

<b>RESPONDENT</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
<b>Alan Baxter and Associates</b>	Road safety audit should be part of street quality audit (2.9)	Quality audits will have an overarching control over all audits	Reword document
	Level of development served off street type shouldn't be limited (3.2.1.4 – 3.2.1.5)	Rewrite to relate development to traffic flows. Also to state that this does not apply to distributor roads.	Reword document
	Width of bus routes should not be set at 6.75m (3.2.2.12 iv)	Discussed with Metro who require 6.75m, but will discuss reduction on site specific basis.	No action
	Anticipated speed as opposed to design speed should be used for forward visibility (3.2.2.12 vii)	Design speed already reduced as well as centreline radius. Safety concerns with further reductions.	No action
	There should not be a minimum centreline radii (3.2.2.12 viii)	Speed control bends allow for further reduction in centreline radius. (3.3.4 [ii])	No action
	Reversing from private drive onto a type 1 street should be allowed (3.2.2.12 ix)	Type 1 streets have higher level of pedestrian movement. A number of personal injury accidents occur in this situation	No action
	Verges should not be a requirement on type 1 streets (3.2.2.14)	The aspiration is to increase street environment, therefore verges should remain a requirement	No action
	There should be flexibility on shared surfaces with no minimum width (3.2.2.21 iv)	The minimum width is necessary to retain vehicle access whilst allowing access to service trench.	Amend wording to provide reason
	There should be a flexible approach to forward visibility (3.2.2.33)	The document does allow for reduced visibility	No action
	DMRB should not be used for streets not covered by this document(3.2.2.36)	There is no other guidance for design. A standard has to be provided	No action
	Higher quality materials should be used on adopted streets (3.2.3.3)	High quality materials are acceptable on adopted streets; however there are cost implications that could restrict the use without commuted sums.	Amend wording to reflect this

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
	Central features such as roundabouts should be allowed (3.3.5)	Roundabouts are an acceptable feature except as a traffic calming feature.	Amend wording
	Gradients greater than 5% should be allowed due to the topography of Leeds(3.4.1 – 3.4.2)	Any gradient greater than 5% is classed as a ramp. The 5% is a government standard.	No action
	The K values proposed are unnecessary (3.4.8)	K values are necessary to prevent vehicles from grounding as well as comfort	No action
	Parking bays should be allowed within sightlines (3.5.21)	With the very short visibility splays proposed they should be protected	No action
	Crossroads should be allowed for speeds of 20mph (3.5.26)	They are allowed	Amend table to confirm this
	Garages should be allowed without drives (3.9.20)	To prevent garage doors overhanging footway the garage is required to be set back 1m.	Alter 3.9.22 to have a 1m strip behind back of highway if drives are not provided.
	The pedestrian inter-visibility is too great (3.9.21)	2x2m is considered that absolute minimum. Most cars are reversing out of drives.	No action
	Carriageway widening is not necessary (3.10.9)	It is considered that widening on bends is required but the table requires to be revised to cater for the appropriate radii	Amend table
	The emphasis is on through routes not cul-de-sac hence down play turning heads (3.10.10 – 3.10.15)	Culs-de-sac will be provided where appropriate and therefore turning heads still necessary although emphasis on through routes	No action
	Large areas of landscaping should be adopted (3.12.3)	The highway authority will not adopt large landscaping areas.	No action
	Location of street lighting should be considered early in process (3.13.1)	Agreed the statement says exactly that.	No action

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
	Type I streets should be designed to 20mph to reduce the number of signs (3.17.4)	If the actual speed of the street could be maintained at 20mph this would be acceptable. However to-date this has not been achieved	No action
	Do features within a 30mph zone require signing if provided from new	Yes as required by TSRGD	No action
<b>Bryan G Hall</b>	No specific reference for objection other than the guide is too restrictive and does not follow the principles of MfS	Cannot address the comments raised in this letter as no direct comment or any proposals are provided. The consultants do not agree with the whole document as written.	No action
<b>Calderdale Council</b>	Parking provision proposed is not in line with PPG13 (P59 footnote)	The proposals accord with the inspectors decision on the revised UDP	No action
	Better consideration of sustainable drainage systems required.	The guidance on sustainable drainage is considered appropriate	No action
<b>Leeds Civic Trust</b>	Do not want a hierarchy of streets (3.2.2.8) (Q1)	Developers need advice on what to construct. The way forward is to provide alternative, hence there has to be various 'types' of street.	No action
	Does not want specific criteria as set out in tables (Q3 & Q4)	Developer has to be provided with guidance.	No action
	Speed restraints are not required if they are well laid out. (Q5)	Advice on restraints is provided to assist designers to achieve speed control.	No action
	Suggests very tight radii to control speed (Q6)	Tight radii are proposed.	No action
	Requests more flexibility in junction spaces (Q7)	Following meeting with LCT they have retracted this comment.	No action
	Prefers method 1 for car parking	Noted	

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
	Requests that 'dry laid clay bricks' to list of approved materials	Clay bricks do not meet the required skid resistance	No action
	The guide is not flexible and does not reflect MfS	The guide provides adequate flexibility for developers to provide a range of varied layouts	No action
	The document is old fashioned	Noted	
<b>METRO</b>	Reference to SPD Developer Contribution should be made (2.9)	Agreed	Amend document
	Refer to travel plan SPD (2.9 iv)	Agreed	Amend document
	Adjacent development should be considered to allow possibility of bus routes (3.2.2.6)	Agreed	
	Only horizontal traffic calming measures on bus routes (3.3)	Vertical calming can be used on bus routes subject to dimensions. See below	No action
	Minimum length of speed table to be 6m (3.3.4 iv)	Agreed	Amend document
	Minimum use of guardrail (3.6.17)	Agreed	Amend document
	Reference to SPDs (3.16)	Agreed	Amend document
	Metro to be consulted on proposals that affect bus stops (3.16)	As set out in 3.16	No action
	Add addition wording 'on the matters below' (3.16.2)	Agreed	Amend document
	SPD para requires up-dating (3.16.10)	Agreed	Amend document
<b>Sanderson Associates</b>	Should use equation to calculate 'Y' distance (3.5.17)	Agreed to use equation on existing network	Amend document
	High number of dwellings should be allowed for shared surfaces (3.2.2.21)	There is a major concern for the provision of shared surfaces. Subject to the provision of a safe pedestrian route a higher level will be acceptable	Amend document

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
	There should be flexibility on shared surfaces with no minimum width (3.2.2.21 iv)	The minimum width is necessary to retain vehicle access whilst allowing access to service trench	No action
	Conflict between adoption procedures and appendix B (3.17.11)	Agreed	Amend the appropriate section
	Commuted sums on all materials not acceptable	Government are producing guidance on commuted sums. The wording within the document to be altered to allow for this.	Amend document
	The proposal that garages are equal to 0.5 space will result in more car parking/visual intrusion	Subject to a garage being of a certain size a garage will be counted as a space	Amend document
	National guidance should be referred to (1.12)	Add 'and national guidance'	Amend document
	Agrees with the flexible approach but considered document is too rigid [visibility/shared surfaces](2.5)	General supporting comment. Other issues dealt with elsewhere.	
	Shared surfaces require careful consideration of delineation of different functions needed to avoid patchwork effect (p18)	Delineation of areas has been agreed with the appropriate bodies	Amend document accordingly
	Concern raised about the removal of ransom strips (3.2.2.6)	Noted but will retain statement	No action
	Treatment of areas of margins outside c/way & margins unclear. Can length of shared surface street increase?(3.2.2.21)	Area outside c/way & margins would be private. The length of shared streets can be increased if a safe pedestrian route is provided	Amend document
	Contradiction between approach for type 3 & type 4 (p20 & 21)	Do not consider any contradiction.	No action
	The term private street is inappropriate in light of case law (3.2.3)	.The term private street is correct. However there is inconsistency with the section	Amend wording to address inconsistency in statement but the term 'private street' is correct
	Replace 'any gate' with 'where	Agreed	Amend document

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
	permitted, gates..' (3.2.3.6)		
	The highway authority has no rights of adoption (3.2.4.717)	The highways authority considers that the appropriate way to ensure maintenance is to adopt the highway	No action
	There appears to be conflicting guidance on trees within the adopted highway (p31)	It is considered that no conflicting advice is given.	No action
	Do archways require 'height signs? (p32)	If the highway underneath an archway is to be adopted then signage would be required. Guidance given in 3.4.5	No action
	Speed control bends diagram would be helpful (p32)	Diagram required.	Amend document
	Carriageway width – is this acceptable to the fire authority?(p32)	Fire brigade consulted and have not objected	no action
	Ramp gradient too shallow (3.3.4)	Amend gradient to 1:18	Amend document
	No advice given on roundabout/minis (3.3.5)	There is no need to repeat government guidance	No action
	Who will carry out the consultation (3.3.7)	The developer should undertake consultation and provide the appropriate correspondence to the LA. Amend the wording	Amend document
	Are K values necessary? (3.4.8)	K values are necessary to prevent vehicles from grounding as well as comfort	No action
	Will the authority accept traffic management measures to provide visibility splays where such facilities fit in with the general road environment?	Yes, if the proposals conform with existing traffic management measures	No action
	Who maintains areas adjacent to footpaths (3.6.1)	Site specific but could be adopted	No action

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
	Clarification on areas of parking that could be adopted (p60)	Site specific	
	The proposal is contrary to MfS (3.9.21)	The guidance is to clarify/amend MfS where appropriate as the MfS requires	No action
	Example of visitor parking does not work in practice. (3.9.30)	The example shown does work as noted on site	No action
	Turning head difficult to maintain (3.10.11)	Will amend the detail	Amend document
	Suggest MfS(p75) be used. [3.2.3.4] is worded differently (3.11.3)	agreed	Amend document
	Widths proposed differ from those given earlier (3.4.11)	Will amend	Amend document
	Max growth height should be 0.6 (3.12.8)	Agreed but will remove reference to walls for paragraph	Amend document
	How do the dimensions fit in a 3.1m road narrowing? (3.13.2)	Can be accommodated if public sewer is located out of carriageway	No action
<b>Councillor Harrand</b>	The provision of a raised white line be required for type 3 &4 streets	Considered as part of shared street debate	Amend document
<b>Peter Barnett</b>	Terminology of disabled people/elderly etc (2.6, 3.1.1)	Amend terminology if necessary	Amend document
	Para 2.8 slightly confusing	Para reads OK	No action
	Should refer to Leeds City Council Planning Services or LPA (2.9)	Amend para	Amend document
	2.9(ii) needs footnote/bibliographical ref to explain guidance on TA	Not required	No action
	Poor diagram 3.5.12	Agreed	Amend document
	Prefers method 1 simpler 3.9.9 etc	Noted	
<b>Joint Highways Advisory Group</b>	Tactile Paving – should add ‘the use of tactiles is to be considered based upon the issues of all road users and the likelihood of damage’	Not included	No action

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
<b>Sport England</b>	Raises a number of questions as to whether the guide addresses accessibility.	The answer to each question raised is 'yes'	No action
<b>Jacobs</b>	Suggests that a sustainability appraisal be added to the list documents (2.9)	A sustainability appraisal is not required in planning terms.	No action
	Suggests 20mph on type 1 roads	If this can be achieved then it would be acceptable but a 30mph street is expected to be the norm.	No action
	Provision for cyclists on all routes	Cyclist would be expected to use the same space as others. Widening to provide a separate cycle lane would increase the speed of traffic.	No action
	Provision for public transport facilities (Qu.4)	Public transport facilities are encouraged where appropriate.	No action
	Speed restraints provided over distances that drivers find acceptable. Recommends changes in horizontal & vertical alignment and short cul-de-sac. Metro to agree calming measures (qu.5)	The provision of restraints is covered by a plethora of guidance which has to be followed. Metro have provided their own comments.	No action
	Recommends that visibility be in range of 1.05 – 2.0 (qu.6)	Add diagram or reference appropriate document	Amend document
	Junction spacing should be 30m [same side] and 15m [opposite side] on 100 – 300 dwellings. Not within 20m of junction with distributor road. (qu.7)	The guide allows for crossroads as per MfS. The 20m from distributor roads will be added.	Amend document
	Method 1 preferred	noted	
<b>Morley Town Council</b>	Concern at the high level of traffic for	The guide follows government	No action



RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
	a home zone, suggests a lower level (3.2.2.8)	guidance	
	Requires two accesses for over 200 dwellings and preferred for over 100 dwelling (3.2.2.13)	This is already included within the guide.	No action
	States type 3 is lowest order to be adopted but contradicted with type 4 (3.2.2.18/3.2.2.32)	agreed	Amend document
	Supports the max of 5 off a private road. (3.2.3.1)		No action
	Does not support the use of speed tables (3.3.4)	These are necessary to control speeds below 20mph.	No action
	Does not support the reduction in sightlines (3.5)	The document is following government guidance on this issue.	No action
	Does not support the over provision of cycle facilities (3.7)	The document is following the LTP and government guidance.	No action
	Requires the provision of 2 spaces per dwelling no matter what size (3.9)	The document is following the current planning policy.	No action
	Para 3.9.32 is not logical	Reword the last sentence	Amend document
	Supports commitment to natural paving in conservation areas	Agreed	No action
<b>Steve Gombocz</b>	Figure 1 in appendix C requires reconfiguring for two boxes	Accept	Amend document
<b>Sam Grimwood</b>	Generally supportive of the document but provides comment on issues not covered by it. Suggests increase in trees within the highway	Provision of trees is supported and covered in the landscape section	No action
<b>Alan Taylor</b>	Suggests the document is called "Residential Street Design Guide"	The document covers industrial streets as well as residential	No action

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
		streets.	
	The term 'mixed use' appears in a number of places but no definition (1.11)	??	
	The term 'local centre' is wrongly used and should be 'town/district centre' (3.9.12)	agreed	Amend document
	"S2 local centre" should be "S2 town/district centre" (p59)	agreed	Amend document
<b>Brian Ablett</b>	Wants 20mph speed limit on all roads	If this can be achieved then it would be acceptable but a 30mph street is expected to be the norm.	No action
	Requires street lighting to be efficient	This is controlled by the PFI project.	No action
	Requires the document to accord with the Nottingham Declaration	Transport policy is dealt with through LTP	No action
<b>Yasin Raja</b>	Add 'residential' to car parking guidelines (p58)	Agreed	Amend document
	Add ' to try and achieve aims and objectives of the car parking guidelines in the UDP and subsequent LDF's (3.9.9)	agreed	Amend document
	City centre 'core' average 0.6 (3.9.12)	agreed	Amend document
<b>Jonathan Eyre</b>	Concerned at lack of mention of recycled material in section 4	Materials covered in 'specification for highway works'	No action
	Requires the use of permeable pavement for car parking areas	Agreed	Amend document
	Should refer to the SPD on sustainable design and construction	Agreed	Amend document

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
Leeds Property Forum	The guide should provide more emphasis on place making	The guide is read in conjunction with Neighbourhoods for living which sets out the principles of place making	No action
	The document is negative (2.6)	Reword to put a positive slant on comment	Amend document
	Provide a distinction between guidance required for safety and these related to quality of place which could be more flexible	The carrying out of quality audits will address this issue	No action
	Type 1 is over restrictive (3.2.2.12)	It is considered that there is adequate flexibility within the document to allow designers to produce good designs	No action
	Design speeds outside schools should be 10mph	Government guidance is 20mph	No action
	Footways on type 2 should vary in width from 1.2 to 3.5 (3.2.2.17)	The minimum width of footways is 2.0m to cater for statutory undertakers' equipment.	No action
	Would like home zone standards without designation.	A home zone, and hence standards, are as designated in the Transport Act 2000	No action
	More flexibility in shared surface design	The provision of a safe pedestrian route will allow more flexibility	Amend document
	Agrees with speeds should be self enforcing but requires clear examples on how this can be achieved (3.3.2)	Speeds are self enforcing if designed is correct	No action
	Agrees with reduced visibility splays		No action
	Proposes method 1 but also supports car ownership figures!! Suggests worked examples	agreed	Amend document
	Wants more interesting materials than just the standard pallet	Nothing was put forward as a suggestion. Willing to discuss	No action

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
		alternative materials with developers.	
	Should be written in a positive language not negative and requires better illustrations and clear examples	Agreed	Amend document
<b>Sue Speak</b>	Supports method 1. Concern at distinction between owned/rented	noted	No action
<b>Tim Parry</b>	Concern at type 2 footway width for shared with cyclists is not wide enough. (3.2.2.17)	Propose 3.0m for shared footways.	Amend document
	Raises concern about a through route on shared surfaces (3.2.2.19)	The provision of a safe pedestrian route will allow more flexibility	Amend document
	Reword 3.2.4.1 to "...public transport stops, <i>housing and other nearby walking and cycle routes</i> "	Agreed	Amend document
	Diagram not correct (3.7.15)	Agreed	Amend document
	Dimensioned diagram not correct (3.7.15)	Agreed	Amend document
	3.2.2.1 it's should be its	Agreed	Amend document
	3.2.2.12 dependant should be dependent	Agreed	Amend document
	3.22.36/37/38/39 & 41 tolerance should be clearance/clear space/gap	agreed	Amend document
<b>Magda Lezama</b>	Suggests new words for para 4.3 & 6.2 of appendix E	agreed	Amend document
<b>Andy Wheeler</b>	Shared streets should be limited to 25 dwellings	Shared street criteria altered after extensive consultations	Amend document
<b>John Wilson</b>	Street lighting should have the ability	This is governed by the PFI project.	No action

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
	to have lower levels of luminaries during low levels of pedestrian flow		
<b>Andrew Smith</b>	Section 3.11 – Emergency Access Para 3.11.4 should be expanded to mirror the comments in MfS (para 6.7.3)	agreed	Amend document
<b>Members</b>	Suggest para 3.2.3.2 be removed to conform with the original design guide	agreed	Amend document
<b>Disabled Peoples groups including:</b> An Alliance of Service Users and Carers, Leeds Involvement, British Retinitis Pigmentosa Society, Talking Newspaper for the Blind for Otley, The National Federation for the Blind, Access Committee for Leeds, RNIB Shire View Centre Leeds, Leeds Jewish Blind Society, Vision is not Essential, Leeds Society for Deaf and Blind People,	General concern that the provision of Shared Space does not provide adequately for blind, partially sighted and disabled people	A solution to provide a safe route through shared streets of over 25 dwellings by means of a 2m wide area delineated by means of a 30 mm up-stand and appropriate designated crossing points has been included in the document.  The recommendations of the document ‘designing for disabled people in home zones’ to be included in the document	Amend document

<b>RESPONDENT</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
Transport Access Group, Mrs Ruth Holder			