

Consultee Comments for Planning Application 21/00494/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00494/FUL

Address: Warland Farm Warland Todmorden Calderdale OL14 6XA

Proposal: Conversion and extension of Mickle Barn and Shippen to provide overnight accommodation, workshop, communal facilities, crafts studios and associated bakery/brewery/bike store (with PV roof covering)/sun-space and greenhouse structures at Warland Farm.

Case Officer: Gillian Boulton

Consultee Details

Name: Mr Andrew Dmoch

Address: Calderdale MBC, Mulcture House, Westgate Halifax, Halifax HX1 1PS

Email: Not Available

On Behalf Of: Highways Section

Comments

The proposal is for a significant development in a rural location. There is reference to 20 people working as assistants, teachers etc. and not all of these will be from the local community. The Arts and Craft school with 2 or 3 classes with 6 students per class equates to 18 students per day. There will be a need for deliveries related to the bakery, brewery and tea-room uses. The absence of employees on the application form is not realistic given the need for the aforementioned staff, rooms to be made up meals prepared and other activities associated with a hostel use.

Whilst the aspirations of the applicant are noted, and the intention to minimise vehicular movements are commendable, the highway authority has to consider the operator ability to realistically influence the mode of travel given the location.

There are few dwellings within walking distance so it is highly likely that many visitors and staff would travel by car. And clearly delivery movements would need to be by vehicle.

There is a bus service on Rochdale Road, the 590 which runs between Halifax and Rochdale via Todmorden and Walsden. It operates at a reasonable frequency for a rural location at half hourly intervals during the day and hourly in the evening and on Sundays. However the route from the bus stops is poor in terms of lighting and surface quality, especially to the east of the canal.

It is therefore concluded that the development is not well located in terms of access by modes other than the private car and is therefore contrary to the NPPF, Replacement Calderdale Unitary Development Plan, and emerging Local Plan.

Warland Gate End is a single lane track and apart from an area near the swing bridge there are no

passing places between the site and the A6033 It is approximately 100m from Rochdale Road to the swing bridge. This lane is well used by walkers and cyclists with a public footpath, Todmorden 108, running along it. It is also part of the Calder Valley Cycleway which runs as a shared footway and cycleway on the east side of Rochdale Road to the north of the lane. This route then uses the lane up to the canal towpath and then continues back to the north along the towpath.

Todmorden 108 also runs along the towpath whilst another public footpath, Todmorden 151, runs on the lane past Warland House.

The proposals would result in a significant increase in vehicular movements. The highway authority requires any traffic surveys to be undertaken by third party independent companies. However, based on the quoted 55 daily movements the proposals would represent a significant increase in vehicle movements.

Any vehicles meeting in opposite directions on the initial 100m length of lane would need to reverse back. Given that distance, any vehicles meeting near Rochdale Road would result in reversing back onto the A6033.

The visibility splays in both directions at the junction of Warland Gate End with Rochdale Road conform to Manual for Streets at the 2.4m set back distance. However there is a major safety concern with the substandard visibility between drivers of vehicles turning into the lane and vehicles approaching the give-way from the site. This is because of the gable end of the terrace at the back of the footway and the single lane width which will not allow a left turning vehicle to pass a vehicle at, or approaching the give-way point. The occasions when there will be conflicts would significantly increase with the proposal. The conflicts would include sudden braking and need for vehicle reversing within the junction bellmouth onto the A6033. The highway authority does not accept the analysis in the traffic statement about the acceptability of the layout given the available intervisibility and observed vehicle speeds. The suggested mitigation with a highway mirror would not address these concerns.

The absence of footways and presence of the public right of way exacerbates the concerns. The severity of these concerns means that there is an objection on highway safety grounds

I have reviewed an appeal decision from an application that was submitted in 1999. In the decision the Inspector highlighted these inadequacies, both the single lane approach and the junction with the A6033, and considered any significant intensification to be unacceptable. That development would generate much less traffic than the one proposed.

Turning to the access track on the immediate approach to the site, the width gradient and alignment are constrained for car use. The surfacing is also poor. The approach for delivery vehicles would be difficult particularly in poor weather conditions. From the plans and site visit it was evident that service vehicles would not easily access the site. There is also a concern that

goods vehicles would increase the erosion of the track to the detriment of walkers.

There is reference to 6 car parking spaces although the plan and application form state 2 spaces. It appears that to accommodate six cars there would need to be reversing into or out of the site which would not be acceptable. Even with six spaces it is likely that there would be insufficient provision based on the scale of the proposals and activities described. There are also no details of unloading and manoeuvring areas for goods vehicles.

A site visit was carried out on a fine day in late September and there were no available parking spaces in the informal area by the canal. All parking provision should be provided within the red line site boundary.

The proposals are contrary to the NPPF and policy BE5 of the RCUDP in terms of severity of traffic impact and also road safety. Refusal is therefore requested.