

Project	Application 2024/1060 – Alterations to existing car park and provision of new public open space and landscaping with associated works - Lower Car Park, The Seam, County Way, Barnsley	Document No	159592-002-01
Subject	Technical Note – Response to Highways Development Control Comments of 6 February 2025		

Overview

Sanderson Associates Consulting Engineers has been instructed to prepare a Technical Note responding to the formal consultation response made by BMBC's Highways Development Control Officer in relation to the above application and the submitted Transport Assessment.

A copy of this response is attached at **Appendix A** and throughout the remainder of this document the salient points of the response are summarised with the Sanderson Associates response provided below.

BMBC Comment 1 – Availability of parking spaces

It is noted that Table 2 includes the parking spaces that are controlled by barriers serving Barnsley College SciTech Centre and DMC02 within the calculations of reserved capacity levels. This seems to reflect paragraph 3.1.3 which reads *"It is understood that these barriered areas were previously allocated to specific buildings but that all bays are in the process of being brought back into general use"*. However, there is a need for absolute clarification on this matter from the Town Centre Car Parks team including timescales as the reserved capacity levels (for general use) indicated within the report may be incorrect or misleading.

It is also noted that paragraph 6.3.4 also makes similar references.

Sanderson Associates Response

Further liaison with BMBC Parking Services (Lucy Naylor – Group Leader Commercial Services) has confirmed that the two car park areas in question (referenced as Zone 3b SciTech Centre and 4b DMC in the Transport Assessment) are now fully available to the general public. Barriers previously in place restricting access to authorised users only have been removed. This was also confirmed during the project team meeting held on Wednesday 5 March 2025.

It is, therefore, appropriate for these areas to be included within the development construction and operational period calculations.

BMBC Comment 2 – Proposed Access Arrangement/Vehicle Swept Path Analysis

Section 4.3. The proposed access arrangements are described but not supported by scalable vehicle tracking plans (See earlier comments). Whilst the desire / need for the route to be regulated by a TRO and level of signage etc. is unclear at this stage this is due to be discussed at a meeting of March 5th and so clarification will be sought then.

I also refer to comments made at pre-application stage in respect of the relatively narrow service route. It is assumed this route will be a shared surface type arrangement, however during periods when servicing is undertaken it is unclear what consideration has been given to potential interaction and conflict between vehicles and non-motorised users and how the design reflects this. Avoiding conflicts between large vehicles and non-motorized users (such as pedestrians, cyclists and those who are mobility impaired) on shared space routes usually requires a combination of design strategy and intervention. Consideration in the design of possible segregation, width of route, surface materials, markings, access restrictions, visibility, signage etc can significantly reduce the potential conflict between large vehicles and others using shared space to create a safer environment. Furthermore, an independent safety audit is considered prudent for the overall scheme.

This does not appear to have been addressed in the submission and therefore clarification is sought on this.

Sanderson Associates Response

Following the project team meeting of 5 March 2025 further review of the one-way service route between the Lower Seam car park and the Regent Street back road has taken place.

Attached at **Appendix B** is **Drawing 159592-001 Rev B** which demonstrates the vehicle swept path of three different vehicle types which are anticipated to require access to this area in the future.

The vehicle service route is not anticipated to function as a “shared surface” area accommodating vehicles and pedestrians. Alternative pedestrian routes with way finder signage will be provided directing pedestrians to the appropriate routes which are in the main vehicle free. However, if it is considered necessary additional can be incorporated into the scheme. It is suggested that this can be discussed post planning.

At this current time no firm decision has been made in relation to any restrictions on deliveries. Clearly other town centre public realm areas have restrictions on vehicle access to the potential conflict between pedestrians and vehicles.

One of the vehicle types assessed is a 16.5m long articulated vehicle and although it is understood that such a vehicle does not currently visit any of the premises served by this service route at the present time it is considered prudent to ensure that if such a vehicle does require access in the future that it can be accommodated.

It is noted that there is some minor vehicle overhang into adjacent feature paving/grassed areas along the route. However, in these locations the edge treatment consists of a kerbline with typical kerbface dimension of 100mm/125mm. As such there will be no direct conflict between the vehicle body and the edge restraint.

Further comments are also made in relation to the HGV overhang as the vehicle negotiates the left turn from the one-way service road onto County Way heading towards Regent Street.

This situation is acknowledged, however, it must also be acknowledged that servicing by larger vehicles already takes place to the DMC building and the Courthouse PH with large vehicles and as such the same manoeuvres already take place. The presence of HGV's in this area is infrequent and it is not envisaged that there will be any significant change in the foreseeable future.

The development will, however, present an opportunity to improve the situation by making the service route one-way towards County Way and thereby removing potential conflict with other vehicles which are currently able to access the Lower Seam car park from this point.

BMBC Comment 3 – Access for emergency services

Paragraph 4.3.9 refers to arrangements for emergency service access. Clarification is sought on whether there is a plan already in place and known to the emergency services. How will they be made aware?

Sanderson Associates Response

During the meeting of 5 March 2025 BMBC confirmed that there must be a number keypad on the intercom system to allow Emergency Services to override the automatic bollards. This will be captured in the design.

BMBC Comment 4 – TRO/Parking Order Requirements

Paragraph 4.3.10 states that *The required amendments to access routes within the car park will be covered by the legal Parking Order and will not require a formal Traffic Regulation Order*. Clarification is sought on this as it is not clear what the legal Parking Order contains in respect of access routes. Again, the TRO is an agenda item that is due to be discussed at a meeting of March 5th and so it is hoped that clarification will be provided.

Sanderson Associates Response

The requirement for a TRO/ATTRO was discussed at length during the meeting of 5 March 2025. The consensus was that some form of TRO would be required to cover the changes to the car park and introduction of the one-way servicing route. It will also be necessary to review the existing Order which governs all Town Centre car parks within which "Courthouse Car Park" is referenced as CP11. A copy of the current Order (Car Parks 2018 Consolidation Order) has been provided by the Council and will be reviewed at the earliest opportunity.

It is, however, expected that the above requirements will be dealt with at planning stage by way of an appropriately worded condition.

BMBC Comment 5 – Review peak displacement

6.2.1 / 6.2.2 Given the construction period is likely to extend over the Christmas period, I would expect that as a worst-case scenario a “peak” displacement approaching the 491 spaces lost should be considered.

Sanderson Associates Response

During the construction period a total of 491 spaces will be lost from the Town Centre. This comprises the whole of the Lower Seam (467 spaces) and an area on the Upper Seam to accommodate the construction compound (24 spaces).

In undertaking a reassessment to consider this worst case scenario it has also been necessary to remove the John Street car park as an alternative car parking option as a result of the Council’s intentions to utilise this car park for other purposes in the near future. See also BMBC Comment 6 overleaf.

Table 1, below, provides details of alternative car parking locations which can accommodate the 491 spaces which will be lost during the construction period.

From Table 1 it can be seen that from the information contained in the Alpha Parking Report and the Council’s Parking Services 2023 “snapshot” there is sufficient capacity across other Town Centre car parks to accommodate the peak displacement from Lower and Upper Seam during the construction period.

Table 1 – Construction Period - Alternative Car Parking Options (peak displacement 491 spaces)

Weekday Assessment				
Car Park	Number of Spaces	2023 Peak Occupancy Level	Capacity	Source
Market Gate	148	14	134	Alpha Parking Report
Burleigh Street East	66	5	61	Alpha Parking Report
Burleigh Street West	28	25	3	Alpha Parking Report
Mark Street	48	15	33	Alpha Parking Report
Pitt Street	75	10	65	Alpha Parking Report
Graham’s Orchard	61	43	18	Alpha Parking Report
Alhambra	482	250	232	Data from BMBC Parking Services 2023 “snapshot”
Glassworks	465	230	235	Data from BMBC Parking Services 2023 “snapshot”
TOTAL			781	

BMBC Comment 6 – John Street Car Park

6.2.3 Alternative parking availability is inclusive of the John Street Car Park. However, it is understood that this car park will be removed from parking stock as the site is being considered for use by school, transport services and will be the subject to a forthcoming planning application. As such this should be removed from the alternative parking calculations. Also see Tables 3 and 5.

Sanderson Associates Response

Please see response to BMBC Comment 5 above which removes the John Street car park as an alternative car park option.

BMBC Comment 7 – Communication Strategy

Section 6.4 – The communication strategy is welcomed and details of which could be conditioned as part of the Construction Management Strategy. Whilst no reference is made to temporary highway signage during the construction period, has this been considered / discussed with the Traffic team to assist in mitigating impacts during the construction period?

Sanderson Associates Response

The Communication Strategy is currently being developed by the Council and will be published for review by Planning and Highways officers at the earliest opportunity.

BMBC Comment 8 – Traffic Impact

It is noted that the junction assessments for the Lower seam car park access and Old Mill Lane / County Way demonstrate that there is sufficient capacity to accommodate a redistribution of traffic movements.

Sanderson Associates Response

Comment noted.

BMBC Comment on Planning Statement

Paragraph 3.10 references the 39 EV Charging Bays, however it states that it is still to be determined when these EV bays will be installed. Clarification is required over this statement – Is their installation dependent on other matters?

Sanderson Associates Response

During the meeting of 5 March 2025 Willmott Dixon Construction confirmed that only infrastructure to EV charging is included within their contract with the Council and the associated planning submission. It will be for the Council to implement an installation strategy which meets its requirements.

Acknowledgements

Data from the 2023 report “Off-Street Parking Review” prepared by Alpha Parking Ltd on behalf of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council has been used in the preparation of this report.

Car parking data in the form of an internal “parking snapshot” which was undertaken in 2023 by the Council’s Transportation team and which recorded occupancy levels with the Council operated car parks has been used in the preparation of this report.

Issue Record

Issue Status	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by	Date
01 Final	K Smith	S Burkinshaw	K Smith	17 March 2025

Sanderson Associates Consulting Engineers is a trading name of Fairhurst Group LLP, a limited liability partnership registered in Scotland with the registered number SO307306 and registered office at 43 George Street, Edinburgh EH2 2HT.

This document has been prepared in accordance with the Fairhurst Quality and Environmental Management System and in accordance with the instructions of the client, Willmott Dixon Construction Ltd, for the client’s sole and specific use. Any other persons who use any information contained herein do so at their own risk. Any information provided by third parties and referred to herein has not been checked or verified by Fairhurst unless otherwise expressly stated within this report.

Unless otherwise agreed in writing, all intellectual property rights in, or arising out of, or in connection with this report, are owned by Fairhurst. The client named above has a licence to copy and use this report only for the purposes for which it was provided. The licence to use and copy this report is subject to other terms and conditions agreed between Fairhurst and the client.

Appendix A

BMBC Highways Development Control Consultation Response dated 6 February 2025

HIGHWAYS DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
CONSULTATION RESPONSE

PLANNING CASE OFFICER	Jessica Duffield
HIGHWAYS OFFICER	Wayne Lake
PLANNING APPLICATION REF.	2024/1060
LOCATION	Lower Car Park, The Seam, County Way, Barnsley
DESCRIPTION	Alterations to existing car park and provision of new public open space and landscaping with associated works
ASSOCIATED APPLICATION	2024/1062
RESPONSE DATE	06/02/2025

Good morning Jess,

Many thanks for consulting Highways Development Control in respect of this planning application.

Further to my previous response, I note that a revised location plan with corrected red line boundary has been submitted thereby addressing comments made.

I have now had the opportunity to fully assess the Transport Statement and other associated documents and plans and have the following comments:

Planning Statement:

Paragraph 3.10 references the 39 EV Charging Bays, however it states that it is still to be determined when these EV bays will be installed. Clarification is required over this statement – Is their installation dependent on other matters?

Design and Access Statement:

Section 3.2 – Vehicle Tracking has only been provided in the DAS in the form of 3 viewports on page 15 showing swept paths from the car park via the one way system which do not appear to be to scale. There is a need for the vehicle tracking plans to be provided for the relevant design vehicles at a suitable scale for review and this should include the area of one way within the car park to demonstrate that this route can accommodate the requisite movements within the scheme.

Notwithstanding this however, the paths shown on the small viewports appear to show vehicle overhang / overrun along the route. Furthermore, the left turn out onto County Way shows significant vehicle encroachment into the opposing lane. Given that the stop line for the traffic signals is set back from the give way shown, the vehicle design vehicles are likely to be stationary impeding the free flow of vehicles travelling in the opposite direction which is not acceptable.

Section 3.3 – Hostile vehicle mitigation. It is unclear from the plan where this is to be located, however this is due to be discussed at a meeting of March 5th and so clarification will be sought then.

Transport Statement:

It is noted that Table 2 includes the parking spaces that are controlled by barriers serving Barnsley College SciTech Centre and DMC02 within the calculations of reserved capacity levels. This seems to reflect paragraph 3.1.3 which reads *“It is understood that these barriered areas were previously allocated to specific buildings but that all bays are in the process of being brought back into general use”*. However, there is a need for absolute clarification on this matter from the Town Centre Car Parks team including timescales as the reserved capacity levels (for general use) indicated within the report may be incorrect or misleading.

Section 4.3. The proposed access arrangements are described but not supported by scalable vehicle tracking plans (See earlier comments). Whilst the desire / need for the route to be regulated by a TRO and level of signage etc is unclear at this stage this is due to be discussed at a meeting of March 5th and so clarification will be sought then.

I also refer to comments made at pre-application stage in respect of the relatively narrow service route. *It is assumed this route will be a shared surface type arrangement, however during periods when servicing is undertaken it is unclear what consideration has been given to potential interaction and conflict between vehicles and non-motorised users and how the design reflects this. Avoiding conflicts between large vehicles and non-motorized users (such as pedestrians, cyclists and those who are mobility impaired) on shared space routes usually requires a combination of design strategy and intervention. Consideration in the design of possible segregation, width of route, surface materials, markings, access restrictions, visibility, signage etc can significantly reduce the potential conflict between large vehicles and others using shared space to create a safer environment. Furthermore, an independent safety audit is considered prudent for the overall scheme.*

This does not appear to have been addressed in the submission and therefore clarification is sought on this.

Paragraph 4.3.9 refers to arrangements for emergency service access. Clarification is sought on whether there is a plan already in place and known to the emergency services. How will they be made aware?

Paragraph 4.3.10 states that *The required amendments to access routes within the car park will be covered by the legal Parking Order and will not require a formal Traffic Regulation Order*. Clarification is sought on this as it is not clear what the legal Parking Order contains in respect of access routes. Again, the TRO is an agenda item that is due to be discussed at a meeting of March 5th and so it is hoped that clarification will be provided.

6.2.1 / 6.2.2 Given the construction period is likely to extend over the Christmas period, I would expect that as a worst-case scenario a “peak” displacement approaching the 491 spaces lost should be considered.

6.2.3 Alternative parking availability is inclusive of the John Street Car Park. However, it is understood that this car park will be removed from parking stock as the site is being considered for use by school, transport services and will be the subject to a forthcoming planning application. As such this should be removed from the alternative parking calculations. Also see Tables 3 and 5.

6.3.4 Please see previous comments re paragraph 3.1.3 re zones 3B and 4B.

Section 6.4 – The communication strategy is welcomed and details of which could be conditioned as part of the Construction Management Strategy. Whilst no reference is made to temporary highway signage during the construction period, has this been considered / discussed with the Traffic team to assist in mitigating impacts during the construction period?

Section 7 – Traffic Impact. It is noted that the junction assessments for the Lower seam car park access and Old Mill Lane / County Way demonstrate that there is sufficient capacity to accommodate a redistribution of traffic movements.

Kind Regards

Wayne



Appendix B

Drawing 159592-001 Rev B – Vehicle Swept Path Analysis



- Sanderson Associates Consulting Engineers ("the consultant"), has not checked or verified, and shall have no liability whatsoever for any inaccuracies which may be attributable to any data, reports, base plan(s) and drawings provided by the client, or purchased by the consultant on the client's behalf, that may have been utilised within this drawing.
- The consultant shall not be liable for the use by any person of any document for any purpose other than that for which the same were provided by the consultant.
- No liability whatsoever is accepted by the consultant for any error or omissions.
- The consultant accepts no liability for any vehicle specification errors within the vehicle track software used and / or its vehicle libraries.
- The locations of utilities apparatus, if shown, is reproduced from plans supplied to the consultant, although care has been taken when duplicating this information. These locations are approximate only and no guarantee can be given for their accuracy. It is the client's or it's appointed agent/contractors responsibility to verify the exact locations on site by hand dug trial holes or other appropriate means prior to mechanical excavation.
- Service connections are not shown but their presence should be anticipated.
- Reference to any third party equipment shown on this drawing was only relevant at the time the drawing was prepared.
- It is the client's responsibility to ensure that any equipment ordered meets the design.

B	Layout Amend	SB	Mar 2025	KS
A	Rigid Truck added	CP	May 2024	KS
Rev	Amendment	Drawn	Date	Checked



Client

Willmott Dixon Construction Limited

Project Title

The Seam

Drawing Title

Vehicle Swept Paths

Scale	1:500	Drawn By	SB
Drawing Size	A2	Checked By	KS
Date	May 2024	Approved By	KS
Drawing Number		Rev	
159592-001		B	