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: Jenny Rhodes
Our ref: AVBC/2026/018015/R1
Your ref: AVA/2026/0416
Date: 5 October 2026

Dear Mr 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 Local Highway Authority (LHA) 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

The LHA's initial observations on this planning application were issued on 23/7/26. The applicant has submitted further information in the form of a written response to the highway authority's 23/7/26 observations.

Assessment

The applicant's submission does not address the significant shortfall in visibility along the B600 from the site access.

The applicant maintains that the on-site car parking space has been used for several years and is therefore exempt from any enforcement action and has submitted

Google Map images from 2009 to 2019 showing a parked car on the frontage of the property. The LHA notes that more recent images from Google Maps, for the period 2021 to 2026, show overgrown paving slabs on the frontage, which does not appear to have been used for the parking of a vehicle. Notwithstanding the applicant's submission, the formation of an access to a classified road requires planning permission.

The LHA notes that some of the submitted photographs show the parked vehicle overhanging the footway at the site frontage. This is also apparent from satellite imagery, confirming the LHA's concern in relation to the limited depth of the driveway, and is detrimental to pedestrian convenience and safety. The applicant seeks to argue that allowing off-street parking within the site will benefit highway safety. However, the same issues that the applicant refers to as being detrimental to highway safety in relation to on-street parking, i.e. "difficulties for pedestrians, wheelchair users and pushchairs" would apply to the situation where cars parked on the site frontage obstruct the footway. These difficulties would continue to apply to the application scheme whether or not action is taken to prevent on street parking along the B600, as suggested by the applicant.

The applicant shows a photograph of off-street parking on the frontages to those properties to the south-east of the application site. The LHA notes that the driveway to those properties have greater depth than that on the application site, which means that vehicles parked on those driveways do not obstruct the adjacent footway.

The applicant comments that vehicles parking on-street do so partly on the pavement therefore obstructing users of the footway. The applicant suggests that, as Councils are given greater powers to prevent parking on footways, the opportunity to park on the B600 will reduce. However, removal of on-street parking, as suggested by the applicant, would not address the significant shortfall in visibility from the site access along the B600, as referred to in the LHA's 23/7/26 observations, which is restricted by the limited footway width and the limited length of site frontage.

The applicant maintains that this application is an opportunity to provide off road parking, reducing the requirement for on-street parking and therefore reducing obstructions to pedestrians and increasing the free flow of traffic on Main Road. An improvement to free flow along the B600, arising from this application would give rise to greater concern in relation to the lack of visibility from the application site access along the B600.

The applicant references proposals that have recently received planning permission within Amber Valley. Notwithstanding this, the schemes referred to by the applicant are on roads that are more minor than the B600, have driveways with greater depth, take access via wider verges/footways which allow adequate site access visibility, and, in the case of Cherry Tree Avenue, is on a cul-de-sac. The schemes referred to by the applicant are not therefore valid comparators. The LHA has assessed this planning application on its own merits.

The highway authority continues to question the need to form a new access to the classified B600 when the applicant could, subject to appropriate works, provide car parking to the rear of the property served by an existing access. The LHA notes that several other properties along this section of the B600 do take access to car parking spaces using the existing access to the rear of the application property.

Having regard to the above, the LHA does not consider that the further information submitted by the applicant satisfactorily addresses the LHA's concerns. The LHA therefore continues to consider that the proposed development would give rise to an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Conclusion

The LHA recommends that planning permission should be refused for the following reason, amended to reflect the August 2026 National Planning Policy Framework.

> 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 proposed development is therefore likely to give rise to an unacceptable impact on highway safety, contrary to policy TR6 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Yours sincerely,

Jenny Rhodes
Transport Development Management

Date Received	Case Officer	Reviewer	Date Issued
8 September 2026	Jenny Rhodes	SD	5 October 2026