



Improving life for local people

Mike Ashworth
Strategic Director

Economy, Transport and Communities
County Hall
Matlock
Derbyshire DE4 3AG

Mr R Weaver
Head of Regulatory Services
High Peak Borough Council
Town Hall
Market Place
Buxton
Derbyshire SK17 6EL

Minicom: 01629 533240
Telephone: 01629 538578
Ask for: Ian Turkington
Our ref: HDC/IT/23635
Your ref: HPK/2016/0520
Date: 17 October 2016



LOGGED

Dear Mr Weaver,

Application : HPK/2016/0520
Applicant : Sherwood Homes Ltd
Development : Approval of reserved matters – for outline planning permission HPK/2013/0597
Location : Charlestown Works, Charlestown Road (A624), Glossop

I refer to the above application, details of which were received at this Authority on the 29th September 2016 for highway comment.

The principle of development for this site was established under a previous outline planning application - reference HPK/2013/0597, which was granted approval by your Authority in a decision notice issued on the 30th October 2013. At the time this application considered means of access only, with all other matters being reserved.

The current application creates 85 No new residential properties, 12 No apartments (in an existing converted building) and 2 No new blocks of office accommodation. Based on the access and layout proposals submitted I would offer the following highway comments.

Whilst access has been determined in principle, condition 6 of the outline planning consent requires 'designs' (of the accesses) to be submitted for subsequent approval. It would also appear as though the proposals have been modified slightly over the drawings previously considered by the Highway Authority. As you will be aware from my consultation response, dated 20th January 2014, comments regarding the access improvements were based around drawing references 12732-5002/03 Rev G and 12732-5002/19 Rev F. The current site layout plan (drg no 016/043/SL and associated drawings) shows a narrower carriageway width – less than 8.5m (previously 9.5m)



together with modification of the private access route (leading to properties to the east of the site). This width would not be considered acceptable for the A624 and the layout will need to be amended to ensure acceptable highway arrangements can be achieved without impacting on the frontage development as proposed. The modification of the private access should also be checked to ensure it can accommodate all vehicle movements associated with the existing properties. I would also request, given amendments clearly need to be undertaken to the layout plans, that the access to the office accommodation be laid out in the form of a dropped vehicle crossing point, rather than a radius junction. The internal car parking area will not be considered for adoption and therefore pedestrian priority should be maintained on the public highway. This will also reinforce the private nature of this access point.

Condition 7 of the outline planning consent requires the internal estate street layouts to be designed and laid out in accordance with the County Council's current design guide – the 6C's document. Whilst the layouts submitted are generally acceptable in parts, there are nevertheless a number of areas where they are considered deficient and do not fully meet safe minimum or adoptable criteria. Comprehensive guidance is available within the 6C's document in respect of achieving safe and adoptable estate street layouts and the following comments identify areas which need to be given further consideration:-

The scale of development warrants the estate streets to be laid out as an Access Road. This requires the street to be laid out at least 4.8m wide flanked by 2m wide footways (6C's, Part 3, Section DG2, Table DG1). However, in the case of the road serving plots 44–85 the initial section of road will have an industrial use and should be laid out 6.75m wide, in accordance with Part 3, Section DG2, table DG2.

Where the estate street centreline radius less than 20m carriageway widening on the inside of the bend is required to ease the movement of traffic through the street – at radii 20m and less this requires 0.6m widening on the inside of the bend (6C's, Part 3, Section DG2, Table DG6). The bends fronting plots 2, 5, 32, 60, 74 and 85 will therefore require amending to accord with acceptable criteria.

The streets are expected to achieve a maximum design speed of 20 mph or below and this will require forward visibility splays of 25m around bends - the area in advance of the splay being laid out as part of the street and not part of any plot. The splays should be appropriately constructed (following any widening modifications on the inside of the bend) and demonstrated on modified drawings. All the above mentioned bends should be checked for compliance.

Based on the design speed of the estate street visibility from private driveways should also achieve save minimum criteria, in this instance 25m visibility is

required from private driveway access points. Given the proposed layout of the street and parking areas a number of plots are unlikely to achieve satisfactory visibility sightlines. All plots should be checked although this is likely to affect plots 8, 9, 13, 14, 25, 26, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 44, 46, 60, 61, 69-77, 83, 84 & 85. Revised driveway arrangements will need to be considered where acceptable visibility sightlines cannot be achieved.

Access Roads require footways both sides of the carriageway, especially where there is a demonstrated demand from fronting properties. A footway should be provided fronting plots 69-77 - this will also help with achieving visibility sightlines from parking spaces and forward visibility around bends. Where it is agreed that the highway margins can be reduced in width, where there is no pedestrian demand, the margin should be a minimum width of 1m to comply with adoptable criteria.

The overall level of parking is likely to be acceptable in principle, however, there are a number of concerns regarding the dimensions of parking spaces shown for some plots – whether it be the internal dimensions for integral garages or open parking spaces. The design guide recommends garages should have internal dimensions of 3m x 6m long (6C's Part 3, Section DG18 : Garages and gated accesses) or 2.5m by 5.5m long for open parking spaces (including driveway spaces). The internal dimensions of any garages should be checked for compliance; otherwise, it may not count towards parking provision for that plot (if it is likely to be unusable for the parking of a motor vehicle). All parking spaces should be checked especially plots 13, 14, 22-26, 32-36, 38, 58, 59 (shown as less than 4m long), 63, 64, 75, 76, 83 and 84 to ensure acceptable on-plot parking arrangements can be achieved. Permitted Development rights are also likely to require removing for integral garages in order to maintain and control future on-site parking provision.

The estate street should be laid out with adequate turning to avoid vehicles reversing over long distances (normally anything over 25m). The potentially adoptable street fronting plots 23-26 will therefore need to be shortened, up to the plot boundary between plot 24 and 25.

Manoeuvring out of some of the parking areas is likely to be difficult given the alignment of the driveways to the estate street and the estate street geometry itself e.g. the alignment of the driveways associated with plots 5 and 6 and the available geometry behind the parking areas associated with plots 69-74 (6m is normally required behind any car parking space for acceptable manoeuvring).

The access associated with the apartment block is only 13m from the junction with the A624 and it is likely inlet vehicle speeds could be quite high due to the larger junction geometry. Improved and extended visibility should be provided from a modified access point, to ensure a safe means of access can be achieved.

It is noted existing drainage sewers run through the site and the new estate streets appear to be constructed over them. It will need to be demonstrated that the drainage is in the public ownership in order for the Highway Authority to consider adoption of the estate streets.

Drainage details have been submitted, although it appears the system proposed has a shared use and as such would not be eligible for adoption by the Highway Authority. The Highway Authority has therefore not commented on any strategy, layout or construction details submitted.

Street lighting details have also been submitted, however, the design will need to be formally approved by the Highway Authority as part of any Section 38 or Section 278 Agreements pursued for these works. It is likely that amendments will be required to the proposals submitted and therefore no formal Highway Authority approval is given at this stage for the street lighting proposals shown. Construction details for the works have also been submitted and again this will form part of the construction approval process with the Highway Authority prior to entering any Agreements for the works.

Details of the offices within the application site boundary have not been provided to ascertain if parking levels and manoeuvring are acceptable for this use.

Whilst the proposals are likely to be acceptable in principle to the Highway Authority there are, as highlighted above, a number of access and layout issues to be resolved before the Highway Authority may be in a position to formally sanction the proposals. I would be grateful if the applicant could consider the above comments and submit suitably amended plans for further consideration. However, should you wish to determine the application in its current form I would welcome the opportunity to provide further highway comments.

Yours sincerely

Highways Development Control