



Chris Henning
Executive Director - Place
Economy & Regeneration
County Hall
Matlock
Derbyshire DE4 3AG

Head of Development Services
High Peak Borough Council
Town Hall, Market Place
BUXTON
Derbyshire
SK17 6EL

Telephone
Ask for Adrian Martin
Email
Our ref HPBC/2024/007944
Your ref HPK/2024/0151
Date 29 April 2024

Dear Mr Haywood

Application Ref: HPK/2024/0151
Proposal: Single Storey Side and Rear Extension, Enlarge Drive with Associated Engineering Works
Site: SPRING COTTAGE
MAYNESTONE ROAD
CHINLEY
SK23 6AQ

I refer to the consultation on the above-mentioned application and I have the following comments to make.

The application proposes the removal of an existing garage which is to remain clear and become an extension to one of the existing parking spaces and will in effect provide two tandem parking spaces. Tandem parking spaces are not ideal due to the increase in movements at the access to allow the rear most vehicle to exit the space. It is also noted that the existing spaces do suffer from restricted visibility on to Maynestone Road; however, in effect, the new spaces will be similar to the existing and the exit visibility is not considered to be something which would warrant an objection.

It is also proposed to construct a new extension, annotated as storage and office, with a parking space located to the front between the 'garage door' and the fronting road. The space between the carriageway edge/ highway boundary and the garage door is some 4.8m. Derbyshire County Council's Design Guide recommends a preferred space of 6.5m between a garage door and the site boundary with an absolute minimum of 5.5m. The space available falls significantly below the absolute minimum distance; a reduced space between the highway boundary and the garage door potentially lead to a parked vehicle encroaching on to the adjacent carriageway. Whilst this is clearly not an ideal situation, should a parked vehicle encroach on to the highway it is considered unlikely that such a vehicle would restrict the movement of traffic, including cyclists and pedestrians, when considering that such traffic is likely to be positioned more centrally on the carriageway and away from the carriageway edge.

Ultimately, it is considered that the proposed scenario would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety which would warrant an objection in accordance with paragraph 115 of the NPPF. It is recommended that the door to the new store is required to be a roller/shutter type and that this is conditioned accordingly.

Yours sincerely

Adrian Martin
Highways Development Control