



**The Network Rail (Leeds to Micklefield Enhancements) Order**  
*CD 7.07 – Summary of Highway Design Proof of Evidence*

---

**TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992**  
**TRANSPORT AND WORKS (INQUIRIES PROCEDURES)**  
**RULES 2004**  
**NETWORK RAIL (LEEDS TO MICKLEFIELD**  
**ENHANCEMENTS) ORDER**

---

**SUMMARY OF HIGHWAY AND DESIGN PROOF OF**  
**EVIDENCE**  
**OF**  
**GED STAMPER**

Document Reference	CD 7.07
Author	Ged Stamper
Date	6 February 2024

**The Network Rail (Leeds to Micklefield Enhancements) Order**  
*CD 7.07 – Summary of Highway Design Proof of Evidence*

*[this page is intentionally left blank]*

## **Contents**

<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. SCOPE OF EVIDENCE .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3. ENGINEERING AND DESIGN.....</b>	<b>1</b>

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Qualifications and experience**

1.1.1 My name is Ged Stamper and am a Principal Engineer at SYSTRA and lead a team for the design of highways schemes.

## **2. SCOPE OF EVIDENCE**

2.1.1 My evidence is concerned with the highways interface with The Network Rail (Leeds to Micklefield Enhancements) Order. I address in particular the highway design of the replacement bridges at Austhorpe Lane and Ridge Road.

2.1.2 I also address the proposed new access road at Neville Hill and its interface with the existing non definitive bridleway and the closure of the Peckfield Level Crossing and associated diversion of the bridleway at Peckfield Lane / Pit Lane in Micklefield

2.1.3 My evidence relates to points 3, 4c, 4d and 5 of the Statement of Matters.

## **3. ENGINEERING AND DESIGN**

### **3.1 Austhorpe Lane**

3.1.1 Austhorpe Lane Bridge is a single span overbridge carrying a single carriageway public road, Austhorpe Lane.

3.1.2 The current bridge needs to be replaced as the headroom over the railway is insufficient for the electrification works of TRU.

3.1.3 The new structure will incorporate the existing separate footpath bridge into a single structure. The highway alignment will replace the single lane over the bridge with 2 narrow lanes. The footbridge will be replaced with a 2m wide footpath.

3.1.4 Austhorpe Lane has been designed to comply predominantly with a Type 1 connector street (LCC SPD), which is the highest category within this design guide. The design has been checked against DMRB CD 109 (Highway Link Design) and this standard has been used where it is more appropriate. Whilst there are some departures from those standards, as I set out in my Proof, the final design is the best that can be achieved within the constraints of the changes to the railway and the constrained nature of the site.

## **The Network Rail (Leeds to Micklefield Enhancements) Order**

### *CD 7.07 – Summary of Highway Design Proof of Evidence*

3.1.5 I have provided details of the various options considered for the design of the replacement highway in Sections 4.2 to 4.10 of my Proof.

### **3.2 Ridge Road**

3.2.1 Ridge Road is a single carriageway road between M1 Motorway junction 47 to the north and Peckfield Roundabout / A63 Selby Road to the south. The road runs in a straight line north/south for approximately 1700 metres with the overbridge located approximately 1150 metres from Peckfield Roundabout.

3.2.2 HUL4/14 is a single span overbridge carrying the A656 single carriageway public road. Immediately to the south of the bridge the carriageway widens to form an exit for entry into Phoenix Avenue.

3.2.3 The current bridge needs to be replaced as the headroom over the railway is insufficient for the electrification works of TRU.

3.2.4 In keeping with the existing arrangement, the new carriageway will be a like-for-like replacement with some structural changes to the bridge parapets and provision for future widening.

3.2.5 Ridge Road has been designed in accordance with DMRB CD 109 (Highway Link Design) with a design speed of 100kph as national speed limits Ridge Road has been designed in accordance with DMRB CD 109 (Highway Link Design) with a design speed of 100kph as national speed limits apply on this section of road.

3.2.6 I have provided details of the options considered for the design of the replacement highway in Sections 4.11 – 4.20 of my Proof.

### **3.3 Neville Hill Access Road**

3.3.1 The proposed Neville Hill Access Road is located at the end of Newmarket Approach which in turn connects to A63, Pontefract Lane.

3.3.2 The proposed carriageway is 7.3m wide from the junction with Newmarket Approach to the existing track within the depot.

3.3.3 Although the road will remain in Network Rail ownership, the road and the details have been designed in accordance with LCC standards and details, with the exception of the vertical profile of the road to the north of the existing bridleway.

## **The Network Rail (Leeds to Micklefield Enhancements) Order**

### *CD 7.07 – Summary of Highway Design Proof of Evidence*

- 3.3.4 The highway vertical profile up to the bridleway is compliant with standards. The section of the carriageway to the north of the bridleway does not comply with LCC standards due to the large level difference and the short horizontal distance between the bridleway and the finished ground level inside the compound.
- 3.3.5 The bridleway is widened from the existing 2.2m wide to 3.0m wide through the proposed works to be compliant with cycleway design standards. This widening is provided over a length of 34m. The northern edge of the bridleway remains the same and the widening is to the south only. Chicane guard rail barriers are provided on both approaches of the bridleway to the new road and are intended to warn and slow cyclists as they near the junction. Pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians will have priority over the road users at the crossing.

### **3.4 Peckfield Level Crossing Diversion**

- 3.4.1 A number of issues have been raised regarding the proposed diversion route for the closure of Peckfield Level Crossing by objectors including Leeds City Council.
- 3.4.2 A Route Safety Assessment has been carried out to consider the safety implications to non-motorised users from the proposals at the request of LCC. The assessment considered the safety implications of NMU's being diverted from the current route to the proposed route.
- 3.4.3 With regards to the entrance at Micklefield Recreation Ground, all users of the track will be likely to be moving at very low speeds and are unlikely to come into conflict. Therefore, the shared use of this track by self-propelled vehicles, horse riders, cyclists and walkers is not considered to be a safety problem.
- 3.4.4 With regards to Great North Road, as it passes under the railway bridge, the road under the tunnel is not narrow, as it is in excess of 6.0m between kerbs. Recent works by LCC have narrowed the road under the bridge from approximately 7.5m wide and has provided a wider footpath on the west side of the road. I do not agree that motorised vehicles cannot pass horses on Great North Road.
- 3.4.5 Great North Road is approximately 7.5m wide through Micklefield and in excess of 6.0m wide under the bridge. The section of Pit Lane (on the southern side of the railway) near to Great North Road is in excess of 6m wide and there is therefore sufficient width for any normal road vehicle to pass a horse and rider, following the precautions listed in my Proof. A protected space for cycling is not a requirement in this situation due to the very low cycle flows.

### **3.5 Response to objections**

- 3.5.1 I have provided a response to a number of objections which raise particular concerns regarding highways issues in respect of Austhorpe Lane, Ridge Road and Peckfield Level Crossing in Section 5 of my Proof.

**The Network Rail (Leeds to Micklefield Enhancements) Order**  
*CD 7.07 – Summary of Highway Design Proof of Evidence*

**3.6 Witness declaration**

3.6.1 This Proof of Evidence includes the facts which I regard as being relevant to the opinions which I have expressed, and the Inquiry's attention has been drawn to any matter which would affect the validity of that opinion.

3.6.2 I believe the facts which I have stated in this PoE are true and that the opinions expressed are correct.

3.6.3 I understand my duty to the Inquiry to help it with the matters within my expertise and I believe I have complied with that duty.

Signed:



Dated: 6 February 2024

**Ged Stamper**

Principal Engineer, SYSTRA