

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

Highway Officer: Glen Donaldson
Our ref: HPBC/2024/010623
Your ref: HPK/2024/0495
Date: 7 January 2025

Dear Stuart Talbot

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
(DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE) (ENGLAND) ORDER 2015
ARTICLE 18 CONSULTATION WITH HIGHWAY AUTHORITY**

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing outbuilding and erection of a single dwelling with associated landscaping work

LOCATION: Thorncroft,
Lower Hague,
New Mills,
SK22 3AP

Derbyshire County Council, the Highway Authority (HA) acting in its role as Statutory Consultee has undertaken a full assessment of this planning application. Based on the appraisal of the development proposals the Highways Development Management Manager on behalf of the County Council, under Article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, note a previously refused (not on highway grounds) application for the demolition of existing outbuilding and erection of a single dwelling on this site under reference HPK/2017/0219 which was also subsequently refused on appeal and the HA provided the following (extract) response:

'Therefore, by applying a driver reaction time of 2.0s and deceleration rate of 0.375g minimum sightlines of 2.4m x 43m and 2.4m x 45m to the right and left respectively when exiting are considered to be more appropriate.'

Application HPK/2017/0219 also submitted drawing PT138-121 P05 which showed the appropriate visibility splays, and this drawing has also been included in the submitted information, Highway Access Appraisal (HAA).

However, although the principle of development has already been accepted from a highway aspect, the Officer Report for HPK/2017/0219 also states:

'Final comments

Further to communications re the latest visibility plans, I note that all lines on the drawing are stated as being taken from an accurate topographical survey and that the requisite exit visibility sightlines of 2.4m x 43m and 2.4m x 45m to the right and left respectively have been demonstrated. These sightlines pass over land to each side of the existing access that would appear to be outside the control of the applicant. These areas (whether over currently controlled land or not) should be legally secured to the satisfaction of your Authority to be maintained clear of all obstructions greater than 1.0m in height (600mm in the case of vegetation) relative to the nearside carriageway channel level (NB not adjacent footway level) for the life of the development. Recommendations with respect to access, parking, manoeuvring, etc. have been provided previously.'

Therefore, as the previous HA recommendation was for refusal (see 3 reasons below):

'1. The proposed development, if permitted, would be likely to lead to the significant intensification in use of an existing substandard access to Lower Hague (B6101) where visibility is severely restricted due to existing road alignment and boundary treatments, thereby leading to a potential interference with the safe and efficient movement of traffic on the adjoining highway].

2. No adequate provision is included in the proposals for the parking/loading/unloading/manoeuvring of vehicles clear of the public highway, which would be likely to result in parking/loading/unloading/reversing onto or off of the public highway against the best interests of safe and efficient traffic movement.

3. The provision of a vehicular access with adequate visibility splays to the Highway Authority's minimum standards would involve the use of land, which as far as can be ascertained from the application drawings, lies outside the applicant's control.'

The following is required:

(1) Although drawing number PT138-121 P05 mentions, 'existing wall inside red line to be lowered to ensure visibility splays maintained', no wall height measurements have been shown.

(2) Although drawing number DR-A-00102 shows 2 parking spaces, no vehicle tracking has been provided, and

(3) Have the areas (whether over currently controlled land or not) been legally secured to the satisfaction of your Authority?

The County Council would wish to see the highway issues addressed prior to determination, however, should the LPA be minded approving the application in its current form we would be grateful if the LPA could reconsult the HA so that consideration can be given to formulating an appropriate response.

Yours Sincerely

Glen Donaldson
Highways Development Control