Park Avenue instead. HDM acknowledges these local concerns and agrees that the one-way proposal (in either direction) should not be pursued.

As the Knowle Park Avenue one-way proposal is not an acceptable option, it is considered that the development should instead contribute towards alternative measures, to enable the increase in development traffic via The Knowle to be accommodated, ensuring that safe and efficient operation of the route is maintained following development. However, as existing traffic flows along The Knowle are currently relatively light, and as no personal injury accidents have been recorded on this section of highway within the last 5 years (as confirmed in the TA), it is considered that any mitigation measures are best determined following full occupation of the development, should they become necessary. Therefore, to enable future mitigation measures to be delivered, a Section 106 of contribution of **£50,000** should be provided by the development. This contribution has been agreed as being appropriate with the Council Highway Safety Team, and is commensurate with the likely costs that would have been incurred in delivering a one-way scheme, thus enabling mitigation works of a similar scale to be delivered, if necessary. These works could include signing / lining works, footway improvements, new/amended TRO's or other appropriate works identified in future by the Highway Safety Team. It is suggested that this contribution would need to be retained for a period of 5 years following full occupation of the

development, with any unspent funds returned after this time should they not be required. To ensure flexibility over the mitigation works that could be delivered, it is recommended that the definition of the works in the S106 agreement should state: *'Off-site highway works contribution, to enable highway safety and/or operational improvements along The Knowle, Knowle Park Avenue and / or Abbey Road'*.

At the pre-application stage, HDM identified a number of potential deficiencies at the Lea Drive / Abbey Road junction. This included sub-standard (e.g. narrow width and length) ghost island right turn lane arrangements, and potentially restricted junction visibility from the minor arm, including obstruction of visibility by on-street parking to the southwest of the junction. The applicant was advised to investigate these matters further, including obtaining topographical survey and speed survey data to determine whether any improvements may be possible at the junction.

The applicant has provided topographical survey data, which confirms that the Abbey Road carriageway is circa 7.6m wide within the vicinity of the junction. Therefore, it is clear that there is no scope to significantly improve the ghost island right turn lane arrangements. As such, HDM have considered whether there is merit in removing the current sub-standard ghost island markings. However, it is considered that whilst the current arrangements provide only limited benefit, as the circa 1.5m wide right turn lane does not provide sufficient width to accommodate a car, it does provide harbourage for two-wheeled vehicles and should therefore be retained.

It is noted that the junction modelling (to be updated – see further traffic modelling comments below) included within the TA has been undertaken correctly on the basis that right turner blocking occurs with a single vehicle waiting to turn right into Lea Drive. Therefore, the sub-standard width of the ghost island right turn lane has been taken into account in the assessment.

The TA also includes speed data on Abbey Road, which was obtained using a one-week automatic traffic counter (ATC) located to the northeast of the Lea Drive junction. The location of the ATC survey was agreed in advance with HDM, to ensure that robust speed data was obtained in a location where free flow traffic occurs. The speed data indicated 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds of 36.1mph and 34.4mph in the eastbound and westbound directions respectively. Based on these recorded speeds, visibility splays of up to 2.4x58m and 2.4x55m would typically be required from the Lea Drive minor arm of the junction. Drawing AMA-23174-SK-006 P02 included in Appendix F of the TA confirms that these visibility splays are available within the highway boundary.

Based on HDM site visit observations, the visibility splay looking to the southwest of the Lea Drive junction towards northeastbound traffic on Abbey Road is often obscured by parked cars associated with the adjacent properties, and to a lesser extent by school related traffic. This could be fully addressed by extending the proposed DYL on the initial section of Lea Drive, so that the DYL's extend along Abbey Road in front of the adjacent dwellings. However, given that no turning related collisions have been recorded at the junction (as confirmed in the accident analysis in the TA, there have been no recorded PIA's at the junction in the last 5 years of any type) and as parking restrictions would be detrimental to the amenity of the existing occupiers of these properties, it is not considered necessary to introduce extensive DYL within the vicinity of the junction at this time. That said, the indicative DYL proposals shown on drawing AMA-23174-SK-006 P02 should be extended slightly to cover a 10m length either side of the junction (measured from the projection of the minor arm e.g. 2-3m further than currently shown) and for the same length on the opposite side of the junction. A bar marking (circa 5m long) should also be indicated in front of the dropped vehicle crossing for No. 219 Abbey Road, located immediately southwest of the proposed DYL markings, to prevent parking from blocking the access, and further discouraging parking within the immediate vicinity of the junction. These indicative DYL / bar marking proposals should be finalised once the junction modelling has been updated (see further comments below) and the peak queuing information has been confirmed. However, based on the junction modelling information provided to date, it is not expected that any additional changes to the DYL proposals would be necessary.

The above DYL and bar markings will assist by ensuring junction visibility is not significantly constrained by parked cars following initial occupation of the development, but with limited impact on existing highway users (e.g. as the suggested DYL proposals only reinforce general parking prohibitions that already exist in line with the highway code). However, should visibility (or other) related issues arise in future that require remedial works, there would be scope to increase the DYL restrictions (or other appropriate works) in future, by utilising the aforementioned *'Off-site highway works contribution'*.

The development will increase vehicular traffic along Abbey Road, as well as pedestrian crossing demand at the existing Zebra crossing on Abbey Road located to the southwest of the Lea Drive junction. This crossing provides the main crossing point that links the site to the various amenities in Shepley village centre. Based on HDM's on-site observations, and as raised in a number of the public comments, the pedestrian crossing can be difficult to use at peak times due to the speed & volume of passing traffic, and as pedestrian visibility to/from the crossing can be obscured by parked cars. This is particularly the case for less able/confident pedestrians, who can find it more difficult to establish priority at Zebra crossings (See TSM Chapter 6 for further advice on this point).

Therefore, it is considered that the development should upgrade the crossing to a signal controlled 'Puffin' type crossing. This matter has been discussed with the Councils Highway Safety and UTMC Teams, who have agreed that in this instance the improvement can be secured via a Section 106 contribution of **£100,000** (rather than via a planning condition and S278 agreement with associated commuted sums). These works will also need to include associated signage, road markings and other physical features to ensure that the crossing is conspicuous and to encourage slower traffic speeds on the approaches (particularly the northeastbound downhill approach). This S106 funding should be secured with a prior to commencement trigger, to enable the improvement works to be delivered in advance of occupation of the development.

### **Accessibility and Travel Plan:**

The supporting information included in the Transport Assessment and Travel Plan provides a high-level review of the accessibility of the site by non-car modes, and concludes that the site is considered to be sustainability located, in accordance with local and national policy objectives. These reports also suggest that a Vision-led approach to transport planning has been undertaken, in accordance with current national policy.

HDM agrees that the site is well located within Shepley village, where there are a range of local facilities that would be accessible by non-car modes, including education, medical, retail and leisure uses. In particular, the site's proximity to Shepley First School (and the associated nursery) are of particular benefit, subject to high quality pedestrian and cycle access being provided. However, the Transport Vision for the site has not been clearly articulated in the TA/TP, nor has detailed consideration been given to access by sustainable transport modes. Instead, the assessment only considers the proximity of local facilities, without detailed consideration of how they would be accessed via sustainable transport modes.

Therefore, a more detailed qualitative and quantitative assessment of the site's accessibility by sustainable transport modes should be provided (as was requested by HDM at the pre-app stage). This should then identify proportionate measures (in addition to the Puffin crossing upgrade on Abbey Road mentioned above) to facilitate and encourage access by sustainable transport modes, which should align with a clear transport vision for the development. This information should be set out in an updated Travel Plan, which should then inform the revised traffic assessment modelling that is required (see further comments below).

HDM have consulted the PROW Team regarding the proposals, who have requested that a Section 106 contribution of **£30,000** is provided to enable a 2-3m wide flexi-pave path to be provided through the recreation ground land to the south of the site, which would upgrade the route of PROW KIR/143/20. This would then provide a good quality / all-weather active travel route from the northwest corner of the site boundary to Shepley First School. This S106 funding should again be secured with a prior to commencement trigger, to enable the works to be delivered in advance of occupation of the development.

The illustrate masterplan provided with the submission also suggests that a further pedestrian link to PROW KIR/143/20 could be provided along the southern site boundary, leading in the direction of the war memorial. However, no firm commitment to this proposal, or details of what would be provided have been included with the submission. Therefore, the applicant should clarify what is intended, and confirm how this footpath link would be delivered, as it would require land beyond the site's redline boundary (but within their wider land ownership as shown within the site's blue line boundary).

A planning condition will be required to secure the above active travel links. It is expected that these would be hard surfaced paths that are a minimum of 3m wide, and will require BS compliant gates at the site boundaries.

HDM have consulted with WYCA regarding the proposals, who have provided a formal response that is included alongside these comments. WYCA have requested that the following be provided by the development to enhance the development accessibility by public transport, which should be secured via S106 agreement:

- New Realtime Information (RTI) display at the 'The Black Bull (Stop ID 45017221)' bus stop on Abbey Road = **£12,000**;
- New RTI display at the 'Lea Drive (Stop ID 45026150)' bus stop on Abbey Road = **£12,000**;
- New Bus Shelter at 'Lea Drive (Stop ID 45026150)' bus stop on Abbey Road = **£20,000**;
- Sustainable Transport Fund or Residential MCard Scheme, based on Countywide Bus and Rail Zones 1 to 5, which currently costs £1,191.74 per dwelling.

It is noted that the applicant had already confirmed agreement to provide the Residential MCard Scheme in the submitted Travel Plan. This is currently based on the lower cost of the Bus and Rail Zones 2 to 5 MCard, which is currently provided at the discounted price of **£832.37 per dwelling**. Given the financial contributions that have already been identified above, to provide off-site pedestrian improvements (e.g. Puffin crossing upgrade on Abbey Road and the PROW link improvement), and as additional active travel measures may be identified by the applicant once the more detailed qualitative and quantitative accessibility assessment has been undertaken, HDM considers that the lower cost MCard option that the applicant has already committed to is acceptable in this instance. However, it is recommended that the contribution is secured in the S106 agreement as a Sustainable Transport Fund (STF), as this would allow greater flexibility over the use of the funding. This funding could then be used for a range of Travel Plan measures (including the MCard scheme) such as discounted rail tickets to a wider range of destinations (e.g. locations in South Yorkshire not covered by the MCard scheme). This S106 funding should be secured with a prior to occupation trigger, although there may be scope for phased payments (e.g. phased payment of 50% at initial occupation and remaining payment at 50% occupation). This S106 funding should be secured on a non-returnable basis, so there is no incentive for the Travel Plan not to fully utilise the funding. Any unspent funds following the 5-year formal monitoring period of the Travel Plan could then be utilised for sustainable transport measures in the local area (e.g. additional PROW improvements).

Kirklees Council requires a Travel Plan Monitoring contribution for all sites where a formal Travel Plan is required, to cover the Council's costs in monitoring the Travel Plan process (note this does not cover the development costs for implementing/monitoring the Travel Plan, which must be funded separately by the developer). For a development of this scale, which is classed as a 'small major' residential development, the fee is **£10,000** (£2,000 for the minimum 5-year monitoring period following occupation).

In addition to the above issues, the following points should also be addressed in the updated Travel Plan:

- Whilst high-level objectives and targets have been identified, these need to be aligned with the Transport Vision for the development. The Transport Vision and associated targets also need to be realistic, and consistent with the transport assessment methodology. HDM consider that a 10% reduction in single occupancy car trips identified in the TP is likely to be a realistic target, but should be based on the modal split for all trips and not just commuter trips. The suggestion in the TA that a 20% reduction in vehicle trips is proposed as the Vision-led target is not considered to be realistic and should be reviewed. Any targets that are included need to be clearly aligned to the proposed sustainable transport measures that are proposed, which is not currently considered to be the case (e.g. a significant increase in cycle use has been assumed in the TA, without any significant measures being proposed that support and validate this assumption).
- Once realistic Vision-led targets and associated measures have been identified, the monitoring and review mechanism needs to confirm what additional measures are to be provided should targets not be met, which should be more than additional information provision, as this is a standard measure that is required in any case.
- In addition to questionnaire surveys, traffic count data should form part of the standard annual monitoring process, to ensure that vehicle trip rate targets are being achieved. As a minimum, a 1-week ATC survey at the site access should be identified.
- Whilst the final details of the development cycle parking will need to be secured by condition, further clarification of what is likely to be proposed should be identified in the Travel Plan. At present there is conflicted information in the TP and TA, which suggests that either 1 cycle space per dwelling or 1 space

per bedroom is proposed (the TP should commit to provide parking in line with LTN 1/20 e.g. 1 space per bedroom, with the minimum size/quality identified);

- The mechanism for delivery of the Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) measures should be confirmed. This needs to confirm agreement of measures with the LPA prior to occupation, and then on an ongoing basis as part of the annual monitoring / action plan. As part of this process, the S106 funding would be released back to the TPC to allow the agreed annual action plan measures to be delivered, and the LPA will require proof of expenditure as part of this process.
- The TP should include a more detailed qualitative and quantitative assessment of the site's accessibility, and propose measures that maximise the accessibility of the site. This should also be informed by the DFT Connectivity Tool. Given the relatively limited public transport and cycling facilities in the local area, it is likely that walking will provide the greatest opportunity for encouraging sustainable transport use, with Shepley including a relatively good range of local facilities that are accessible within a reasonable walking distance of the site.

### **Traffic Assessment**

An updated traffic assessment and junction modelling should be provided in a technical note, to take account of the removal of the one-way proposals on Knowle Park Avenue.

The updated assessment should also take into account the following issues:

- Traffic flow diagrams were missing from the original TA and must be provided for the updated assessment. The base traffic count data should also be provided in the report, with the data files also provided to HDM to enable further analysis, if necessary.
- The trip rate assessment should include a more robust baseline assessment, and a realistic (see above comments regarding the TP) Vision-led scenario assessment, which takes account of all proposed sustainable transport measures. The assessment should also be undertaken based on up to 121 dwellings being proposed, which is based on the potential development density of up to 35dph.
- The current vehicle trip rates utilised in the TA are not considered to provide a robust assessment for the baseline scenario. These trip rates should take into account local factors, including public transport accessibility and car ownership levels etc.
- At the pre-application stage, it was requested that any proposed trip rates should be compared to the existing trip rates associated with the existing residential development served from Lea Drive and Knowle Park Avenue. However, this validation assessment has not been provided. Whilst there is only limited traffic data included in the current TA (as traffic flow diagrams are missing, and only the ATC 24hr traffic flow data has been included), HDM have utilised the 24hr 5-day average ATC traffic data contained in the TA to check the robustness of the proposed vehicle trip rates. The ATC data indicates that there are currently 667 two-way vehicle movements (508 from ATC 2 + 537 from ATC3 – 378 from ATC4 = 667) utilising Knowle Park Avenue and Lea Drive. Therefore, based on the circa 94 dwellings served by these streets, this equates to a 24hr vehicle trip rate of circa 7.1 two-way vehicle trips per dwelling. However, the daily trip rates identified in the proposed TRICS data contained in Appendix I of the TA identifies a daily trip rate of 4.1 two-way trips per dwellings. Therefore, it appears that the current vehicle trip rates under-estimate the baseline trip rate for the development. This should be reviewed further as part of the updated traffic assessment, including a review of the weekday peak hour and daily trip rates, compared to the current local trip rates, to ensure that a robust baseline scenario is assessed.
- The development traffic distribution should be informed by the existing traffic flows to/from the existing residential estate, and turning proportions at the junctions to be assessed. The TA suggests that this has been done. However, the report includes various errors, and lacks the supporting information that it purports to include, including various missing or incorrectly labelled appendices (e.g. not all ATC data included in Appendix F, Flow diagrams and/or TEMPRO growth rates not in Appendix C, Committed development flows and/or Traffic Distribution information not in Appendix G etc).
- Further details of how multi-modal trip rates have been derived needs to be clarified. It is recommended that this is based on modal split data obtained from TRICS, rather than manipulating vehicle trip rates using travel to work census data. These modal splits should then be adjusted to suit the Vision-led transport scenario, utilising a realistic modal shift that aligns with the proposed TP targets.

- The JUNCTION 9 modelling provided generally appears to include appropriate input parameters. However, the single lane minor arm widths should be reviewed, as they appear to over-estimate the available widths. The junction modelling at The Knowle / Abbey Road / Yew Tree Road should also be modelled as a staggered junction, rather than a crossroads. When the revised modelling information is resubmitted, the JUNCTION 9 input files should also be provided to HDM to assist with checking.

**Construction Traffic Management Plan and Highway Condition Surveys:**

The applicant has provided a Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) with the submission, which is welcomed. The report confirms that a full CTMP will be secured by condition and would be informed by the nominated contractor requirements in due course. This is the standard approach used in Kirklees, and it is acceptable for these details to be secured by condition.

The framework document suggests that construction traffic will utilise Lea Drive rather than The Knowle. Whilst HDM agrees that this is likely to be the most suitable option. This will need to be considered further once the full CTMP is produced. It is noted that the steep gradient issues on the initial section of Lea Drive (circa 1:8) will need to be taken into account in the routing proposals, and may limit the size/type of vehicles that can be used. Construction vehicle movements would also need to be undertaken outside of school start/finish time periods.

The framework document also suggests that highway condition surveys may be required. It is confirmed that these will be required, including pre-start and post-completion surveys, which would determine whether any remediation measures are required. These requirements will need to be secured by a pre-commencement condition.

**Conclusion:**

Further information and amendments required.

**Recommend Planning Conditions and S106 requirements:**

To be confirmed in full in due course. However, currently envisaged to include the following:

**Planning Conditions:**

- Construction Traffic Management Plan;
- Highway Condition Surveys and Remediation;
- Site access details and traffic calming measures on local residential streets (including Stage 1 Road Safety Audit);
- Details of active travel links into and through the site;
- Internal access arrangement details (including Stage 1 Road Safety Audit);
- Cycle parking;
- Waste Storage and collection arrangements (temporary and permanent);
- Full Travel Plan.

**S106 Requirements:**

- Off-site Highway Works Contribution (for future highway safety/operation mitigation) - £50,000;
- Abbey Road Pedestrian Crossing (Puffin) Upgrade Contribution - £100,000;
- Abbey Road / Lea Drive TRO Contribution - £10,000;
- PROW KIR/143/20 Upgrade Contribution - £30,000;
- Bus Stop Improvement Contribution - £44,000;
- Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) - £832.37 per dwelling (estimated at £100,716.77 based on up to 121 dwellings);
- Travel Plan Monitoring Fee - £10,000;
- Travel Plan Co-ordinator and implementation requirements.