
From: Stannard, James
Sent: 23 August 2023 10:16
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: HPK/2023/0104 - Crossgate Farm, Crossgate Lane, Tintwistle.

Categories:

Hi

Please see further comments from the Highways Authority in connection with HPK/2023/0104

Thanks

James Stannard MRTPI
Planning Officer
High Peak Borough Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
Tel:
Mobile:
Email:

From: Adrian Martin (Place)
Sent: Wednesday, August 23, 2023 10:11 AM
To: Stannard, James
Cc: Colley, Jane
Subject: RE: HPK/2023/0104 - Crossgate Farm, Crossgate Lane, Tintwistle.

Dear James,

Further to the previous highway authority comments submitted in response to the above application and to our recent conversation in which you raised your concerns about the highway authority comments and the apparent lack of detailed analysis carried out when assessing the application. For information, as requested, I have visited the site and provide the following further comments to the application and to your email below:

The locality of the site, in relation to the highway network, and the characteristics of the access roads i.e. Crossgate Lane and Arnfield Lane is understood and was understood when the application was initially assessed, as was the nature of the site access. It is and was also understood what the application, if granted consent, would permit in terms of use and operating periods.

The original assessment of the application took into account the proposal to create a one way system via the site access off Crossgate Lane, that being the entrance, and an existing access off Manchester Road, that being the exit. You have confirmed that you consider this arrangement to be unenforceable; however, this was unknown at the time of the original assessment and the original assessment took this scenario in to account. The one way system would have been a preferred option and would have reduced the likelihood of interaction between those users of Crossgate Lane travelling uphill to the site access and those travelling downhill away from the site, given that the proposed campsite is likely to generate movements on Crossgate Lane, including both vehicular and pedestrian, as well as potentially cyclists and horse riders (the application makes mention of stables being available on the site and that horse riders are welcomed). However, if the one way system is not to be accepted by the LPA, then the existing access scenario must be assessed i.e. all traffic generated by the campsite making two way movements on

Crossgate Lane (there is potential for anyone to use Arnfield Lane; this is considered unlikely for motorised traffic due to the cobbled surface and the ease of accessing Manchester Road via Crossgate Lane).

The potential likely vehicular traffic generated by the proposed campsite is obviously something which must be considered. But, this consideration should also take in to account existing traffic generated by the site and the other likely existing movements on Crossgate Lane and the surrounding highway network. It is understood that the site has operated as a campsite under permitted development rights for the previous two years. This allowed 28 days total use as a campsite in one year; this was increased to 56 days during the Covid period. The number of pitches and/or berths allowed under permitted development rights in the previous two years is not known; however it is assumed to be up to 50 which corresponds with the latest permitted development rights. It is clear that some vehicular traffic would have been generated by the campsite in the previous two years. Therefore, the potential increase in traffic generated by the proposed campsite and the impact of that traffic on highway network should be considered and was in the original assessment. And whilst accepting that the characteristics of Crossgate Lane and Arnfield Lane for that matter, are not ideal, both having a restricted width and a relatively steep gradient, that impact must be considered in its acceptability. As you have kindly pointed out, paragraph 111 of NPPF states that “development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.” The previous permitted development rights allowed the site to operate a campsite for 56 days with all of the associated traffic using Crossgate Lane and possibly Arnfield Lane, although unlikely as previously stated, with no known unacceptable highway impact as a consequence e.g. collisions and capacity issues. There may have been some occasions of inconvenience, for instance, where, two vehicles met on Crossgate Lane but these would have resulted in slow moving manoeuvres to ultimately allow both vehicles to pass. These instances are not considered to represent an unacceptable highway safety issue. There are some areas on Crossgate Lane which provide an informal passing opportunity and areas for pedestrians to wait if vehicles are also using Crossgate Lane at the same time. Again, this may be inconvenient but are not considered to be an unacceptable highway impact. There are many roads and parts of the highway network which are not ideal in their nature and characteristics; however, this does not necessarily mean that those parts of the highway network are fundamentally unsafe to highway users.

You have raised a concern about the restricted visibility at the site access on Crossgate Lane due to the proximity of the main dwelling to the access. It is agreed that exit visibility in the right hand direction when exiting the access does not meet current emerging visibility guidance. However, what should also be considered is the traffic flow on Crossgate Lane and the likely instances where conflict will occur between a vehicle exiting the access and another user of Crossgate Lane. During my visit to the site some vehicles were observed passing the site access as well as other vehicles entering and existing the site access. All vehicles were travelling at a slow speed as would be expected. A vehicle exiting the site access was observed and the driver was able to position the vehicle away from the dwelling, the obstruction to visibility, and took all the expected care to check for oncoming vehicles and, it is assumed, other users. This is considered to be the likely action taken by all users of the access especially those unfamiliar with the access.

Regarding the location of the site, which you consider to be isolated, there are amenities such as bus stops, pub and local/village shop all within acceptable walking distances of the site. The very nature of campsites and the reasons why people choose to visit them would suggest that a certain remoteness of the site from areas with an abundance of amenities would be the point of visiting them. There may be some vehicle trips generated by the site when patrons of the site wish to visit nearby attractions for instance but it would also be expected to be common for some, if not many, patrons of the site to walk or cycle to nearby attractions. Having said this, there is no data available to provide a definitive judgement on predicted trip generation of campsites.

The aforementioned comments and conclusions reached are based on a subjective assessment of the application as a whole similar to that which, as you have stated, you as a planner assess other aspects of planning applications. Also, which I am sure you as a planner will also consider, is the prospect of sustaining an objection at appeal. In this instance it is considered that a highway related objection would be difficult to sustain.

Regardless, of the aforementioned comments, you may be aware that recent changes to permitted development rights allow campsites, including motorhomes, to operate for 60 days with up to 50 pitches/berths. This application is for fewer pitches and berths in total than is allowed under permitted development. Whilst the proposed campsite is intended to operate for a longer period than 60 days, if 60 days is considered acceptable without requiring planning consent, why would a longer period of operation for a smaller site be unacceptable? I am sure you would agree that this would be difficult to argue against at appeal.

Based on the above comments, it is considered that the application would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or have a severe cumulative impact on the road network.

I trust that you now consider that the highway authority response to this application to be a detailed assessment which has given due regard to the characteristics etc. of the site and the highway network.

Regards,

Adrian Martin MCIHT | Project Engineer | Highways Development Control | Place | Derbyshire County Council | direct dial: |
Visit us at www.derbyshire.gov.uk | Follow us on Twitter | Find us on Facebook

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.highpeak.gov.uk/YourData>
