

**From:** [Essex,John \(Environmental Services\)](#)  
**To:** [ES Planning Control \(Environmental Services\);](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** FW: Pye Bridge Proposed Energy Generation Plant  
**Date:** Friday, June 10, 2011 2:14:59 PM  
**Attachments:**

---

**From:** Barton,Kevin (Environmental Services)  
**Sent:** 10 June 2011 14:08  
**To:** Essex,John (Environmental Services)  
**Subject:** Pye Bridge Proposed Energy Generation Plant

John

Thank you for forwarding the recent correspondence regarding this site on which I comment below.

The recent letter from Signet Planning and the Transport Statement prepared by NTP have been read and considered. It is clear from the Transport Statement that the Developer still intends to service the site from their adjacent site. However they have included within the Transport Assessment details of the potential traffic generation should materials need to be sourced and disposed of off site. I have no reason to doubt their traffic predictions. The Transport Statement does not include details of the potential traffic generation of the site should it be reused under its previous use class however this only serves to make their traffic predictions more robust that they otherwise would be.

In terms of Traffic generation the applicants have demonstrated that assuming their worst case scenario the impact of this proposal on the adjacent highway network would have no material detriment. The access to the industrial estate from the B600 is suitable in terms of geometry and visibility. Therefore there are no highway objections to this proposal.

I would however suggest a condition be applied to any consent requiring the parking and manoeuvring facilities demonstrated on the plans submitted with the Transport statement be provided prior to the proposed

use being taken into use and be thereafter so maintained free from any impediment to their designated use.

It is appreciated that other issues may cause local concern regarding this proposal and I would therefore add the following for clarification. When the Highway Authority's advice to the Planning Authority is that there is no objection to the granting of planning permission this should not be interpreted that the generated traffic is regarded as having no effect. In the case of the Pye Bridge site the Highway Authority acknowledges that the proposals will generate an increase in vehicle movements compared to existing circumstances (or indeed that which could potentially result from a reopening of the previous use), any such increase will have an "impact" on the B600, in the vicinity of the site. However, any such increase must be demonstrably materially harmful to a degree that there is justification for refusal of planning permission, and that an associated reason for refusal would be sustainable on appeal. The Highway Authority will not propose a recommendation to refuse planning permission if it does not consider that an evidence base exists to support such a reason for refusal.

*Kevin Barton*  
*Project Engineer*  
*Development Control South*  
[kevin.barton@derbyshire.gov.uk](mailto:kevin.barton@derbyshire.gov.uk)  
01629 538658