

SUMMARY
PROOF OF EVIDENCE
OF
DAVID ROBERTS IEng FIHE FCIHT
ON BEHALF OF WAIN HOMES (NORTH WEST) LIMITED

DEALING WITH
HIGHWAY, TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT MATTERS

PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
ON LAND AT A57 DINTING VALE, GLOSSOP

PINS REF: APP/H1033/W/24/3339815

SCP REF: DR/210087/S

MAY 2024

Colwyn Chambers
19 York Street
Manchester
M2 3BA

T: 0161 832 4400

E: info@scptransport.co.uk
W: www.scptransport.co.uk



This document has been prepared for the titled project or named part thereof and should not be relied upon or used for any other project without an independent check being carried out as to its suitability and prior written authority of SCP being obtained. SCP accepts no responsibility or liability for the consequence of this document being used for a purpose other than the purposes for which it was commissioned. Any person using or relying on the document for such other purposes agrees and will by such use or reliance be taken to confirm his agreement to indemnify SCP for all loss or damage resulting there from. SCP accepts no responsibility or liability for this document to any party other than the person by whom it was commissioned.

1.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

- 1.1 I am instructed in this matter by Wain Homes to provide highway, traffic and transport advice in connection with their proposals to construct 92 dwellings on land served from the A57 Dinting Vale, Glossop.
- 1.2 Whilst there are no longer any highway, traffic or transport related reasons for refusal in connection with this proposed development, the Council originally refused planning permission with two highway related reasons cited in the decision notice. These, now withdrawn reasons for refusal, have been the focus of objections by third parties and relate to:
- i. The position of the site access in close proximity to a school
 - ii. The potential for an existing pedestrian public right of way, and private vehicle right of way, serving dwellings at Adderley Place from becoming a rat-run between Simmondley Lane and the development.
- 1.3 Firstly, dealing with the position of the access, it must be noted that the position of the access was dictated by the allocation of the site in the Local Plan. It should also be noted that my client has acquired additional land to that envisaged by the allocation, in order to achieve an improved access arrangement in the same location.
- 1.4 The proposed access meets both national and local design standards for a junction of this type and the scale of development, in terms of both geometry and visibility requirements.
- 1.5 The development related traffic would not exceed an average of 1 vehicle every 2 minutes in any direction of travel in the busiest hour of the day. This level of traffic can be easily accommodated at the site access, with industry standard software for undertaking capacity assessments confirming that there would be no queues or delays associated with the access.
- 1.6 Most schools throughout the country cause some form of disruption to the flow of traffic at the start and finish times of the day. However, the problems are short-lived and cannot reasonably be used to resist otherwise acceptable developments.
- 1.7 There are no policies in national or local guidance in relation to restricting accesses in close proximity to schools. Indeed, providing residential developments in close proximity to schools should be supported to encourage more walking to school, rather than more remote developments that can lead to children being dropped off and picked up by car.

- 1.8 The school benefits from a traffic signal controlled pedestrian crossing and there is no history of accidents in the vicinity of the proposed access or the school. The crossing location is some 75m from the proposed access and there is no interaction between the two features.
- 1.9 Turning to the matter of the potential for development related vehicles to use Adderley Place as a rat-run, it had always been the intention to deal with this matter by a condition of planning permission, in the knowledge that a suitable solution is achievable. This was supported by the professional officers of the Council.
- 1.10 However, in the time between the refusal of planning permission and the preparation of evidence for the Inquiry, it has been possible to agree more details of a scheme with the public rights of way officer at DCC. These details are appended to my evidence and demonstrate that continued vehicular rights of way to the dwellings at Adderley Place can be maintained, whilst also preventing vehicles from being able to turn to or from the proposed development road and the eastern section of Adderley Place. The scheme of works includes both physical restrictions and supporting signs.
- 1.11 In terms of additional matters raised by third parties, these relate to inclusive design due to the gradient of the access road from the A57, and the site access junction type.
- 1.12 Inclusive design seeks to ensure that access for all users is available to new development proposals. Whilst the majority of users will be able to negotiate the site access road gradient, for those with more restricted mobility issues there is an opportunity to use the eastern section of Adderley Place to walk between Simmondley Lane and the development site.
- 1.13 It should be recognised that both Glossop, and the High Peak as a whole, has steep gradients in parts and the gradient of the access road is not unusual in this context. Also, the gradient is dictated by the level of the A57 and the plateau of the development site and was a consideration as part of the allocation of this site in the Local Plan.
- 1.14 The site access junction type meets the normal level of expectation for a development of the scale and type proposed. The junction type is dictated by highway capacity and highway safety. In this case both elements are met by the site access design. The suggestions of a mini roundabout or a ghost island type right turning lane are not required to achieve an acceptable level of capacity, and a mini roundabout in this location would potentially raise safety concerns due to the low traffic flows on the side road, and vehicles on the main road becoming accustomed to not stopping at the give way line.

1.15 Overall, my investigations of the highway, traffic and transport aspects of the proposals have led me to conclude that there are no related reasons to resist the development as proposed, and this is a view shared by both the Local Planning and Highway Authorities.