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/2026/018015
Your ref: AVA/2026/0416
Date: 23 July 2026

Dear Alex Shaw,

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

PROPOSAL: Proposed works to front of property including extension of drop kerbs to allow off-road parking, replacement of hardstanding and addition of side fence to west boundary not to exceed 900mm in height.

LOCATION: 79 Main Road Pye Bridge Alfreton Derbyshire DE55 4NY

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 planning permission should be refused.

Background

This planning application seeks permission for works to the front of the property to include an extension of existing drop kerbs to allow off-road parking, replacement of hardstanding, and addition of a side fence to the western boundary not to exceed 900mm in height.

Site Access

The proposed parking area would take access from the classified B600 Main Road, which is subject to a 30mph speed limit at the site frontage.

New accesses to the public highway must be assessed in terms of the stopping sight distance (SSD) required for an approaching vehicle to safely stop in time when a vehicle emerges from the access. This assessment informs the visibility splay required from the new access. Manual for Streets (MfS) provides guidance on assessing visibility splays.

The B600 is subject to a 30mph speed limit which gives rise to a requirement for visibility splays of 2.4m x 43m along Main Road on both sides of the site access.

The applicant has not demonstrated suitable visibility splays from the proposed access onto the B600.

Site inspection confirms that the footway fronting the site has a width of 1.9m. The site has a relatively narrow frontage, with a length of circa 5.35m. These constraints allow visibility splays of only 2.4m x 12.5m. A major road visibility splay distance of 12.5m equates to an approach traffic speed of less than 11mph. Actual approach traffic speeds are higher than this and the available visibility splays would therefore be severely substandard.

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) is not therefore satisfied that access and egress would be safe.

Where a new access emerges onto a footway, 2m x 2m pedestrian visibility splays should be provided on both sides of the access at the back of the footway, in accordance with paragraph 4.8.1 of the LHA's Planning, Streets, and Places (PSP) guidance. Due to the relatively narrow site frontage, such splays are not achievable.

In addition to the above, vehicles would either need to reverse into or out of the access. For the former, a car would have to stop in the road, impeding the free flow of traffic along the B600. Regarding the latter, such a manoeuvre would bring with it the added difficulty of restricted visibility for the exiting driver, increasing the risk of conflict with pedestrians, cyclists, and other vehicles.

The submitted plan (Ref: 2619 / 03) indicates that the depth of the front garden, which is proposed to accommodate a parking space, is 4.25m between the highway boundary and the front of the dwelling. The preferred length of a parking space is 5.5m, with a minimum length of 4.8m. The length of the proposed parking space would therefore fall below the minimum length giving rise to the likelihood that a parked vehicle would encroach on to the adjacent footway.

The footway is 1.9m wide, falling below the normal 2m minimum width requirement. Encroachment over the footway by a parked vehicle would further reduce the footway width, yielding an effective width of 1.35m or less, and would therefore obstruct the passage of pedestrians. This could result in pedestrians having to walk within the carriageway, which would be detrimental to pedestrian safety.

The lack of pedestrian visibility splays would compound the above issue.

Having regard to the above analyses, the LHA therefore considers that the proposed new site access and driveway would give rise to an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

The highway authority notes that 79 Main Road, in common with other dwellings along this section of the B600, has rear access served by a driveway located between numbers 73 and 74 Main Road. The highway authority therefore questions the need to form a new access to the classified road when the applicant could provide car parking to the rear of the property served by an existing access.

Further Matters

The submitted plan shows that existing concrete slabs are to be taken up and replaced with a permeable asphalt surface, preventing the unregulated discharge of surface water to the public highway and the possibility of deleterious material being deposited in the highway.

Access should take the form of a hard surfaced footway crossing, constructed in accordance with the highway authority's specification.

Conclusion

Having regard to the above assessment, the LHA recommends that planning permission should be refused for the following reason.

> The proposed development would introduce traffic movements to and from the classified B600 Main Road via an access with severely restricted visibility, no provision for vehicles to enter, turn within, and leave the site in forward gear, and no provision of satisfactory pedestrian visibility splays. The applicant therefore fails to demonstrate that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users, contrary to paragraph 115 b) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The proposed development is therefore likely to give rise to an unacceptable impact on highway safety, contrary to NPPF paragraph 116.

Yours sincerely,

Robert Smith
Transport Development Management

Date Received	Case Officer	Reviewer	Date Issued
7 July 2026	**Robert Smith**	**SD**	**23 July 2026**