

From: [Will Elliott](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [Nigel Cussen](#); [Heidi Boot](#); [Sargeson](#); [REDACTED] [Lake, Wayne \(GROUP LEADER HDC\)](#)
Subject: RE: 2021/1090 Land south of Barugh Green Road and east of Higham Common Road, Barnsley -
Date: 02 April 2024 12:53:54
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image011.png](#)
[image012.png](#)
[image013.png](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning [REDACTED]

In assessing applications we look at a range of criteria that we feel are relevant to encouraging active travel and changing travel patterns towards the Government's objectives (half of all journeys in towns to be walked, wheeled or cycled by 2030). In order to be consistent (as well as with the intention of providing detailed advice in our first year as a statutory consultee) we will highlight all areas where we feel there are shortfalls or enhancements to be made, which is why our first response covered several pages and a number of topics.

Link Road

-

The fact that the meeting on the 20th March focused primarily on the link road and the crossings and junctions on this proposed highway is probably indicative that this is our biggest concern. These are the areas where there will be interactions and conflict between more vulnerable road users and motor vehicles, and where collisions result in the greatest harm; ensuring safety is a high priority of ATE. Junctions are also where cyclists and pedestrians perceive the greatest safety risk and unsafe junctions can discourage use of otherwise high quality routes (10.3 of LTN 1/20). It is accepted that the link road is strategic and necessary to accommodate local transport and there will be an element of severance within the site as a result, however we would expect crossings and junctions to meet design guidance and seek to limit this where possible – I can provide examples of similar schemes where strategic roads have been 'softened' when new housing has been located adjacent to them if useful. The tools and guidance in LTN 1/20 are useful here in choosing the right level of crossing when speeds and volume of traffic is known or can be estimated; similarly South Yorkshire Design Guide S2.2 states schemes must be tested for continuous access with controlled crossings over busier streets. The indicative layout does suggest there will be a strong network of active travel routes, footpaths and cycle paths (although to play devils advocate, I would also highlight these are mostly reserved and not under consideration/agreed now), our argument would be therefore that it would be disappointing to reduce their effectiveness through the delivery of a link road with unsafe

crossings.

The use of shared footways/cycleways is a concern and is contrary to guidance in LTN 1/20, Gear Change, and again the South Yorkshire Design Guide (A2.3, N5.2, B2.2.8, B2.3). The conflict here is between pedestrians and cyclists and these result in notably fewer significant injuries. However, the risk of conflict is still a concern, particularly for more vulnerable pedestrians, and segregation is also valuable in encouraging cycle trips. So, while this is not as high of a priority as above, given there is clearly space to design the footway and cycleway in accordance with national and local guidance, it is unclear why this has not been included by the applicant or requested by the local authority since the application was submitted 3 years ago.

Primary school

-

On the school access/location, again this is a quite significant concern as this relates to vulnerable road users crossing carriageways with reasonably high volumes of traffic (some of these crossings can be 'solved' on the link road). It is accepted that this is a reserved matter, but ATE would highlight that the design of the link road will affect the ability to position the school in a location where pupils and parents are provided with attractive walking, wheeling and cycling environments. Our first comments raise this, and that the approach to the layout routes all traffic from the eastern neighbourhoods to the junctions around the school. While the design of these junctions and streets is reserved, the routing of traffic would be set. Mitigation could potentially soften this impact, but given the approach taken so far to crossings, street hierarchy and the divergence from design guidance focused on active travel, we have concerns. If the existing approach is continued in these reserved phases, trips to the school and local centre by active travel modes will not be as attractive as they could be, will raise safety concerns and exclude certain users, and will struggle to facilitate the shift in travel patterns aimed for in local and national objectives.

Phase 1

-

In our first response we commented on the lack of street hierarchy, street trees and all streets being primarily designed for motor vehicles in Phase 1. Again, our views are that the approach taken does not clearly align with guidance in the National Design Guide or South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide. Yes there are footways and pocket parks, and given the number of dwellings in Phase 1 this is not a high priority, but it is an identified shortfall where improvements could be found.

Links to Higham

-

Connections from the site to Higham were raised on our first comments. Between plots 115 and 116 there is an access that appears appropriate, although a 3m wide path would be preferable. The access to Avon Close is significantly constrained and not accessible or

attractive for many users; the access between 33 and 35 Welland Close has not been confirmed/it is not clear if this is planned. Although the meeting did not cover this topic it is worthy of consideration by the LPA. If there is only a single point of access from the site to Higham (via Longley Street) that is accessible and attractive, pedestrian and cycle routes will be indirect, and less attractive than car trips for what should be short journeys between this site and Higham.

Our comments are intended to be useful and not obstructive. I recognise that we have been introduced relatively late in the process, but following a consultation request by the LPA we have assessed the scheme and given our view. In summary to your question, I would state that as there have been no amendments (or clear justification for why our recommendations could not be accommodated), ATE's initial comments remain our view on the development. As said previously, if the local authority and applicant have a different view and the application is progressing to decision, we just request that our comments are outlined and considered in any officer report, as I'm sure they would be.

Kind regards,

Will Elliott | Planning Casework Officer, , Active Travel England
| [REDACTED] |

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, April 2, 2024 8:52 AM
To: Will Elliott [REDACTED]
Cc: Nigel Cussen [REDACTED] Heidi Boot [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Lake , Wayne (GROUP LEADER HDC)
[REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 2021/1090 Land south of Barugh Green Road and east of Higham Common Road, Barnsley -

Good morning Will

I refer to the Active Travel England objection of 15th November 2023 which details a number of areas of concern covering several pages, including the Claycliffe link road, shared user path, roundabouts, crossings, surfacing, proposed school site (which is applied for in outline only and not being considered in this application), Phase 1, and pedestrian friendly design. The entirety of the objection has been sustained in the email from you of 7th March 2023. The email notes that "opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes are being missed", although an extensive network of active travel routes, footpaths and cycle paths are proposed, throughout the scheme.

The wide range of concerns in Active Travel comments of November were not reflected in the Teams meeting of 20th March 2024 where officers from Active Travel discussed their objections with the applicants and council officers. Instead, it seemed that the key objection related to crossings of the link road, issues relating to the footway/cycleway appeared to be of less importance and the remainder of the concerns previously raised were not raised by Active Travel at the meeting.

In the light of the above would be grateful if you would clarify the extent of Active Travel England's objections to the proposal in the light of the meeting of the 20th March 2024.