

From: [Glen Donaldson \(Place\)](#)
To: [Nick Brookman](#)
Cc: [Steven Gunn-Russell](#); [Planning Comments \(HPBC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Dinting Vale HPK/2022/0456 - Transport
Date: 18 July 2023 16:01:25
Attachments: [image003.png](#)

Hello Nick.

I thought the meeting was beneficial and as promised, the following information should enable you to fully understand the direction the County Council is heading in terms of Active Travel, so please pass on the information to all the relevant parties, but firstly point 3 (see below) can be removed as I note the information required is within the submitted TN dated April 2023 and is acceptable by the County Council.

- [The second cycling and walking investment strategy GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#),
- [ciht shared streets](#)
- [cycle-infrastructure-design-ltn-1-20](#)
- [working Together to Promote Active Travel A briefing for local authorities.](#)
- [inclusive mobility a guide to best practice on access to pedestrian and transport infrastructure.](#)
- [inclusive-transport-strategy.](#)
- [Building Car Dependency 2022.](#)

PRoW email address: ETC.PROW@derbyshire.gov.uk

I have included (bcc'd) the Flood and structure team members in this email so they are aware you wish for them to contact you to discuss the drainage and possible gas pipe protection structure.

I will also discuss with Steve Hawley if the Draft Highway Design Guide can be sent to you before it has been approved.

Regards

Glen Donaldson | Project Engineer | Highways Development Control

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

Tel: **01629 535544** | Ext: **35544**

E-mail:: ete.devcontrol@derbyshire.gov.uk



CONTROLLED

From: Glen Donaldson (Place)
Sent: 06 July 2023 15:43
To: planning@highpeak.gov.uk
Cc: Steven Gunn-Russell <Stevengr@whitepeakplanning.co.uk>
Subject: Dinting Vale HPK/2022/0456 - Transport

Hello

After having an internal meeting with the relevant colleagues at the County Council on 5 July 2023, the following highway concerns we identified:

1. Levels:

The submitted Technical Note (TN) dated May 2023 references approved planning application HPK/2017/0247 however back in November 2022, the pre-application discussions identified the levels as being an issue with significant level concerns at the site access and within the site as a whole. The County Council at the time assessed the site access at 1 in 3 (the geo-environmental report refers to the site being 1 in 3 to 1 in 5), but at that stage there wasn't a proposed gradient identified within the TA ,D and A statement or application as a whole.

So HPK/2017/0247 will not be taken as an example as I was not involved with the application and the Highway Officer has left the County Council so discussions cannot take place regarding the specific reasons for the departure from the Highway Design Guide (6C's) which at that stage required:

'Longitudinal gradients: • 1:100 - flexible surfacing minimum. • 1:80 - block surfacing minimum. • 1:20 - maximum (For the majority of cases. Refer to LHAs for allowances in site specific areas). • 1:30 - maximum at junctions for the first 10m of the side road. Vertical curves (only necessary where changes in gradient occur due to crests and sags): • To be calculated based on formula: $L = KA$. • L = length of vertical curve (m). • 10m - minimum for streets with a design speed of 20mph or less. • 25m - minimum for streets with a design speed of more than 20mph. • K = constant. • 1.0 - minimum for streets with a design speed of 20mph or less. • 4.0 - minimum for streets with a design speed of over 20mph. • A = algebraic difference of the gradients expressed as a percentage.'

The Highway Design Guide is also being updated and although in draft form at this time, it has not departed from the 1:20 for all streets, but consideration given to 1:12 with the road gradient into junctions should be set at 1:20 (5%) for the first 10m.

I am also aware of the requirements of the 'Inclusive Mobility' DfT 2022 which States:
'Generally, pedestrian environments should be level, which means that there should be no

gradient in excess of 1 in 60. Effort should be made to ensure that the route is smooth, since even small dips or gaps in paving points might present a hazard such as to people who use a stick or a crutch. If a level route is not feasible, then gradients should not exceed 1 in 20. (A slope steeper than this is generally defined as a 'ramp'). Even if a pedestrian route has no slopes in excess of 1 in 20, it is important that there are level sections, or 'landings', at regular intervals. This is to provide people with an opportunity to rest; where possible accessible seating should be provided on such landings. A level landing should be provided for every 500mm that the route rises. The length of each landing should be equal to at least the width of the ramp'


LTN/120 states: '5.9.7 Unlike motor traffic, human physiology means that people can cycle steep gradients that are fairly short but are not capable of maintaining high levels of effort for longer distances. Cycle routes should therefore, where possible, be designed in such a way that the steepness and maximum length of longitudinal gradients meets the requirements of Table 5-8' with Table 5-8 having a maximum gradient of 5% (1:20).

The County Council must be mindful of all highway users, so the levels must be reassessed and conform with the 1:20 requirement.

2. PRoW:

It is noted that the Internal road crosses a PRoW (see attached copy of PRoW and extract from submitted layout drawing Rev G below), so the following information is required:

- a. Has the applicant been in contact with the County Council PRoW section
- b. What is the grey feature below?
- c. What legal access rights does the PRoW have?
- d. What measures have been put in place for the prevention of development traffic using PRoW?
- e. Is the approximate location of Cycle and/or Pedestrian routes shown in submitted Design and Access Statement being put forward a PRoW?



3. Pre-application discussion actions included:

- a. Traffic speeds on A57, road safety analysis, evidenced visibility splay, local parking evidence, implications of A57 DCO, revised trip rates, further analysis of mini roundabout and consideration of refuse vehicles and apart from a mention in the Design and Access Statement (D&AS) section 5.1 which does not show any vehicle tracking, the submitted documents do not provide any information of the requested.

4. Cycle/pedestrian Link:

It is noted that Sustrans have provided a response which highlights:

'The proposed route, whilst welcome, does not provide the same level of connection/extension. New residents will therefore have no connection to the wider sustainable transport network. The developer and High Peak are urged to consider how this can be resolved as part of this application / contributions. Residents health and well-being are paramount and this includes connections to the wider sustainable transport network, and the inclusion of equestrian provision. The Technical Note does not provide any drgs to show the revised sustainable transport option'.

The County Council note the lack of connectivity is also an issue (see attached TP response) and since 2017 there has been a pandemic, government emphasis has changed regarding road hierarchy and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021 has also altered from the 2019 version and the relevant changes are:

- 'Changes to wording of paragraph 11a from "plans should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area, and be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change" to "all plans should promote a sustainable pattern of development that seeks to: meet the development needs of their area; align

- growth and infrastructure; improve the environment; mitigate climate change (including by making effective use of land in urban areas) and adapt to its effects'

 - Paragraph 72 of the 2019 version has changed to paragraph 73 in the 2021 version and now includes "...and facilities (including a genuine choice of transport modes)"

In summary:

- b. Resubmission of a revised document which acknowledges that targets should be set once the initial residential travel survey baseline figures are established. A 10% gross target reduction in SOV should then be set. This replaces the use of the 2011 dataset and the 'no change' SOV target proposed.
- c. Confirmation that access arrangements for all to the site can be reasonably achieved in accordance with current accessibility guidelines. This includes, amongst others, regulation widths, gradients and resting places along the main access road.
- d. Provision of walkways to all dwellings.
- e. No information provided regarding the interface with public highway at each end for cyclists/pedestrians.

It should be pointed out that the site is in close proximity to a proposed Key Cycle Network (KCN) route which is also part of the Trans Pennine Trail and the Pennine Bridleway. This has clear potential to take trips to the development off the highway and facilitate safe and sustainable trips to local destinations. As a minimum, the link to this route should be safeguarded; wherever possible a developer contribution should be secured to provide the link.

See attached KCN with the thin orange line is the link, the thick orange line is the proposed KCN route beneath Dinting Viaduct.

In the event of a S106, the Travel Plan Monitoring fee is £1,265.00 pa x five years, total £6,325.00.

5. Trees in footway:

Submitted drawing layout Rev G shows trees at the entrance which are beyond the proposed adopted highway so does this conform to the requirements of NPPF 131 and (see extract from layout Rev G below) the trees seem to have been placed within the footway which is an obvious highway safety issue as they will reduce the width of the footway and impede all highway users.



6. Parking provision:

Although no specific guidance regarding the placing of parking spaces in close proximity to each other within the existing (a) Design Guide (6C's), updated (b) Design Guide/Standard Advice which are both in draft form and HPBC (c) where the following is provided:

- a. States: *'Off-street car parking shall be designed for convenient access to frontages. Wherever possible, off-street car parking shall be directly overlooked by the property which it serves for security reasons and to encourage users to utilise the facilities provided. Parking provisions that are not overlooked are strongly discouraged'*
- b. States: *'All car parking should be provided off-street. Provision must be made to enter and exit in a forward gear on roads with high levels of vehicle flow. In/out drive arrangements are only permitted where space allows for manoeuvring within the site and does not rely on the use of both accesses, full visibility is required at both accesses. Car parking spaces must be delineated to maximize occupancy and courteous behaviour, which may not otherwise be achieved through errant parking' and 'Parking spaces dimension shall be 2.4m x 4.8m. For dwelling houses an addition 0.9m width should be applied to give extra space for egress by less mobile persons as suggested by Homes for Life. Where the parking space is in front of a garage the space length should be increased to 6m to allow space for the garage door to be opened.'*
- c. Mentions bay sizes and amount, but no design options.

However, looking at layout drawing Rev G:

- a. 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.
- b. The size of the bays has not been provided.
- c. Plots 60 to 62 may be an issue as they will be reversing in or out of the bay on a bend in the road.
- d. No parking space sight lines have been shown.

- e. The creation of one long dropped kerb to access the cluster of parking spaces could be a highway safety issue in terms walking or cycling over a long distance before passing the row of vehicles.

The County Council would wish to see the highway issues addressed prior to determination, however, should the LPA be minded to approve the application in its current form we would be grateful if the LPA could reconsult the Highway Authority so that consideration can be given to formulating appropriate Conditions/Notes which can be recommended to be appended to any consent issued.

Regards

Glen Donaldson | Project Engineer | Highways Development Control

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

Tel: **01629 535544** | Ext: **35544**

E-mail:: ete.devcontrol@derbyshire.gov.uk



Join thousands of local residents who receive regular county council news direct to their inbox. Go to our [website](#) and click on the Sign Up button.

Think before you print! Save energy and paper. Do you really need to print this email?

Derbyshire County Council works to improve the lives of local people by delivering high quality services. You can find out more about us by visiting www.derbyshire.gov.uk. If you want to work for us go to our job pages on www.derbyshire.gov.uk/jobs. You can register for e-mail alerts, download job packs and apply on-line.

Please Note

This email is confidential, may be legally privileged and may contain personal views that are not the views of Derbyshire County Council. It is intended solely for the addressee. If this email was sent to you in error please notify us by replying to the email. Once you have done this please delete the email and do not disclose, copy, distribute, or rely on it. Under the Data Protection Act 2018 and the Freedom of Information Act 2000 the contents of this email may be disclosed.

Any personal information you have given us will be processed in accordance with our

privacy notices, available at www.derbyshire.gov.uk/privacynotices.

Derbyshire County Council reserves the right to monitor both sent and received emails.
