From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access
Date: 28 January 2025 12:58:46

Application Reference No. : HPK/2024/0513
Site Address: 4 6 Burlow Road Harpur Hill Buxton Derbyshire SK17 9JD Buxton
Comments by: Ade P.
From:
23
College Drive
Harpur Hill
Buxton
Derbyshire
SK179FZ

Submission: Objection
Comments:

This planning application presents multiple concerns from a Highways perspective. I would ask that you forward my response to County Highways for further consideration and their response, please. As follows:

Vehicular Parking.

The development site directly fronts Burlow Road. At this point, Burlow Road has uncontrolled parking which means that there are no waiting restrictions such as double-yellow lines. It is noted that there are waiting restrictions flanking both sides of Burlow Road (within 10m of the site access). The existing double-yellow lines will have been implemented by the Highways Authority for the purposes of prohibiting vehicular parking, maintaining a clear highway and safeguarding the necessary forward-visibility sightlines for the purposes of Highways Safety.

There are three key points to consider here:

1) Extending the waiting restrictions (if deemed necessary) would form a separate process to this planning application and require a legal Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to secure any future extension of the existing double-yellow lines. There is no guarantee that process would succeed, due to the necessity to consult on the process. DCC would also need to secure associated costs linked to any mitigation on the public highway.

2) It is reasonable to highlight the fact that parking enforcement does not occur in this area, even where waiting restrictions are in place. For example, the visibility sightline when egressing the nearby Burlow Avenue is frequently impeded and reduced to approximately 20m, due to parked vehicles. The consequence is that the necessary 43m (highways standard) sightline for a 30mph speed limit, cannot be achieved.

3) Parking Enforcement Officers focus on Buxton town centre and other town centres in the High Peak, not

village locations. Ad-hoc parking officer enforcement would have little impact on existing or future parking habits, for example, someone using the future retail unit would spot a parking officer and either park elsewhere or leave the shop and move their vehicle. This is human nature.

The application form states that there are 8 no. existing vehicular parking spaces. This is incorrect. The area also forms the only pedestrian access to the premises and is where cyclists and mobility scooter users would secure their cycle/scooter.

The hard-standing frontage (split into two separate parts due to a level difference and retaining wall) is not marked out for vehicular parking and is not a ¿car park¿, per-se. It is an area where the existing resident and/or the bar owners would originally park 1 to 2 vehicles so as to keep Burlow Road (and their access) clear of parked vehicles.

When the public house was regularly open, only a small number of vehicles would ever be seen parking in this area (see Google Streetview historic records for July 2009 and June 2011). Customers of the public house would not have been accessing and departing the site every few minutes, which would be the case with a convenience store type use as proposed.

The ¿passing trade¿ that a retail proposal of this type depends upon (so as to be commercially viable) will see vehicles executing dangerous reversing manoeuvres over the pedestrian footway and onto Burlow Road, in addition to parking on Burlow Road and further impeding sightlines.

This presents road safety concerns to vulnerable road users such as pedestrian and cyclist, or children who are using scooters, for example. It also raises the likelihood of vehicular collisions. This concern would be heightened in low-light or inclement weather. There appears to be no way of mitigating this issue, neither does it appear to have been considered by the application team.

Finally, there is no supporting drawing to demonstrate that a vehicle can safely access, turn and egress the site in forward gear, particularly when other vehicles are in situ within the site frontage. Mindful of the retaining structure which splits the hard-standing area into two quite distinct parts, it is unlikely that the required turning manoeuvre could be safely achieved. Vehicular tracking drawings are therefore required to demonstrate if this is achievable (and they should incorporate a ¿large car¿ with 7 other vehicles in situ.) A 300mm buffer zone/margin for error should be incorporated into any future swept-path analysis drawing and reviewed by DCC, for the purposes of accuracy/approval.

Intensification of Use and Road Safety Implications.

Mindful of the residential characteristics of the surrounding area and frequent observations of a high level of parking both on pedestrian footways and within nearby junction inter-visibility sightlines, there is merit in requesting a Stage One Road Safety Audit (RSA1). This would need to be completed by an independent auditor (i.e. separate to the application team).

This is a procedure that allows an independent overview of a proposal for the purposes of safeguarding future highways safety. The process in most cases includes the preparation of a report and the agreed response and actions by the application/design team and their designers/contractors, with the Highways Authority (in this case DCC) as ¿Overseeing Organisation¿.

The purpose of this exercise would be to identify safety issues relating to the proposal that may result in a collision or user injury. In response to any issues identified, the process includes a response by the designer/contractor on how they wish to resolve these and requires the overall agreement of the Highways Authority.

There is no RSA1 (or indeed, Transport Statement) supporting this planning application. Mindful of the intensification of use of this existing private access (which is not a formal junction but a ¿footway crossover¿, whereby pedestrians have priority over vehicles) DCC should be requesting such, as a consultee to the Planning Authority.

An RSA1 and Designer¿s Response should therefore be submitted to and be reviewed by DCC. Any concern(s) that an RSA1 raised should be afforded significant weight in determining whether the proposal was acceptable (if suitable mitigation could not be secured against any future planning consent).

Bus Stop Opposite the Site.

The site is directly opposite a bus stop on the northern side of Burlow Road which serves four (east-bound) operational bus services, the 185, 186, 442 and TP. Resultantly, buses can regularly be seen standing at the location directly opposite the development site. The result is that other vehicles either back up behind the bus or pass it (a regular scenario on many highways).

However, the consequence of supporting this application and granting planning consent is that customers are highly likely to park on the public highway for a number of minutes when using the shop, directly opposite the bus stop.

When a bus arrives, this would block Burlow Road in a scenario whereby a passenger using a wheelchair or mobility scooter may be boarding or alighting the bus (or a number of passengers are boarding with smaller children or items such as pushchairs) which can take more than a handful of seconds to complete.

The result of such a scenario would be that customer vehicles may impede the free and safe flow of all road users. This may present a concern to emergency services and accordingly, organisations including Derbyshire Fire & Rescue Service and East Midlands Ambulance Service, should be consulted by HPBC.

Recognising the uplift in residential accommodation over the ground floor use which forms part of this planning application, there is no consideration as to where future occupants of the proposed residential units would park

in a scenario whereby a resident returns home, only to find the hard-standing area full of customer or delivery vehicles. The consequence of this scenario is that future residents are likely to park their vehicle on Burlow Road or the adjacent footway.

This would impede the safe passage of pedestrians, wheelchair and mobility scooter users. Whilst it is acknowledged that this is a scenario that happens in the wider area, from a Planning and Highways consideration this does not mean that such a ¿precedent¿ makes that scenario an acceptable one, nor one that should be overlooked as part of this development proposal.

Servicing & Delivery.

There is no Outline/Framework Servicing and Delivery Statement supporting this planning application and it therefore appears unlikely that a full Statement would be secured by planning condition, should consent be granted. Information is required as to where light or heavy good vehicles would park when servicing the development, their likely frequency and dwell times.

Resultantly, it would be challenging for a DCC Highways officer to establish how a servicing or delivery vehicle might access the site, turn and egress in forward gear. If this was unachievable, it would result in LGV/HGVs standing on the public highway in front of the property directly adjacent to the aforementioned bus stop, as the delivery driver unloads goods.

Once again, this presents a road safety concern. It is likely to result in an obstructed forward visibility sightline on a stretch of Burlow Road that sees pedestrians crossing to access the bus stop and church, devoid of any formal or informal pedestrian infrastructure to allow them to do so safely. This presents an unacceptable arrangement with respect to future servicing and delivery of the proposed retail unit.

Conclusion.

The proposal presents serious concerns relating to highways and vulnerable road user safety. The application is contrary to National Planning Policy Framework, HPBC Planning and DCC Highways policies. The HPBC Planning case officer and DCC Highways officer are encouraged to properly assess the implications of such.

It is highly likely that development related vehicles would regularly impede the free and safe passage of all road users such as the emergency services, pedestrians and mobility scooter users. Resultantly, this planning application should be refused.

Finally, thank you for considering the above points in your determination of this planning application.

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