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: Steve Dudhill
Our ref: AVBC/2026/018490
Your ref: AVA/2026/0398
Date: 11 August 2026

Dear Ms Graham,

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

PROPOSAL: Detached garden annexe

LOCATION: 3 Church Close Smalley Ilkeston Derbyshire DE7 6JX

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, has no objection.

Background

This planning application seeks permission for the development of a detached garden annex at 3 Church Close Smalley. The existing dwelling has 3 bedrooms with an attached garage and driveway space for a single car to park clear of Church Close. The proposed annex would add a further bedroom.

Car Parking

The highway authority's car parking standards are set out in its Parking Guidance for New Developments (PGND).

The PGND stipulates that 3-bedroom houses should have at least 2 car parking spaces. Garages are not counted towards car parking provision. The site therefore currently has a shortfall of 1 car parking space below the PGND requirement.

Addition of the proposed annex would result in the overall property having 4 bedrooms. Whether ancillary to the existing dwelling or not, the proposed annex would increase the minimum parking requirement to at least 3 car parking spaces. The proposed development would therefore increase the shortfall in on-site car parking provision by 2 spaces below the PGND requirement, giving rise to a net increase on off-site parking demand of 1 space.

The highway authority's preference would be for the applicant to come forward with a scheme to increase the level of on-site parking provision to mitigate the increase in car parking demand. However, given the current format of the property, that would not appear feasible. It is therefore necessary to consider whether the potential increase in on-street car parking demand arising from the proposed development would be likely to give rise to an unacceptable impact on highway safety, contrary to paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The carriageway width on Church Close is sufficient to accommodate on-street parking without the risk of significant obstruction. The bend on Church Close to the north-west of the site, together with the relatively short length of straight on Church Close between the A608 and the bend, means that traffic speeds are low in the vicinity of the site frontage. Church Close serves 24 dwellings, so traffic volumes on Church Close at the site frontage are relatively low.

Having regard to the above factors, the highway authority concludes that the net increase in on-street car parking demand of 1 space arising from the proposed development would be unlikely to give rise to an unacceptable impact on highway safety and that refusal of planning permission could not be sustained in this instance.

Conclusion

Having regard to the above, the highway authority has no objection to this planning application.

SD; DCC TDM; 11/8/26.