DERBYSHIRE County Council

***Response provided under the delegated authority of the Executive Director for Place***

Planning Manager
Amber Valley Borough Council
PO Box 15, Town Hall, Market Place
RIPLEY
Derbyshire
DE5 3XE

Highway Officer: Robert Smith
Our ref: AVBC/2026/016467/R2
Your ref: AVA/2026/0115
Date: 3 July 2026

Dear Laura Anthony,

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

**PROPOSAL: Single-storey extension to an existing paint workshop**

**LOCATION: Howardson Group Ltd, Howardson Ltd, Ashbourne Road, Kirk Langley, Ashbourne DE6 4NJ**

---

Derbyshire County Council, the Highway Authority 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, recommends that determination of this planning application should be deferred pending the submission of additional information.

## Background

Following the Local Highway Authority's (LHA's) previous comments on this planning application, the applicant has submitted further information in the form of a proposed block plan and additional information from the agent via email dated 23/6/26.

## Application Form

The planning application form states that: the existing and proposed floor areas are 5200 sq m and 5214 sq m, respectively; there are 29 car parking spaces within the site, with no additional parking provision proposed; and, there are 100 full-time equivalent (FTE) employees with 5 proposed FTE employees.

However, the total floor area of the existing building, including its extension, within the “red line” area is circa 1600 sq m and the existing and proposed block plans show only 25 car parking spaces within the “red line” boundary, with 29 spaces noted in the application form.

Clarification of the above discrepancies is required.

It is not clear whether the stated numbers of employees apply to the units within the application site (i.e. units 7/8) or to the wider site. The applicant should also confirm the existing and proposed numbers of employees within units 7/8.

An amended planning application form will be required.

**Car Parking**

The proposed block plan includes a series of notes which seek to explain the allocation of car parking within the site.

The notes confirm that units 7/8 (the only units within the “red line” boundary) have 6 car parking spaces plus 3 to 5 motorcycle parking spaces, located in the areas shown on the plan as being occupied by spaces 101 to 109.

The notes confirm that the remaining parking spaces within the “red line” area are allocated to units 1 and 4.

Despite the notes stating that units 7/8 share the other on-site parking spaces, all the other parking spaces fall outside the “red line” area. It is not therefore clear that units 7/8 have access to the parking spaces which fall outside the “red line” boundary.

It is noted in the agents’ email that the only designated parking spaces are spaces 15 to 27 (13 spaces) which are assigned to unit 4 with the remaining spaces shared throughout the site. However, as noted previously, unit 1 has 14 spaces, therefore all the other spaces fall outside the “red line” area. Clarification is required, with the planning application “red line” boundary to be amended appropriately.

**Assessment**

From the agents’ email it is extrapolated that:

- Only designated parking spaces are spaces 15 to 27 (13 spaces) which are assigned to unit 4.
- The remaining spaces are shared throughout the site.
- The site has two companies under the same ownership.
- 92 spaces are noted as being required.
- 114 spaces in total.
- Secure cycle parking on the attached block plan.

It is not clear precisely what is meant by '*The applicant has listed the number of employees and their mode of transport to the site.- 79 spaces (excluding unit 4)*' nor how the 92 required spaces have been arrived at.

The secure cycle parking has been shown on the existing block plan, rather than the proposed block plan. A revised plan is required accordingly.

Given the above issues, based on the information submitted it is not possible for the highway authority to properly assess the impact of the proposed development.

The proposal for additional commercial floor space and staffing would ordinarily suggest the need for an increase in car parking and servicing provision, but no additional parking provision is proposed.

Parking takes place in several areas within the site, and occupancy of the allocated spaces appears high. There is no indication whether the level of available parking provision is adequate for the established uses or whether it can accommodate the proposed development.

The LHA's Parking Guidance for New Developments (PGND) requires that developers should provide a level of parking provision which will avoid the risk of on-street parking which could adversely impact highway and pedestrian safety.

The applicant should therefore provide evidence to demonstrate the appropriateness of the levels of car parking provision. Surveys would be of assistance to confirm current parking and servicing space demands. Parking accumulation should either be derived from first principles or from existing data, for example: using trip rates from the TRICS Database or by comparison with parking demands associated with the established use and its employees.

**Conclusion**

Having regard to the above, the highway authority recommends that this planning application should not be determined until the applicant has submitted further details which satisfactorily address the above issues. A highway technical note would be an appropriate means to present the necessary information.

The highway authority will comment again following receipt of further information.

Yours sincerely,

Robert Smith
Transport Development Management

| Date Received | Case Officer | Reviewer | Date Issued |
|---|---|---|---|
| **23 June 2026** | **Robert Smith** | **SD** | **3 July 2026** |