

Paul Brook
29/06/2005 17:51

To: Julie Holtby/LDA/LCC@Leeds_City_Council
cc:
Subject: Re: New access road for Abbey Mills

print

P Brook
Chief Asset Management Officer
Development Department
Leeds City Council
0113 247 4233

— Forwarded by Paul Brook/LDA/LCC on 29/06/05 17:51 —

John Illingworth
28/06/05 09:19

To: Andrew Carter/MEM/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Bernard
Atha/MEM/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Elizabeth
Minkin/MEM/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Ian
Andrews/PLAN/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Jean
Dent/PLAN/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Mike
Darwin/HWT/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Neil
Hunter/FIN/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Paul
Brook/LDA/LCC@Leeds_City_Council
cc: vjcrompton@ntlworld.com, jlivers_907@hotmail.com,
moranjandr@aol.com, stephen.rennie1@ntlworld.com,
S.Rennie@leedsmet.ac.uk, k.stratford@ntlworld.com,
trevor.mitchell@english-heritage.org.uk, davidh@sustrans.org.uk,
Elizabeth Minkin/MEM/LCC@Leeds_City_Council,
freda_matthews@ukgateway.net, Kabeer
Hussain/MEM/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, ken@torode.org.uk,
Martin Hamilton/MEM/LCC@Leeds_City_Council,
RichT@followfoucalt.co.uk, Sue
Bentley/MEM/LCC@Leeds_City_Council,
lmallsopp@ROSPA.com, sean.stowell@bbc.co.uk,
peter.lazenby@ypn.co.uk, david.marsh@ypn.co.uk
Subject: Re: New access road for Abbey Mills

Dear All

Further to my previous message forwarded below, I am now sending two maps of Abbey Road in Kirkstall. Both are on the same scale. The sites are only a short distance apart, at opposite ends of Kirkstall Abbey, and carry very similar traffic flows. The gradients are similar, the angles are similar and the visibility is similar at both locations. For the Abbeydale development we closed off the existing oblique junction with Vesper Road, and made a new junction with a right angle turn further from the bend with better visibility. There is a dedicated right turn lane. That was the correct decision.



abbeydales.gif



normans.gif

None of these safety measures are presently contemplated for the proposed junction near the Normans, yet this is a worse layout, with Norman Row opposite to create an additional hazard. We also know that major landowners on the far side of the mill goit have been anxious to create a new access road to their property that would bypass the congested area on Bridge Road. There is no secret about this - people have said quite openly that this is their intention, our planning officers have discussed it internally, and developers have surveyed the site.

Local residents fear that we will start off with a small access road, and once it is in private hands we will face a barrage of applications to gradually widen it out. Some changes may not even require planning or highways consent. Eventually substantial traffic will flow through the proposed junction, which will either have a terrible accident record, or alternatively will involve major civil engineering works that degrade of the environment of Kirkstall Abbey Park.

John Illingworth

John Illingworth

John Illingworth
27/06/2005 23:18

To: Mike Darwin/HWT/LCC
cc: Andrew Carter/MEM/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Bernard
Atha/MEM/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Elizabeth
Minkin/MEM/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Ian
Andrews/PLAN/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Jean
Dent/PLAN/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Neil
Hunter/FIN/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Paul
Brook/LDA/LCC@Leeds_City_Council
Subject: Re: New access road for Abbey Mills 📧

Dear Mike

Thank you for an informative reply, and for the indication that these issues will be determined by rational discussion.

I have had a good look at the proposed junction and come to the conclusion that there is no way that it can be made safe in an environmentally acceptable way. Since we own the entire site, and there are good alternative uses for the buildings, there is no reason to accept a sub-standard or hazardous scheme.

I also feel that any decisions should be consistent with other decisions affecting nearby stretches of the same road. In particular, I would expect the design of this junction to be consistent with the design of the Abbeydales and Vesper Road (oblique intersection on a gradient, on the inside of a blind corner) and with the various junctions on the A65 on either side of Duffield Printers, all of which are staggered and have dedicated right turn lanes.

If we accept a lower safety standard at Abbey Road, people will say that the Council is compromising highway safety in the interests of a capital receipt.

Please can you tell me of ANY other comparable location in Leeds where the Council has accepted a new oblique cross roads on the principal route network on a gradient with sight lines as bad as this one?

Please can you also provide full details of the appeal cases that you have lost?

John Illingworth

Mike Darwin



Mike Darwin
27/06/2005 16:11

To: John Illingworth/MEM/LCC@Leeds_City_Council
cc: Andrew Carter/MEM/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Bernard
Atha/MEM/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Elizabeth
Minkin/MEM/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Jean
Dent/PLAN/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Neil
Hunter/FIN/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Paul
Brook/LDA/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Ian
Andrews/PLAN/LCC@Leeds_City_Council
Subject: Re: New access road for Abbey Mills 📧

Dear Cllr Illingworth,

I was very busy last week so I did not get the opportunity to respond to your e-mail of 18 June in which you questioned the design criteria for roads.

Firstly I would like to inform you of my role in dealing with developments whether it be council owned land or private. I provide advice on the means of access to a site, the extent of any assessment of the highway network, the type of internal road network appropriate to the development and the level of parking required. The intention with any proposal is not to frustrate development but to assist in trying to resolve any likely problems. That is not to say we should support all proposals as a satisfactory solution is not always possible.

When a scheme is put forward by a developer it is the developer's responsibility to ensure that the proposals meet current standards and that it is appropriate for its intended purpose. I will then assess the proposals to determine if I consider that what is being proposed is acceptable. In doing so I have to consider the level of development, the existing situation and what relaxations, if any, can be accepted. I also have to keep in mind comments and decisions of recent planning appeal cases.

With regard to the comments in your e-mail the Authority does use the Design Manual for Roads & Bridges as guidance. However that document is produced for motorways and trunk roads and therefore is not always appropriate. The Highway Design Guide, together with a number of other guidance documents and notes, help in determining the type of road, junction and alignment that is most suitable for the development.

The advice that I have provided to-date for the Abbey Mill site, is that for the level of development envisaged, no formal footway would be required, but a shared highway is more appropriate. This is compatible with the advice in the Highways Design Guide.

As you are aware, the A65 is being considered for the QBI. The scheme, over the length between Bridge Road and the dual carriageway, incorporates a number of pedestrian refuges and a central hatched area. The hatched area will assist in providing for right turn vehicles, although for the level of development envisaged I would not be seeking such a provision.

The requirement for sightlines depend on the level of development as well as the type of road the development accesses onto. You state that the "X" distance should be 9 metres. That is not the case for this particular site. I would initially look for 4.5m, but if this cannot be achieved would allow 2.4m. The reason for this is that the 4.5m is a capacity issue, whereas 2.4m is for safety. I have recently lost a number of appeals on this issue and have therefore allowed a number of developments to proceed on a 2.4m distance.

For the moment I cannot comment on the gradient of a road as I have not been presented with any proposals. However I note your comment and when proposals are put forward the geometry of the road will be assessed.

Mike Darwin
Head of Highways Development Services
Development Department
ext. 75302