

**Consultation Response from KC,
Highways Development Management**
2026/91763 Land off Barnsley Road, Denby Dale, Huddersfield,
Erection of 40 residential dwellings and associated works
Date Responded: 24/08/2026
Responding Officer: CNB
Responding Ref: k17-20/3

This application is for the erection of 40 dwellings with access and associated works at a site fronting on to A635 Barnsley Road, a 40mph two-way single carriageway main distributor road of approximately 8.2m width with a footway on the side of the site and street lighting present.

The site is approximately 1.1km from stops on a high frequency bus route (approx. 625m by PROW, however we don't know the condition of the PROWS or if they are suitable for all weather all year-round use). There are shops and services within the same walking distances with medical facilities just a little further away. The closest primary schools are approximately 2.5km away with the closest secondary school being approximately 4km away (although there is a school bus stop close to the site access on A635 Barnsley Road).

The DfT Connectivity Tool gives the site an overall (except driving) score of 47 and it is placed in Local Authority (Kirklees) band E.

This would give the site a low sustainability score and we would expect the proposals to be more car based than other more sustainably located sites.

There is a PROW, footpath DEN/66/40 runs adjacent to the side of the site and it is proposed to link the site to the PROW with a footpath to allow for pedestrian access to and from the PROW. The join between the proposed footway and the PROW should be agreed by the Kirklees PROW team and no unauthorised changes to the width and surfacing of the PROW should take place.

The site benefits from a previous approval for 30 dwellings under 23/91564. The changes between the approval and the current application are an increase in dwellings from 30 to 40, a slight rearrangement in the layout of the pumping station and attenuation tanks and the removal of some visitor parking lay-bys.

Sustainable Travel

A 2km cycle catchment area was submitted as part of the Transport Statement and this shows that a number of shops and services are within this cycle catchment, however no details of safe cycle routes to these destinations have been provided. There is no specific cycle infrastructure included within the proposals.

The site is below the threshold for the requirement for a Travel Plan, however we would still like to see the promotion of sustainable travel at the site and would request that a contribution for a sustainable Travel Fund is included within a s106 agreement, this should be for provision of bus only Residential Metro Cards for the dwellings or personalised travel planning. The cost for 40 dwellings would be approximately £20,800 but this may change with index linked rises in costs. The developer would be responsible for the administration of the Residential Metro card Scheme and should be done at the point of occupation. This should be conditioned.

Trip Rates and Traffic Generation

Trip rates were submitted with the application, and these are the same as the agreed trip rates for the previous approval 23/91564 and so are deemed acceptable.

The proposals are for 40 dwellings, an increase of 10 dwellings on the previous approval and as such are expected to generate approximately 33 two-way trips in the busiest peak hour, an increase of 8 two-way trips, and this would not be expected to have a severe impact on the operation or efficiency of the local highway network.

Access

The access from A635 Barnsley Road remains as approved within 23/91564 as a simple priority junction and this includes a pedestrian refuge island to the east of the site access and the formation of a kerbed and surfaced footway adjacent to the informal crossing to the south side of A635 Barnsley Road. The visibility splay to the left of 120m is indicated on the drawing and this should remain unobstructed with the wall set behind the sightline and the full splay, including any third party land that was required to form the splay, should be offered for adoption within a s38 agreement, this should be conditioned.

An independent Stage 1 Road Safety Audit was carried out for the previous permission and was found acceptable. As there are to be no changes to the junction from the approved then we would not require another stage 1 RSA to be carried out.

S278 Streetworks

These are indicated on Drawing No AMA/21154/SK018 Rev P03 and include improvements to the footway to the north side of Barnsley Road, a new section of footway to the south side of Barnsley Road and the introduction of a pedestrian refuge island to the east of the proposed access with appropriate tactile paving on both footways.

Internal Layout

The internal layout is shown on Site Layout Plan No 2530-SI-02 rev J.

All internal highway widths are a minimum of 5.5m with footways of 2m width, however it is noted that there is no footway to the front of plots number 2 to 6 and without a footway to the frontage of these dwellings the layout would not be acceptable for adoption by the Kirklees s38 team and would not conform to Kirklees policy on sustainable and active travel.

The access road is located on a sloping site heading downwards from Barnsley Road. Long sections were provided with the previous approval but are missing from the current application, these should be provided to show that any amendments to the layout have not affected the gradients and transitional curves and that they are still within local standards. Shared surfaces should have gradients of less than 1:20 to comply with the Equalities Act 2010 and any with gradients steeper than 1:20 should be constructed as type B residential streets with 2m footways.

A drawing should be submitted showing that 25m forward visibility is achievable on the speed-bend adjacent to plot 28 and that 2.4m x 25m visibility splays are achievable at the junctions near plot 10, the access to plots 12 - 15 and the turning head adjacent to the pumping station. Any obstructions to visibility i.e. street furniture, parking bays or landscaping etc should be removed or be no more than 0.9m in height. This can be added as a condition.

Tracking details for an 11.85m refuse vehicle entering/exiting the site and turning within the turning heads will need to be provided with the current application and this can be conditioned.

The access to the private drives should be over a dropped kerb crossing and ramps of a maximum gradient of 1:12 should be included as the transition from footway to shared surface. These should be clearly indicated on a drawing.

A drawing showing the roads to be adopted under a s38 agreement (Highways Area Plan) will need to be provided.

Once the internal layout has been agreed then we would need to see an independent stage 1 Road Safety Audit carried out to GG119 guidance, with an audit brief and CVs of the audit team submitting to the LPA for checking and written approval prior to the audit taking place and a first issue copy of the RSA being submitted for written approval that it has followed GG119 methodology and that the brief has been met, before it is submitted for designers comments.

Parking

The Transport Statement indicates in paragraph 3.4.1 that the application will provide 81 parking spaces (including 8 visitor parking spaces), unfortunately this is a shortfall in the number of parking spaces required by this development. 1-bed dwellings (4 included) will require 1 space per-dwelling, 3-bed dwellings (13 included) will require 2 parking spaces per-dwelling and 4+ bed dwellings (23 included) will require 3 parking spaces per-dwelling, with 1 visitor parking space per 4 dwellings. This gives a total requirement of 109 parking spaces (including 10 visitor spaces), and this is considerably above the number of spaces to be provided as indicated in the Transport Statement.

Car parking is provided as a mixture of driveway and integral/detached garages depending on the house type. Of these the integral garages for the Allerton (2.4m x 5.2m) and the Malham (2.9m x 5.75m) appear to have internal dimensions below those required by local standards to be considered a parking space (3m x 6m). The Bramham has an integral garage with 3m x 6m internal dimensions and the Cawthorne has internal dimensions of 4.3m x 5.9m and both of these are suitable for single garages. Plots 17 and 18 and plots 33 and 34 share split detached garages with internal dimensions of 2.7m x 5.8m and these are below the standards required. If these garages are required as parking spaces then we would wish to see them with internal dimensions as provided in local standards.

Site Layout Plan No 2530-SI-02 Rev J indicates the layout of driveway parking.

Plots 1, 20, 21, 27 28 and 31 are 5-bed properties and require a minimum of 3 off-street parking spaces. For all these plots suitable parking is provided in a mixture of integral garages and driveway parking and this is acceptable.

Plots 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 26, 30, 33, 34, 35 and 40 are 4-bed properties and require a minimum of 3 off-street parking spaces. Plots 7 and 35 provide 3 off-street parking spaces in a detached single garage and double tandem driveway parking and these are acceptable. Plots 2, 8, 9, 19, 22, 26 and 40 have an acceptable integral garage but the driveway parking may be too narrow to allow pedestrian access to the dwellings when 2 cars are parked, and this would need to be addressed. Plots 3, 7, 10, 17, 18, 23, 30, 33, 34 and 35 have integral garages that are below standards and also don't have sufficiently wide enough driveways to allow pedestrian access to the dwelling when 2 cars are parked, and this would need to be addressed. It should also be noted that the requirement for a 2m footway

along the frontage of plots 2 to 6 will also reduce the space available for off-street parking unless the plots are set back to allow for the footway.

Plots 4, 5, 6, 11, 16, 24, 25, 29, 32, 36, 37, 38 and 39 are 3-bed properties and require a minimum of 2 off-street parking spaces. Plots 4, 5, and 6 have acceptable sized driveways for 2 cars to park off-street, however it must be noted that a 2m footway would be required along the frontage of these dwellings and this would remove driveway parking unless the dwelling plots were set back to allow the 2m footway. Plots 11, 16 have suitable driveway parking for two tandem spaces and are acceptable. Plots 24 and 25 have suitable off-street parking for 2 cars and are acceptable, although parking at plot 24 might be a bit tight. Plot 29 has suitable driveway parking for 1 car, but the integral garage is below standards for a parking space, and this would need to be addressed. Plot 32 has suitable driveway tandem parking for two cars and is acceptable. Plot 36 has suitable driveway parking for 1 car, but the integral garage is below standards for a parking space, and this would need to be addressed. Plots 37 and 38 have suitable driveway parking for 2 cars but parking may be a bit tight. Plot 39 has suitable driveway parking for 1 car, but the integral garage is below standards for a parking space, and this would need to be addressed.

Plots 12 to 15 are quarter houses with 1-bedroom and would only require 1 parking space and these are shown on drawing No 2530-SI-02 Rev J, however there may be issues manoeuvring in and out of all the spaces and we wouldn't like to see parking with a requirement to reverse out on to the main spine road for highway safety reasons. We request that a swept path analysis is submitted to show that cars can access the spaces and turn within the parking area so they can enter and exit the parking area in forward gear.

The visitor parking spaces to the rear of the turning head adjacent to plots 25 and 26 and the one on the private driveway opposite plot 40 should have a minimum of 1m hard standing running behind them to allow vehicle occupants to exit their vehicle on a hard standing rather than on to a grass verge. This should be conditioned and amended during the detailed design phase. The visitor parking space adjacent to plot 23 is acceptable. Other visitor parking spaces are shown as being "on street" and this design is not acceptable to the Kirklees s38 team and so these cannot be used to fulfil the site's allocation of visitor parking spaces, meaning that there is a shortfall of 6 visitor parking spaces. S38 will only adopt parking spaces that are in bays and must be a minimum of 2.5m x 6m. Any other bays (echelon or perpendicular) or private bays will not be considered for adoption. Where parallel parking bays are adjacent Public Open Space or walls, please ensure that, if there is no footway i.e. shared surface carriageway, then there is a minimum 1-metre-wide hardstanding to enable safe entry and exit of the occupants.

Waste storage and collection

Plots 12 to 15 are accessed by a private driveway that would not be accessed by a Kirklees refuse collection vehicle and so a bin collection presentation point has been shown on drawing No 2530-SI-02 Rev J approximately 14.5m from the adoptable highway and as such are above carry distances as given in local guidance and building regulations. We would like to see the collection presentation point relocated closer to the rear of the adoptable highway.

Due to changes in the site housing layout the bin collection presentation point for plots 23 and 24 have been moved from the start of the private driveway that serves these two dwellings to a point approximately 17.5m from the rear of the adoptable highway, and this is above the 8m carry distance between the presentation point and rear of a waste collection vehicle as provided in local waste storage

and collection guidance. The original location of the presentation point in the last approval was at the rear of the footway and was an acceptable distance from the rear of the collection vehicle.

Construction Access Management Plan

We would like to see a construction access management plan that provides details of the location of access for construction vehicles and contractors, the types, sizes and times of access to the site, the locations of parking for contractors vehicles and deliveries, the location of materials storage and site facilities, the use of a banksman for large deliveries and the use and retention of wheel washing facilities to ensure mud and debris is not dragged on to the adopted highway for road safety reasons. This should be conditioned.

Given this, at this moment we cannot support the application as submitted and would wish to see the concerns mentioned above addressed by the applicant to our satisfaction, when hopefully we would be able to reassess the impacts of the application in a more positive way.

Wordings for conditions can be provided when an acceptable layout is agreed and other concerns have been addressed.