

J000269-BN01b  
October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/C/21/3279072  
LPA Reference No: 21/0034

Thornbridge Hall, Bakewell, Derbyshire

# Briefing Note

*Prepared on behalf of:*

Mrs Emma Harrison CBE.

## CONTENTS

<b>1.0</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Overview	1
1.2	Briefing Note Scope	2
<b>2.0</b>	<b>VISITOR NUMBERS, CAR PARK CAPACITY &amp; HIGHWAY IMPACTS</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Review of Visitor Numbers	3
2.2	Effects Upon Car Park Capacity	4
2.3	Effects Upon the Highway Network	5

## APPENDICES

Appendix BN1	Correspondence with Derbyshire County Council
--------------	---

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Overview

- 1.1.1 This Briefing Note (BN) has been prepared by Focus Transport Planning Ltd. (Focus TP) on behalf of Mrs Emma Harrison (the Appellant), to consider updated information submitted by the Appellant (dated 13<sup>th</sup> Sept 2022 to the Planning Inspectorate ) in respect of the Appeal against Enforcement action in relation to works undertaken at Thornbridge Hall (the Appeal Site). Specifically, this BN provides a review of updated visitor information for the Appeal Site, based on data recorded in 2022, and considers the highways and transport implications of this additional information in the context of previous transport submissions (Focus TP Transport Statement document J000269-TS01d dated November 2021).
- 1.1.2 Following submission of the additional information regarding visitor numbers, the Peak District National Park Authority (PDNPA), in its role as Local Planning Authority (LPA), has submitted its comments to the Appeal on the Appellant's additional information (LPA's comments dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2022). In its submissions reference is specifically made by the LPA to the additional information regarding visitor numbers. The LPA notes that monthly visitor number figures for 2021 were included within the Appellant's Transport Statement (Focus TP document referenced above), and that these figures were relied upon by the LHA when raising no objection to the developments. The LPA goes on to comment that "given the very significant increase in visitors in 2022, the Highways Authority may come to a different conclusion", with the LPA finally noting that it will seek the LHA's views on the new figures.
- 1.1.3 The scope of the November 2021 Transport Statement (TS) produced by Focus TP was discussed and agreed with officers of the Local Highway Authority (LHA) Derbyshire County Council (DCC) during June 2021 (see correspondence attached as Appendix BN1 to this Note). These scoping discussions identified that officers at the LHA were keen to ensure that the TS could demonstrate that the capacity of the new car park would suitably accommodate the forecast visitor levels to the Hall. Accordingly, within the submitted TS, a detailed review is provided of the car park's capacity relative to the visitor numbers during the Spring and Summer months of 2021.

## **1.2 Briefing Note Scope**

- 1.2.1 This BN will demonstrate that the most recent visitor number records do not materially alter the findings of the November 2021 Transport Statement and that, accordingly, there should remain no reason for the LHA to object in principle to the development.
- 1.2.2 This BN provides an update to the car park capacity review undertaken in the November 2021 TS, based on the abovementioned visitor number records from 2022. This BN will demonstrate that the car park would continue to provide sufficient capacity for visitors to the Hall by car, and that the wider traffic implications of increased visitor levels observed during 2022 would not have any material bearing on local highway network operational safety or capacity.

## 2.0 VISITOR NUMBERS, CAR PARK CAPACITY & HIGHWAY IMPACTS

### 2.1 Review of Visitor Numbers

2.1.1 In September of 2022, amongst other information provided to PINS by the Appellant, there was included new data relating to visitor numbers during 2022. This information is summarised in Table BN2.1 below for the peak months, alongside the data from 2021 which forms the basis of the analysis in the November 2021 TS:

**Table BN2.1 - Record of Visitor Numbers 2021-2022**

	2021	2022		
	Total	Total	Gardens & Café	Café Only
<b>May</b>	2,125	6,770	2,670	4,100
<b>June</b>	4,200	7,546	3,446	4,100
<b>July</b>	4,341	7,450	3,450	4,000
<b>August</b>	6,603	10,481	6,181	4,300

“Garden & café” denotes those trips made by visitors to both areas of the site, whilst “café only” identifies those where the visitor trip was specifically only to the café.

2.1.2 Review of the above information identifies that overall visitor numbers have increased during 2022, with May-July seeing a marginal increase over the peak figure from August 2021, but August 2022 in particular seeing a much larger increase of approximately 58% compared to the previous year.

2.1.3 During 2022 the systems in place at the Appeal Site have enabled more detailed analysis of visitor numbers and are able to separate those making a visit to both the garden & the café, from those only visiting the café. The majority of visitors to the café only are anticipated to arrive either on foot or cycle via the Monsal Trail or other local walking/cycling routes - it is not anticipated that many visitors to the café only are specifically travelling by car.

2.1.4 The November 2021 TS identified that the proportion of visitors travelling to/arriving at the Appeal Site by foot or cycle had increased markedly from as little as 10% between 2016-2019, to as much as 50% in 2021. The measures to enhance

the Appeal Site's accessibility as part of the works undertaken in 2020/2021, in particular in terms of accessibility via the Monsal Trail, are considered to be directly responsible for this increase in the modal share of sustainable travel by visitors. In essence, the Appeal Site is located in a prime position to enable access by sustainable transport modes by visitors, which is now being reflected in visitor numbers.

## **2.2 Effects Upon Car Park Capacity**

2.2.1 Given that recorded 2022 visitor numbers to the Appeal Site have increased, and by as much as 58% in the peak month of August, a revised appraisal of car park capacity is provided in this section.

2.2.2 The Nov 2021 TS outlines that a total of 150 car parking spaces are provided within the car park as constructed, and the gardens and café are open to visitors between 10:00-16:00 for 7 days per week. If it is conservatively assumed that visitors stay at the site for approximately 3 hours (it is assumed, as above, that the majority of visitors travelling by car would be visiting both the gardens and café) then the car park has the capacity to accommodate between 1.5-2x its capacity per day, which equates to between 200-300 vehicles per day. Based on 7 days/week opening and a average of 4.3 weeks per month, car park capacity could equate to between 6,000-9,000 vehicles per month.

2.2.3 Table BN2.1 above outlines that visitor numbers for August 2022 were recorded at 10,481. However, that figure represents the total number of visitors, including those travelling on foot or by cycle. The November 2021 TS outlines that between 30-50% of total visitors during 2021 arrived either on foot or by cycle, with the opening of access from the Monsal Trail having had a significant effect upon the modal split of travel to the Appeal Site.

2.2.4 Based on the assumption that the majority of those travelling to the "café only" are likely to do so as part of wider walking/cycling trips (e.g. via the Monsal Trail) then approximately 40% of visitors, at least, are likely to have travelled by foot or cycle to the Appeal Site during that busiest month (4,300 "café only" visitors from a total of 10,481 visitors). In reality, a proportion of the visitors to the gardens and café are also likely to have travelled on foot or by cycle. These observed trip

proportions broadly accord with the estimate outlined in the November 2021 TS that between 30-50% of visitors arrived by foot or cycle.

2.2.5 If a highly conservative assumption were to be made that as few as 30% of visitors arrived by foot or cycle (not borne out by observations in practice), then during the busiest month of August 2022 that would equate to approximately 7,300 visitors arriving by car. Given that the peak month for visitor numbers, by some margin, occurred during the school summer holiday period, it would be reasonable to assume that car journeys to the Appeal Site are likely to have accommodated more than 1 passenger, if not at least 2-4. If a conservative figure of just 2 occupants per vehicle were to be assumed, then the 7,300 visitors arriving by car would equate to approximately 3,600 vehicles arriving over the course of the month. This is significantly lower than the estimates of car park capacity provided at Para 2.2.2 above and in the November 2021 TS.

2.2.6 On the basis of the above appraisal, there should be no reasonable concerns relating to the ability of the car park at the Appeal Site to provide sufficient capacity, based on observed peak visitor levels. Indeed, the above analysis would suggest that overall visitor number could increase almost 3-fold before car park capacity is likely to be exceeded. In practice, the usage of the car park is likely to have been even lower than outlined above, as the above estimates are based on strictly conservative assumptions regarding both the modal split of visitors to the Appeal Site, and also the levels of vehicle occupancy during the school holiday/peak visitor month of August.

## **2.3 Effects Upon the Highway Network**

2.3.1 It should be reiterated that the LHA has at no point during the planning process raised any concerns over the safe operation of the local highway network in relation to the operation of the Appeal Site. As outlined in Section 1 of this BN, and as attached in the pre-application scoping communications attached at Appendix BN1, the main concerns of the LHA related to ensuring that the capacity of the car park could be demonstrated as sufficient, and also that the site access on to the A6020 could be demonstrated as being entirely in accordance with design standards.

- 2.3.2 The November 2021 TS included an appraisal of the site access junction with the A6020 and demonstrated that the level of visibility accorded entirely with design requirements, based on the prevailing speed of traffic along the A6020, and that there were no associated highway safety issues. This was subsequently confirmed by the LHA. The TS also identified that suitable passing places were available along the length of the original section of driveway, running between the A6020 access junction and the new section of internal driveway up to the car park.
- 2.3.3 The observed increase in visitor numbers would not have any bearing on the above considerations, either in relation to passing places on the internal driveway or the junction of the driveway with the A6020.
- 2.3.4 Nevertheless, further consideration has been given in this BN to the potential effects of increased visitor numbers upon the operation of the local highway network. Para. 2.2.4 above outlines that, during the busiest observed month of August 2022, overall visitor numbers of approximately 10,500 could, based on very conservative estimates of visitor numbers by foot/cycle and also vehicle occupancy, equate to approximately 3,600 vehicle arrivals to the Appeal Site over the month. Based on an average month of 4.3 weeks, and being open for 7days/week, this would further break down to approximately 120 vehicle arrivals per day.
- 2.3.5 The majority of vehicle arrivals would likely arrive during the first 3-4 hours of opening (between 10:00-14:00) and, therefore, it could be expected that approximately 30-40 vehicles arrive at the site per hour. This level of traffic is not considered to be significant and would be highly unlikely to result in any operational issues across the local highway network. Crucially, as the opening hours remain 10:00-16:00, all visitor traffic to the Appeal Site would take place outside the traditional peak hour periods of (08:00-09:00 and 17:00:18:00).
- 2.3.6 By way of providing further context, the visitor numbers recorded in August 2022 are noted above as representing a 58% increase on those observed in August 2021. That would equate to an increase of between just 10-15 vehicles per hour on August 2021 estimates - such levels are unlikely to even be noticeable across the local highway network.



2.3.7 Lastly, it should be borne in mind that the November 2021 TS identified, as repeated above at Para. 2.2.2, that the car park would have a theoretical capacity of 200-300 vehicles per day - almost 3x that identified above as potentially arriving during August 2022 (120/day - which in itself is based on extremely conservative estimates of the proportion of walking/cycling visits). Communication from the LHA (see Appendix BN1) identifies that no issues were raised by the LHA in relation to between 200-300 vehicles/day to and from the Appeal Site, associated with the car park's maximum capacity. It therefore follows that the LHA should continue to have no concerns in relation to the potential levels of vehicular traffic associated with the recorded August 2022 visitor levels.





**From:** [REDACTED]@derbyshire.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 16 June 2021 08:24  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Thornbridge Hall, Bakewell

Morning [REDACTED]

**RE: Thornbridge Hall, Bakewell**  
**Our Ref:** 82013723/HDC/RBS

I have been forwarded your recent email to my colleague [REDACTED] with regard to Thornbridge Hall, Bakewell.

With regard to your enquire please find comments below:

Concerning the new driveway spur, we are unlikely to have any major concerns, with it being internal. Presumably joining the existing driveway some distance from the main access to the A6020. It would just be a case of ensuring sufficient width was available, potentially by provision of intervisible passing places, to enable two vehicles to pass should they meet.

I believe the spur crosses a Public Right of Way (Footpath number 3 in the Parish of Great Longstone on the Derbyshire Definitive Map. The route should remain unobstructed on its legal alignment at all times and the safety of the public using it must not be prejudiced.

With regard to the new car park, each parking space should measure 2.4m x 5.5m with a 6m gap between spaces for manoeuvring, and information would need to be submitted as part of any formal planning application demonstrating that the level of parking provision was appropriate for the intended development(s).

Regarding the existing access, the A6020 at this point is subject to a 50mph speed limit. Any intensification in use of the site should be supported by 85th percentile speed readings with commensurate visibility splays being demonstrated within controlled land. Based on the speed limit of 50mph this would equate to visibility splays measuring 149m in both directions along the nearside carriageway edge, taken from a setback distance of 2.4m from the centre of the access. It is presumed that the Hall is in control of the frontage either side of the access with the existing boundary wall appearing to be relatively low already from a desktop study. We would look for the land in advance of the sightlines to be maintained in perpetuity clear of any object greater than 1m in height (0.6m in the case of vegetation) relative to the adjoining nearside carriageway channel level.

As you mention, I don't for see any major highway safety concerns from the wider highway network, but a Transport Statement comparing existing and proposed levels of traffic associated with all the various uses on the site would be useful.

I hope the above is of assistance, if you require and additional information please feel free to contact me.

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]

██████████ | Highways Development Control  
Place | Derbyshire County Council  
County Hall, Matlock, Derbyshire DE4 3AG  
Tel: 01629 ██████████ Mobile: ██████████

---

**From:** ██████████  
**Sent:** 15 June 2021 11:52  
**To:** ██████████@derbyshire.gov.uk  
**Subject:** Thornbridge Hall, Bakewell

Hi ██████████

I hope you're keeping well.

Not sure if the above is your area, so I'd be grateful if you could point me in the right direction if not. If it is, then I'd be grateful for 5mins of your time if you wouldn't mind?

A bit of background - our client at Thornbridge Hall has, over the last 12mo whilst closed due to coronavirus, been implementing a number of measures, one of which is a new car park with dedicated access. However, they didn't submit a planning application and are now hoping they can regularise matters via a retrospective submission to the planners at the PDNPA.

Where prior to Covid they operated with visitors to their gardens during the week, and weddings only at weekends, they are now looking to operate with weddings during the week. The existing on-site car park would remain for wedding parties, whilst a new internal driveway spur and car park would be dedicated for visitors to the gardens. Realistically therefore, in terms of the wider highway network, this isn't going to change traffic numbers by much at all - the only effective "addition" is traffic associated with the wedding parties during the week, which is likely to be at the start and end of the day, rather than the regular stream of visitors to the gardens that occurs throughout the day.

I understand they have also been dealing with Derbyshire CC in respect of changing their postcode, in order to ensure that drivers are correctly routed by sat nav guidance to the correct access from the A6020, as opposed to via the limited width route of Longstone Lane as guidance has historically done for some visitors. This should hopefully have resolved some of the historical traffic routing issues associated with the Hall's visitors.

We're simply looking to discuss with you guys in Highways DC to determine what, if anything, would be required to be submitted with any retrospective application in order to satisfy yourselves. Hence we'd be grateful for a quick chat if possible.

If you could get back to me regarding the above, or pointing me in the right direction of who to liaise with, I'd be very grateful

Kind regards

██████████  
Director

## FOCUS TRANSPORT PLANNING

Pentland House | Village Way | Wilmslow | SK9 2GH

Office: 0161 826 4631

Mobile: [REDACTED]



[www.focustp.co.uk](http://www.focustp.co.uk)



Disclaimer: Focus Transport Planning Ltd shall not be liable for any loss caused from reliance on the contents, or due to any errors, bugs viruses or malicious code. Any enclosure with this content should be checked for viruses before it is opened. The company cannot be held responsible for any failure by the recipient to test for viruses before opening any enclosures. The information contained in or attached to this email is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are not authorised to and must not disclose, copy, distribute or retain this message or any part of it. The views expressed in this email are not necessarily the views of Focus Transport Planning Ltd, the company, its directors, officers or employees makes no representation or accept any liability for its accuracy or completeness unless expressly stated to the contrary.

This email or email thread section has been classified CONTROLLED - This email requires controlled access by Council personnel and / or intended recipient(s) only. This email may contain business or personal information. Any personal information you have given us will be processed in accordance with our privacy notices, available at [www.derbyshire.gov.uk/privacynotices](http://www.derbyshire.gov.uk/privacynotices).

---

**From:** [REDACTED]@derbyshire.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 20 August 2021 08:44  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Thornbridge Hall, Bakewell

Hello [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email, please find comments below.

It is presumed that the ATC data will be submitted as part of any forthcoming planning application. On the assumption that the figures are acceptable, I would agree with the visibility quoted. However, I would just add an additional 2.4m to these distances in accordance with paragraph 10.2.5 from MfS2, to take account for the front of a vehicle.

Your comment regarding the vertical plane are noted and I would agree.

Regarding visibility to the north, I am satisfied that appropriate visibility is achievable when measured to a point 0.75m out from the nearside edge of the carriageway at the splay's extremity. Appropriate visibility would also appear achievable to the south, over controlled land, and visibility can be conditioned accordingly. Whilst the above comment will increase splay requirements slightly, I would not expect this to cause an issue.

Feel free to contact me as required.

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]@focustp.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 13 August 2021 15:39  
**To:** [REDACTED]@derbyshire.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** RE: Thornbridge Hall, Bakewell

Hi [REDACTED]

I hope you're keeping well. I'm finally getting back to you regarding comments you kindly provided back in June in relation to the above site. In terms of the planning, I gather that an appeal against the enforcement action has now been validated and we await that to run its course. In the interim some of us have been busy looking into the issues that need to be dealt with in any forthcoming retrospective planning application.

Following your comments we have been taking a look specifically into the existing main access to Thornbridge Hall, which serves the main driveway and the new access road and car park that is the subject of the enforcement action/appeal and retrospective application. As discussed, the aim of the new internal access route and car park was to resolve the historical issues of visitors to the hall parking on local lanes and walking into the grounds, thereby causing obstruction on those lanes. More details on those issues will be provided in the application submissions we produce. However, the works do appear to have had a positive effect in that regard, and have eradicated any such issues.

Regarding the access itself, we have undertaken a detailed review of the achievable visibility, based on prevailing speeds recorded both to the north and south of the access using ATCs. From that ATC data

we have been able to determine that 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds are largely consistent. Speed survey data identified that the prevailing 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds along the route were as follows:

- Northbound from the south - 43.7mph
- Southbound from the north - 43.9mph

On the basis of these recorded speeds the following visibility would be required in order to accord with the relevant national design standards (calculated using the MfS2 formula for SSD for speeds above 60kph):

- Towards the south (leading direction) - 116.95m
- Towards the north (non-leading direction) - 117.85m

You will see from Drawing SK002 that the illustrated visibility that can be achieved is actually marginally reduced from that required, at 102.2m. This is due to the fact that a sizable tree trunk impedes the full visibility, hence that shown is what can be achieved without any such obstructions.

You will also see that we have derived the vertical profiles along the visibility splay for each direction, in order to determine whether there are any obstacles that impede visibility in the vertical plane. When reviewing vertical visibility we have worked from a driver's eye height of 1.05m at the access to a driver's eye height of 1.05m at the kerbline. In addition, we have included a splay from 1.05m to 0.6m as per guidance. However, in this instance we would question whether viewing down to 0.6m is worthwhile, as guidance specifically refers to this being used to represent a child - a measure more appropriate for assessing forward visibility along a route, where a child may step out into the carriageway, rather than from an access, where a child isn't going to be travelling at vehicular speeds along the footway!

The review of visibility in the vertical plane identifies that, to a height of 1.05m there would be no obstruction to visibility. The wall along the frontage does marginally impede visibility down to a height of 0.6m at the kerbline, by fractions of a centimetre, however as above we don't consider that an appropriate requirement in this instance.

In terms of the shortfall in length in the non-leading direction, much of the carriageway at this location is visible. Indeed, SK102 demonstrates that the full required visibility is achievable when measured to a point 0.75m offset from the nearside kerbline. Additionally, it's highly unlikely that driver's travelling southbound would not be visible, even if they were across the centreline of the route.

An initial review of Crashmap data (more detailed review will be provided in the application submissions) identifies that there have been no incidents recorded at the Hall's access on to the A6020 in the last five years, or even 10 years. Hence the access has a history of safe operation.

Hopefully the above information provides you with enough detail at this stage to consider the issues relating to the access itself. Whilst we appreciate that an application is yet to be submitted, and that there are therefore other issues which we need to provide information on, it would be greatly appreciated if you could provide your thoughts/comments on the above information and therefore the suitability of the access for the proposed/currently utilised use.

I'd be happy to chat through if that's easier, but please note that I am about to go on leave for a week. I'll be back on Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> should you wish to discuss. In the meantime, if there's any further information we could provide to assist you regarding the above, then please let me know and we'll try to get something across to you via colleagues. Otherwise, have a great weekend.

Regards



[REDACTED]

Director

**FOCUS TRANSPORT PLANNING**

Office: 0161 826 4631

Mobile: [REDACTED]



[www.focustp.co.uk](http://www.focustp.co.uk)



**From:** [REDACTED]@derbyshire.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 19 October 2021 15:25  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Thornbridge Hall, Bakewell  
**Attachments:** J000269-TS01b.pdf

Hello [REDACTED]

Regarding the attached TS please find a few comments below:

- Based on the figures within the TS the HA is satisfied that there is sufficient capacity in terms of parking provisions within the site.
- Note that approximately 30-50% of visitors to the Hall now arrive either on foot or cycle. Is there secure cover cycle provision?
- Number of wedding events is not restricted. Is the opening of the gardens restricted in planning terms?

Concerning the requirement for a Travel Plan, I would note that paragraph 113 of the NPPF states:

*“All developments that will generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan, and the application should be supported by a transport statement or transport assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed”.*

From the Highway Authority’s current design guidance document (Delivering Streets and Places), link: [www.nottinghaminsight.org.uk/Document-Library/Document-Library/197452](http://www.nottinghaminsight.org.uk/Document-Library/Document-Library/197452)

Table 7.3 within the DSP provides an indication of when TS, TA and TP are likely to be required. Depending on the size and use class of the (retrospective) proposal there may be a requirement for a Travel Plan. Ultimately any documentation/ strategy that would encourage staff and patrons to reduce single-occupancy car trips would be welcomed.

Kind Regards  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]@focustp.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 07 October 2021 12:38  
**To:** [REDACTED]@derbyshire.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** RE: Thornbridge Hall, Bakewell

Hi Robert

I hope you’re keeping well.

With regard to our previous correspondence on the above scheme, which is slowly creeping towards both enforcement appeal and potentially retrospective planning, we have now completed production of our Transport Statement that may support either or both. In order to inform the enforcement/planning process the planning consultant is keen for you to see this and provide any further comments, should you have them, particularly in light of your initial comments made back in June. Hopefully the TS addresses all of the comments/concerns you raised.

On a related but separate note, we may need to add a paragraph or two which responds to one of the points made in the enforcement notice for the site, which I've provided for info below:

*"Given the nature and scale of the unauthorised developments and the potential for a material increase in traffic generation, the Authority would normally require the submission of a travel plan to allow an informed assessment to be made and the potential impacts on the local transport network to be addressed. This approach is endorsed in paragraphs 104 and 113 of the NPPF. There is no evidence that a travel plan was produced or such an assessment was made before the unauthorised developments were carried out. For this reason, the unauthorised developments are in conflict with the relevant government guidance and planning policies, notably paragraphs 104 and 113 of the NPPF, Core Strategy policy GSP3 and Development Management policy DMT7". (updated NPPF references used)*

Now it seems, to my mind, that perhaps the PDNPA are mixing up their terminology here and getting Travel Plan confused with Transport Statement/Assessment. We likely will need to respond to/address the above point specifically so my intention was to do so with a para or two in the TS which responds the above by outlining that the purpose of the TS is to satisfy the above. However, I also want to stress that a Travel Plan for a development of this nature (tourism/leisure destination in a rural location), and which largely pre-exists as a use anyway, would not be appropriate. If you have any views on that specifically I'd be grateful if you could let me know. I want to be sure that any text we add is both to your satisfaction and also that we suitably address the PDNPA's point.

Happy to chat through over the phone if it's more convenient - I'm available on my mobile as below. Otherwise I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Regards

[REDACTED]

Director

**FOCUS TRANSPORT PLANNING**

Office: 0161 826 4631

Mobile: [REDACTED]



[www.focustp.co.uk](http://www.focustp.co.uk)



---

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 24 August 2021 12:38

**To:** [REDACTED]@derbyshire.gov.uk>

**Subject:** RE: Thornbridge Hall, Bakewell

Hi [REDACTED]

Thanks for your response. That's good to hear regarding the generally positive comments on access and visibility.

We'll incorporate the changes to the visi to include for the additional 2.4m, and will issue those drawings in due course with the application and supporting transport statement.

Regards

[REDACTED]

Director

**FOCUS TRANSPORT PLANNING**

Office: 0161 826 4631

Mobile: [REDACTED]



[www.focustp.co.uk](http://www.focustp.co.uk)



**From:** [REDACTED]@derbyshire.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 16 November 2021 16:17  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Thornbridge Hall, Bakewell

Hello [REDACTED]

Based on that there shouldn't be a need for a Travel Plan. I think it will come down to what the existing use classes/floor areas are compared to what is now being sought.

Regards  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]@focustp.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 15 November 2021 16:49  
**To:** [REDACTED]@derbyshire.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** RE: Thornbridge Hall, Bakewell

Hi [REDACTED]

Just to come back to you again regarding the above, and in particular your comment regarding a Travel Plan - the café is only 303sqm, which falls well below the 2,500sqm threshold for a TP that's outlined in the guidance document. We trust, therefore, that there shouldn't be any requirement to undertake a TP as part of any planning application.

Regards

[REDACTED]  
Director

**FOCUS TRANSPORT PLANNING**

Office: 0161 826 4631

Mobile: [REDACTED]



[www.focustp.co.uk](http://www.focustp.co.uk)



---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 01 November 2021 16:36  
**To:** [REDACTED]@derbyshire.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** RE: Thornbridge Hall, Bakewell

Hi [REDACTED]

Just to get back to you on this and thanks for your response.

I'm not sure how it's all going to pan out yet, and believe that may only be decided once Counsel have had a chance to sit down and review the documents for the Enforcement Appeal.

However, it's been a great help to be able to discuss this with you prior to any application being made.

Noted regarding the Travel Plan - I'll await confirmation of the scheme's GFA but I suspect it will come down to what the GFA of the café is, and that should be well below the threshold for a TP I think.

Regarding your other 2 queries I'll conform with the team and we'll make sure to update our TS to include this information if/when an application is made. I suspect the cycle storage is uncovered, and also I believe that the wedding use is unrestricted in planning terms - I think the only real restriction was that historically they couldn't have the gardens open and the weddings on at the same time as there were lots of shared spaces. Hence the works which now enable them to run without impacting each other.

Regards

[Redacted]

**Director**

**FOCUS TRANSPORT PLANNING**

Office: 0161 826 4631

Mobile: [Redacted]



[www.focustp.co.uk](http://www.focustp.co.uk)

