
From: Glen Donaldson (Place)
Sent: 01 December 2022 09:12
To: Steven Gunn-Russell
Subject: HPK/2022/0456 Land at Dinting Vale - pre-response meeting actions

Hello Steven.

The Local Highway Authority (HA) offers the following response to planning application HPK/2022/0456.

HPK/2022/0456 Transport Assessment (TA)

Land At, Dinting Vale, Dinting, Glossop

The site is allocated in the High Peaks Local Plan, policy DS4. It is therefore assumed that a strategic transport assessment was undertaken at the local plan stage and as such strategic modelling is not required and the application is supported with a TA and Travel Plan and has been submitted as a full Planning - Large scale MAJOR application, so these comment are written in that light.

The Planning Statement Confirms that DCC has previously provided pre application comments, dated 22nd November 2021 – TA Scoping correspondence.

Submitted TA for HPK/2022/0456 Comments

- Road Safety. 2.15-2.19 and Figure 2.3. This shows that there is an accident record in the area and the clustering suggests a trend. The TA has not undertaken a detailed assessment of the incident and this needs to occur to identify potential causation factors. The assessment is insufficient.
- Visibility Splay. 3.4. 2.4 x 43m is proposed. It is unacceptable as it is not evidenced, the used of MfS criteria requires 85th percentile speed data, the application of the splay against the posted speed limit does not

confirm the splay is suitable. The speed camera may influence speeds, but a survey is required to assess the splay line.

- **Parking.** 3.8. Whilst the High Peak Local Plan standards are recognised, a parking calculation for Simmondley Ward using census data confirms that the generic parking levels are inappropriate for this location and an evidence based approach is needed.
- **Bicycle Parking.** 3.9. Again the Local Plan is recognised, but the more recent publication of LTN 1/20 confirms a greater level of cycle parking is needed. Bicycle parking locations are not acceptable and in some instances are accessed via narrow alleyways that turn through 90 degrees.
- **Accessibility.** Section 5. The TA suggests an accessible neighbourhood, however the gradient will be a significant barrier that will conflict with the distance / time based assessment. A WCHRA should be provided.
- **Future traffic Flows.** Section 6. A 5 year assessment is used and Temprow applied. I cannot find the TEMPROW scenarios recorded in the TA so they need to be provided. A test of 2031 should also be applied to capture the cumulative local plan growth expected.
- **6.5 Covid Impact.** Agreed no adjustment should be made at this time given the lack of evidence to support this.
- **Trips Rates.** The Local ward data confirm that the average car ownership level of the ward is 1.65 cars per dwelling. The sites used in the TRICS report are not reflective of the local profile. I have undertaken a TRICS assessment to look at comparable development with a greater car ownership level and that confirm the proposal is low and under estimates the impact. If the applicant does not agree the should undertake a local survey to evidence the rate based on current residential movements.
- **Highway Impact.** Section 8. This section is not accepted, firstly the trip rate is too low, and secondly a 2031 assessment is needed based on the local plan year. Notwithstanding this the impact indicated in Table 8.3 A57 Dinting Vale / Simmondley Lane / A57 High Street West / Primrose Lane Double Mini Roundabout shows that this development has an adverse impact on this junction and it is already operating over capacity. The detailed analysis in appendix G also shows the LoS is poor and as such the junction is subject not performing well. As such mitigation will be needed.

Site Access Comment

- The topographic survey and Geo-Environmental report confirm significant gradient at the site access of between 1 in 3 and 1 in 5. The DSP remains the Local design guide and requires 1 in 30 for the first 10m for a priority junction, it also applies different gradient for footways and cycleways, but in summary says 1 in 12 maximum. The applicant also needs to consider “Inclusive mobility” and “LTN 1/20” both of which address key considerations to promote active travel and ensure that persons with protected characteristics are catered for.
- The applicant has not provided a long section of the proposed estate road and in the circumstance of such significant land challenges it must be provided.
- The initial evidence suggests that the application is not complying with the local or national considerations which would conflict with NPPF 110.
- The access should provide an implied side road priority crossing for pedestrians.

Internal Site Layout Comments.

- Notwithstanding the submitted information, the internal layout of the site should be in accordance with the guidance contained in the 6C’s Delivering Streets and Places Design Guide (DSP).
- The site layout has not been designed to address the road user hierarchy. Whilst footways are provided the street is car dominated.
- The required design speed cannot be achieved due to the straight length and lack of traffic management.
- The proposal is required to provide street trees (Para 131 NPPF), not justification has been provided for not do so.
- There are significant lengths of dropped kerb which does not provide the required level of protection for pedestrians.
- Some vehicle accesses are located too close to junctions resulting in vehicle to vehicle conflict and difficulties in installing tactile paving.
- A priority crossing should be provided where the Public Right of Way (PROW) crosses the street and this route must remain unobstructed on its legal alignment at all times and the safety of the public using it must

not be prejudiced either during or after development works take place. Further advice can be obtained by calling 01629 533190. Please note that the granting of planning permission is not consent to divert or obstruct a PROW. If it is necessary to temporarily obstruct a right of way to undertake development works then a temporary closure is obtainable from the County Council. Please contact 01629 533190 for further information and an application form. If a right of way is required to be permanently diverted, then the Council that determines the planning application (The Planning Authority) has the necessary powers to make a diversion order. Any development insofar as it will permanently affect a public right of way must not commence until a diversion order (obtainable from the planning authority) has been confirmed. A temporary closure of the public right of way to facilitate public safety during the works may then be granted by the County Council. To avoid delays, where there is reasonable expectation that planning permission will be forthcoming, the proposals for any permanent stopping up or diversion of a public right of way can be considered concurrently with the application for proposed development rather than await the granting of permission.

- Where a 2m verge is provided please explain how pedestrians will connect the proposed footways.
- The access drives to the proposed development road shall be no steeper than 1 in 12 for the first 6m from the rear of footway and 1 in 6 thereafter.
- Suitability of the layout for use by a Large Refuse Vehicle of 11.6m length should be demonstrated by means of appropriate swept paths/turning head. The refuse vehicle is incorrect and should be retracted. Notwithstanding this the vehicle oversail projects beyond the prospective highway which confirms the turning heads are insufficient. The applicant will need to consult with the relevant refuse collection department to ascertain details of what will be acceptable to them in terms of number and location of bins and means of access including the removal of specialist waste. Bin storage should not obstruct the private drive access, parking or turning provision. Additionally a bin dwell area should be provided clear of the public highway, private access, parking and turning for use on refuse collection days.
- Without benefit of details printed to scale, it isn't possible to ascertain the width of the proposed road widths, so carriageway widths should be shown and annotated to be 5.0m - for streets with a design speed of up to 20mph, 5.5m - for streets with a design speed of up to 30mph or 6.0m - for streets designed to facilitate bus services.
- Off-street parking should be provided at a level to satisfy your own Authority's standards, each space being of 2.4m x 4.8m which should be increased in length to 6.5m where a space is in front of a garage. Single garages with minimum internal dimensions of 3m x 6m and any double garages 6m x 6m minimum dimension with an additional 0.5m of width to any side adjacent to a physical barrier e.g. wall, hedge, fence, etc.
- Measures to prevent surface water run-off from entering the public highway from any areas at a higher level will need to be shown.
- The Highway Authority no longer accept shared surfaces within the public highway without a Road Safety Audit (RSA) because of the impact that this has on the blind and partially sighted, so these may remain private.
- Adoption of the estate streets is a purely voluntary act between the developer and the Highway Authority and acceptance of the proposals for planning purposes does not in any way compel the Highway Authority to enter into an adoption Agreement at a future date.
- Any redundant vehicular and pedestrian accesses shall be permanently closed with a physical barrier and the existing crossovers reinstated as footway.
- No pedestrian crossing locations or tactile paving shown within the site.
- Until bedroom numbers per dwelling has been provided, parking provision cannot be assessed and should be made in line with the HA design guide (2 spaces per 2/3 bed property and 3 spaces per 4 bed property).
- Tracking should be provided for a supermarket delivery/ambulance type vehicle within the turning heads.
- The proposed highway drainage and road lighting should be submitted as part of the technical approval process.
- The DSP remains the Local design guide and requires 1 in 30 for the first 10m for a priority junction and 1 in 20 for the remainder of the site. It also applies different gradient for footways and cycleways, but in summary says 1 in 12 maximum. The applicant also needs to consider "Inclusive mobility" and "LTN 1/20" both of which address key considerations to promote active travel and ensure that persons with protected characteristics are catered for.

Overall, the layout does not meet the adopted requirements.

Travel Plan

- This is unacceptable. It does not provide a base position of mode share, nor does it indicate what level of mode shift it wants to achieve.
- The lack of target makes the plan unlikely to be successful.

Additional Comment

- A CLoS and JAT assessment should be provided.

Therefore, whilst the above comments may not be exhaustive, it's recommended that the applicant is given opportunity to submit revised/ further details to satisfactorily address all of the issues highlighted and should be addressed by the applicant prior to determination of the application, ideally through revised information/drawings. However should the proposals be acceptable in planning terms and your Authority is minded to approve the application in its submitted form, I would welcome the opportunity to discuss possible highway related conditions and notes for inclusion in any decision notice issued.

Regards

Glen Donaldson | Project Engineer | Highways Development Control

Place | Derbyshire County Council
County Hall | Matlock | Derbyshire | DE4 3AG