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## Executive summary

Derbyshire County Council has commissioned an Outline Business Case for the development of the County Hall site in Matlock, which currently functions as the headquarters of Derbyshire County Council. Mott MacDonald has been commissioned by HLM Architects to review the transport and movement implications of the associated masterplan to identify any potential issues and/or opportunities.

It is likely that the proposed development will be a mixed-use development, comprising of residential, commercial, conference, banqueting and workspace areas.

The purpose of this report is to present the outcomes from the technical transport review, which are:

- The trip generation and parking accumulation assessment which indicates the following recommended parking provision for the site:
- 447 spaces - If parking for each land use is not segregated, consisting of:
- 285 spaces for New Build Office; and
- 162 spaces for the Hotel and Banqueting/Conference Centre.
- The parking accumulation for the residential development has not been included int he above figure, as it is understood that 1.5 spaces per dwelling have been provided in line with local parking guidelines and local car ownership figures.
- Vehicle tracking has been undertaken in the car park areas and in general, no issues have been identified apart from in the western car park area where some of the end parking spaces were shown to be difficult to access.
- The review of servicing and access arrangements identifies a number of design revisions to enhance future access for refuse vehicles and fire service vehicles.
- An opportunity for placemaking has been identified for Smedley Street. A total of 7 key pedestrian priority options have been considered for Smedley Street. The challenges and opportunities associated with each option are contained within this report. The options were discussed with the Traffic and Road Safety Service at Derbyshire County Council on Tuesday $5^{\text {th }}$ September 2023. The options are as follows:
- Road closures;
- Active travel improvement works;
- One-way restrictions;
- Time restrictions;
- Public transport/servicing access only;
- Day restrictions; and
- Shared-use space.

The review of the pedestrian priority options has concluded that a full road closure to vehicles would pose significant challenges. However, it is noted that a number of alternative options achieve the objectives of providing an accessible space without the need for a full closure to vehicles.

- The importance of connectivity via sustainable transport modes to Matlock Town Centre. The existing route is extremely steep, there are no formal cycle lanes and there are limited crossing facilities in place at the A615 Snitterton Road/Bank Road roundabout. There is existing public transport provision for the route from the site to Matlock Town Centre, however, the service frequency is low with most services operating at one service per hour
or less. As a result, various options have been considered to encourage sustainable transport links to Matlock Town Centre, including:
- New E-Shuttle Bus;
- Demand Responsive Transport (DRT);
- Pool Electrically Assisted Pedal Cycles;
- Mobility Hubs; and
- Enhanced frequency of existing bus services.
- The benefit to securing off-site parking provision for a proportion of office demand has been identified. This would moderate the overall level of parking required on site and maintain amenity value.

No significant issues have been identified with the proposals to date however there are several areas that could be developed in further detail to enhance the operation of the facilities and the connectivity from the site. As part of the ongoing design development, several next steps are recommended:

- Review the need for traffic surveys to understand existing vehicle movements to/from the site.
- Review the need for pedestrian surveys to/from the site and along Smedley Street to understand the existing active travel access habits to/from and around the site.
- Review of parking proposals and engagement with stakeholders.
- Review the need for parking beat surveys to understand how the existing car park operates.
- Further development of the car parking areas, in particular the western car park which requires some reconfiguration.
- There is a need to review the service and access strategy with Derbyshire County Council and the local fire service.
- Further consideration should be given to the benefit that would be provided by the potential new connection route between residential and main building area. If this is deemed to be beneficial then the road needs to be designed to ensure that it is usable by the intended vehicles.
- Ongoing engagement with the local highway authority regarding the access arrangements, Smedley Street proposals and links to Matlock town centre.


## 1 Introduction

Derbyshire County Council has commissioned an Outline Business Case for the development of the County Hall site in Matlock, which currently functions as the headquarters of Derbyshire County Council. The likely development is to be a mixed-use development, comprising of residential, commercial, conference, banqueting and workspace areas.

### 1.1 Report Purpose

The masterplan for the site has been developed by HLM Architects.
Mott MacDonald has been commissioned by HLM Architects to review the transport and movement implications of the masterplan to identify any potential issues and/or opportunities.

The purpose of this report is to present the outcomes from the technical transport review.

### 1.2 Structure of the Report

This report is structured as follows:

- Section 2: Overview of the existing access arrangements for the site
- Section 3: Review of the anticipated trip generation and parking accumulation based on forecast land use proposals;
- Section 4: Review of the car park design proposals;
- Section 5: Car park standards review;
- Section 6: Review of servicing and access proposals;
- Section 7: Review of pedestrian priority options for Smedley Street;
- Section 8: Consideration of sustainable transport links to Matlock Town Centre; and
- Section 9: Summary and conclusions


## 2 Existing Access Arrangements

### 2.1 Existing Vehicle Access and Parking

The existing car parking arrangements for the site are set out in Figure 2.1.
Figure 2.1: Matlock County Hall - Existing Access Arrangements


Source: Derbyshire County Council: County Hall car parking map (derbyshire.gov.uk) and Mott MacDonald annotation
There are currently 510 spaces provided on-site. The existing main vehicular access point to the site is located off Bank Road. This provides access to the central car park, in addition to the western car park (via the central car park). Both car parks are indicated on Figure 2.1. The central and western car parks currently feature disabled parking bays, visitor parking bays, staff car share scheme parking, standard parking bays and electric car charging in the north-west corner of the western car park. There are currently no access barriers at the main vehicular entrance off Bank Road. A 5mph speed limit is in place for the central car park.

The terrace, lower terrace and member parking areas are all currently accessed from Smedley Street. Disabled parking and electric vehicle charging facilities are available within these parking areas. On-street disabled parking bays are also available on Smedley Street.

There is an existing garage parking area off Hopewell Road within the site boundary.

### 2.2 Existing Active Travel Access

There are various site access points for pedestrians and pedestrian only footpaths within the site that connect the car parks and various buildings on site. The main County Hall reception is located on Smedley Street.

Cycle parking is currently available on Hopewell Road and north of the central car park.

## 3 Trip Generation Forecast

### 3.1 Overview

This section sets out the process and outputs of the trip generation exercise for the site. The trip generation has been calculated to inform the proposed parking provision at the site. The trip generation can also be used to inform proposed junction layouts and assess the impact of the site on the local highway network.

### 3.2 Methodology

Trip Rate Information Computer System (TRICS) software has been used to forecast the trip generation for each land use of the site. TRICS is a database system comprising a large number of records of individual developments across a wide range of land use categories. These records include vehicle or multi-modal survey counts, with detailed information on each site.

The database has been used by selecting sites/surveys which are similar to that of the proposed development. The parameters used to select the relevant TRICS surveys include:

- Land use
- Gross Floor Area (GFA) / number of dwellings / number of bedrooms
- Location / Region
- Day of the survey
- Population within 1 mile / 5 miles
- Car Ownership within 5 miles
- Number of car parking spaces available

TRICS software then uses the selected surveys to calculate a trip rate for the site. The trip rate is then been multiplied by the proposed GFA / number of dwellings / number of bedrooms depending on the proposed land use to calculate the forecast number of hourly arrivals and departures at each proposed land use over a daily period. This forecast trip generation is provided for the following vehicle classes:

- Total Vehicles
- Cars
- Taxis
- OGVs
- LGVs
- Cyclists
- Motorcycles


### 3.3 Assumptions

The assumptions shown for each land use in Table 3.1 have been used to calculate the trip generation in TRICS.

Table 3.1: TRICS Assumptions

| Proposed Development | Land use and classification | GFA/dwelling/bedrooms |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hotel | Hotel/Food and Drink (06/A) | 85 bedrooms |


| Proposed Development | Land use and classification | GFA/dwelling/bedrooms |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| New Build Office | Employment/Office (02/A) | 6750 sqm / 600 workstations |
| Banqueting/Conference Centre | Food and Drink/Banqueting Centre <br> $(06 / \mathrm{L})$ | 1485 sqm |
| Residential North | Residentia//Mixed Private Flats and <br> Houses (03/K) | 30 Units |
| Audit Block Residential | Residential/Mixed Private Flats and <br> Houses (03/K) | 2 Units |
| Southern Car Park Residential | Residential/Mixed Private Flats and <br> Houses (03/K) | 26 Units |

The following assumptions have been taken to inform the trip generation exercise:

- Friday to Monday surveys for Residential and Office land uses have been excluded.
- Surveys on all days of the week have been included for Hotel and Banqueting/Conference Centre land uses.
- All Town Centre Surveys have been excluded.
- Only survey locations where the population within 1 mile is less than 25,000 have been chosen.
- Only survey locations where the population within 5 miles is assumed to be less than 250,000 have been chosen, with the exception of the Banqueting centre (due to the limited number of Banqueting Centre surveys within TRICS).
- Only survey locations where car ownership within 5 miles is more than 1.1 per household have been chosen. Car ownership in Derbyshire Dales is 1.49 according to 2021 Census data.
- A trip generation has been calculated separately for each land use. However, the trip generation for all residential proposals have been calculated together i.e., 58 mixed private flats and houses, rather than separately for each element of the residential proposals.
- Any TRICS sites with surveys affected by COVID-19, restrictions have been excluded.
- The trip generation and parking accumulation focuses on proposed development uses only and no consideration has been given for any external car park users.
- The parking accumulation for the Hotel and Banqueting/Conference Centre land use has been calculated based on the assumption that 94 parking spaces are occupied at the hotel throughout the night. This figure is based on Derbyshire County Council parking standards for hotels which states that 1 parking space should be provided for every bedroom for visitors, and 1 parking space should be provided for every 10 bedrooms for staff.

Full TRICS output reports for each land use have been included in Appendix A. These show the full filtering summaries and the sites selected for each trip generation calculation.

### 3.4 Trip Generation Forecast

The total vehicle trip generation for each part of the proposed development is shown in Table 3.2. The car only trip generation for each part of the proposed development is shown in Table 3.3 .

## Table 3.2: Total Vehicle Trip Generation

|  | New Build Office |  |  | Residential |  |  | Hotel |  |  | Banqueting/Conference Centre |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | Arr | Dep | Twoway | Arr | Dep | Twoway | Arr | Dep | Twoway | Arr | Dep | Two-way | Arr | Dep | Two-way |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 00:00- } \\ & 01: 00 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 01: 00- \\ & 02: 00 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 02:00- } \\ & \text { 03:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 03:00- } \\ & \text { 04:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 04:00- } \\ & \text { 05:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 05:00- } \\ & \text { 06:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 06:00- } \\ & \text { 07:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 07:00- } \\ & \text { 08:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 61 | 5 | 66 | 4 | 18 | 22 | 6 | 19 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 43 | 114 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 08:00- } \\ & \text { 09:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 142 | 11 | 153 | 8 | 22 | 30 | 12 | 18 | 30 | 11 | 8 | 19 | 172 | 59 | 231 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 09:00- } \\ & \text { 10:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 69 | 15 | 84 | 8 | 10 | 18 | 15 | 14 | 29 | 20 | 5 | 25 | 113 | 43 | 156 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 10: 00- \\ & 11: 00 \end{aligned}$ | 12 | 13 | 25 | 10 | 17 | 27 | 9 | 14 | 23 | 19 | 19 | 38 | 50 | 62 | 112 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:00- } \\ & \text { 12:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 16 | 12 | 27 | 8 | 9 | 18 | 6 | 12 | 18 | 8 | 14 | 22 | 38 | 47 | 85 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 12: 00- \\ & 13: 00 \end{aligned}$ | 26 | 39 | 65 | 12 | 9 | 21 | 6 | 9 | 15 | 59 | 28 | 88 | 104 | 85 | 188 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 13: 00- \\ & 14: 00 \end{aligned}$ | 30 | 25 | 55 | 9 | 9 | 18 | 8 | 8 | 16 | 20 | 17 | 38 | 68 | 59 | 127 |


| Time | New Build Office |  |  | Residential |  |  | Hotel |  |  | Banqueting/Conference Centre |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Arr | Dep | Twoway | Arr | Dep | Twoway | Arr | Dep | Twoway | Arr | Dep | Two-way | Arr | Dep | Two-way |
| $\begin{aligned} & 14: 00- \\ & 15: 00 \end{aligned}$ | 16 | 27 | 44 | 10 | 12 | 22 | 18 | 13 | 31 | 17 | 20 | 38 | 62 | 72 | 134 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 15: 00- \\ & 16: 00 \end{aligned}$ | 11 | 40 | 50 | 18 | 12 | 29 | 12 | 10 | 22 | 9 | 14 | 23 | 50 | 75 | 125 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:00- } \\ & \text { 17:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 10 | 68 | 79 | 17 | 10 | 27 | 16 | 10 | 26 | 9 | 8 | 17 | 53 | 97 | 149 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:00- } \\ & \text { 18:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 7 | 114 | 121 | 24 | 11 | 35 | 25 | 17 | 42 | 17 | 13 | 30 | 73 | 155 | 227 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 18: 00- \\ & 19: 00 \end{aligned}$ | 5 | 31 | 36 | 17 | 10 | 28 | 19 | 12 | 31 | 16 | 19 | 34 | 56 | 73 | 129 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:00- } \\ & 20: 00 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 14 | 29 | 39 | 23 | 63 | 55 | 37 | 92 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20: 00- \\ & 21: 00 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 16 | 11 | 14 | 25 | 21 | 20 | 41 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21: 00- \\ & \text { 22:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 16 | 9 | 11 | 20 | 19 | 17 | 36 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:00- } \\ & \text { 23:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 25 | 5 | 20 | 25 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23: 00- \\ & 24: 00 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 39 | 63 | 23 | 39 | 63 |
| Daily | 404 | 400 | 804 | 146 | 150 | 296 | 187 | 180 | 368 | 294 | 272 | 566 | 1031 | 1002 | 2033 |

Table 3.3: Total Car Trip Generation

|  | New Build Office |  |  | Residential |  |  | Hotel |  |  | Banqueting/Conference Centre |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | Arr | Dep | Twoway | Arr | Dep | Twoway | Arr | Dep | Twoway | Arr | Dep | Two-way | Arr | Dep | Two-way |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 00:00- } \\ & 01: 00 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 01:00- } \\ & 02: 00 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 02:00- } \\ & \text { 03:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 03:00- } \\ & \text { 04:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 04:00- } \\ & \text { 05:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 05:00- } \\ & \text { 06:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 06:00- } \\ & \text { 07:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 07:00- } \\ & \text { 08:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 57 | 4 | 61 | 3 | 17 | 20 | 6 | 16 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 36 | 102 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 08:00- } \\ & \text { 09:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 135 | 7 | 142 | 6 | 20 | 26 | 9 | 15 | 24 | 9 | 8 | 17 | 160 | 50 | 210 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 09: 00- \\ & \text { 10:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 64 | 10 | 74 | 7 | 9 | 15 | 13 | 12 | 25 | 14 | 2 | 16 | 98 | 32 | 130 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 10: 00- \\ & 11: 00 \end{aligned}$ | 10 | 10 | 21 | 7 | 14 | 21 | 6 | 12 | 18 | 19 | 16 | 34 | 43 | 52 | 95 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11: 00- \\ & 12: 00 \end{aligned}$ | 13 | 10 | 23 | 7 | 7 | 13 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 8 | 14 | 22 | 33 | 40 | 73 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 12: 00- \\ & 13: 00 \end{aligned}$ | 24 | 36 | 60 | 9 | 7 | 17 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 52 | 22 | 73 | 90 | 73 | 162 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:00- } \\ & \text { 14:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 27 | 23 | 49 | 6 | 7 | 13 | 6 | 5 | 12 | 16 | 14 | 30 | 55 | 49 | 104 |


|  | New Build Office |  |  | Residential |  |  | Hotel |  |  | Banqueting/Conference Centre |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | Arr | Dep | Twoway | Arr | Dep | Twoway | Arr | Dep | Twoway | Arr | Dep | Two-way | Arr | Dep | Two-way |
| $\begin{aligned} & 14: 00- \\ & 15: 00 \end{aligned}$ | 14 | 24 | 38 | 8 | 10 | 18 | 16 | 10 | 26 | 16 | 19 | 34 | 53 | 63 | 116 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 15: 00- \\ & 16: 00 \end{aligned}$ | 8 | 34 | 42 | 15 | 9 | 24 | 11 | 9 | 20 | 9 | 13 | 22 | 43 | 65 | 108 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:00- } \\ & \text { 17:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 9 | 66 | 75 | 15 | 9 | 24 | 14 | 9 | 23 | 9 | 8 | 17 | 48 | 92 | 140 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:00- } \\ & \text { 18:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 6 | 112 | 118 | 21 | 10 | 31 | 21 | 14 | 35 | 16 | 13 | 28 | 64 | 149 | 213 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:00- } \\ & \text { 19:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 4 | 31 | 35 | 16 | 9 | 25 | 15 | 10 | 25 | 14 | 14 | 28 | 49 | 63 | 113 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:00- } \\ & \text { 20:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 10 | 23 | 31 | 16 | 47 | 44 | 26 | 70 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20: 00- \\ & 21: 00 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 13 | 11 | 14 | 25 | 19 | 19 | 38 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21: 00- \\ & 22: 00 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 13 | 9 | 11 | 20 | 17 | 16 | 33 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:00- } \\ & \text { 23:00 } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 25 | 5 | 20 | 25 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23: 00- \\ & 24: 00 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 27 | 38 | 11 | 27 | 38 |
| Daily | 371 | 367 | 738 | 122 | 127 | 249 | 157 | 149 | 305 | 249 | 228 | 477 | 898 | 872 | 1769 |

## 4 Parking

### 4.1 Introduction

Parking demand has been calculated for each part of the proposed development and is shown in the tables below. These use the forecast car arrivals and departures for each land use, set out in Section 3, to calculate the accumulation of cars parked on-site in each hour of the day. The parking accumulation for the residential development has not been included, as it is understood that 1.5 spaces per dwelling have been provided in line with local parking guidelines and local car ownership figures.

### 4.2 Parking Accumulation

The maximum parking accumulation for New Build Office is shown in Table 4.1.
Table 4.1: Parking Accumulation - New Build Office

| Time | Arrivals | Departures | Accumulation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:00-01:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 01:00-02:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 02:00-03:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 03:00-04:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 04:00-05:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 05:00-06:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 06:00-07:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:00-08:00 | 57 | 4 | 53 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 135 | 7 | 181 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 64 | 10 | 234 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 10 | 10 | 234 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 13 | 10 | 238 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 24 | 36 | 226 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 27 | 23 | 230 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 14 | 24 | 219 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 8 | 34 | 194 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 9 | 66 | 136 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 6 | 112 | 30 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 4 | 31 | 4 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 22:00-23:00 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 23:00-24:00 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Max |  |  | 238 |

The maximum car parking accumulation for New Build Office is 238 cars between 11:00 and 12:00.

The maximum parking accumulation for the Hotel and Banqueting/Conference Centre is shown in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Parking Accumulation - Hotel and Banqueting/Conference Centre

| Time | Arrivals | Departures | Accumulation |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $00: 00-01: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| $01: 00-02: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| $02: 00-03: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| $03: 00-04: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| $04: 00-05: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| $05: 00-06: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| $06: 00-07: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| $07: 00-08: 00$ | 6 | 16 | 83 |
| $08: 00-09: 00$ | 18 | 23 | 79 |
| $09: 00-10: 00$ | 27 | 13 | 93 |
| $10: 00-11: 00$ | 25 | 28 | 90 |
| $11: 00-12: 00$ | 13 | 24 | 79 |
| $12: 00-13: 00$ | 56 | 29 | 106 |
| $13: 00-14: 00$ | 22 | 19 | 109 |
| $14: 00-15: 00$ | 31 | 29 | 111 |
| $15: 00-16: 00$ | 20 | 22 | 110 |
| $16: 00-17: 00$ | 24 | 16 | 117 |
| $17: 00-18: 00$ | 37 | 26 | 127 |
| $18: 00-19: 00$ | 29 | 24 | 133 |
| $19: 00-20: 00$ | 44 | 26 | 151 |
| $20: 00-21: 00$ | 19 | 19 | 151 |
| $21: 00-22: 00$ | 17 | 16 | 153 |
| $22: 00-23: 00$ | 5 | 20 | 137 |
| $23: 00-24: 00$ | 11 | 27 | 122 |
| Max |  |  | 153 |

The maximum parking accumulation for the Hotel and Banqueting/Conference Centre is 153 cars between 21:00 and 22:00.

Therefore, the maximum parking accumulation for the total non-residential elements of the site is shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Parking Accumulation - Total Non-Residential Elements of the Site

| Time | Arrivals | Departures | Accumulation |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $00: 00-01: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| $01: 00-02: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| $02: 00-03: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| $03: 00-04: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| $04: 00-05: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| $05: 00-06: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| $06: 00-07: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| $07: 00-08: 00$ | 63 | 20 | 137 |
| $08: 00-09: 00$ | 153 | 30 | 260 |


| Time | Arrivals | Departures | Accumulation |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $09: 00-10: 00$ | 91 | 24 | 327 |
| $10: 00-11: 00$ | 36 | 38 | 325 |
| $11: 00-12: 00$ | 26 | 34 | 317 |
| $12: 00-13: 00$ | 80 | 65 | 332 |
| $13: 00-14: 00$ | 49 | 42 | 338 |
| $14: 00-15: 00$ | 45 | 53 | 330 |
| $15: 00-16: 00$ | 29 | 55 | 303 |
| $16: 00-17: 00$ | 33 | 83 | 253 |
| $17: 00-18: 00$ | 43 | 139 | 158 |
| $18: 00-19: 00$ | 33 | 54 | 137 |
| $19: 00-20: 00$ | 44 | 26 | 155 |
| $20: 00-21: 00$ | 19 | 19 | 155 |
| $21: 00-22: 00$ | 17 | 16 | 157 |
| $22: 00-23: 00$ | 5 | 20 | 141 |
| $23: 00-24: 00$ | 11 | 27 | 125 |
| $M a x$ |  | 338 |  |

The maximum parking accumulation for the whole non-residential element of development is 338 cars between 13:00 and 14:00.

### 4.3 Parking Standards

### 4.3.1 Introduction

This section sets out the car parking standards for the local area. The following policy documents have been reviewed to understand the acceptable level of parking (including EV and cycle parking) for the proposed development:

- Adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan (December 2017)
- Derbyshire Dales Climate Change Supplementary Planning Document (July 2021)
- Amber Valley Local Plan. Derbyshire County Council have advised that the DCC adopted parking standards have been retracted and new standards will be issued in 2024. The following statement is included against the Amber Valley Local Plan parking standards: "These parking standards are those currently adopted by Derbyshire County Council, expect in respect of those uses where revised standards have been set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands (RSS8) in line with the latest version of the Government's guidance on planning and transport (PPG13)". Given this, the standards as set out in the Amber Valley Local Plan have been used in lieu of the DCC standards.

The standards have then been compared against the forecast demand for parking set out in Section 4.2.

### 4.3.2 Local Parking Policy

Policy HC21: Car Parking Standards within the Adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan (December 2017) states:
"Vehicular parking for new development should be provided having regard to adopted standards, as set out in Appendix 2 of this Local Plan, or where the developer can adequately justify their own parking provision with evidence accompanying any planning application.

Evidence will need to demonstrate that the level would not have a detrimental impact on the local road network."

The Amber Valley Local Plan sets out the Maximum Parking Standards in Conjunction with Development in Appendix 3, which are the adopted parking standards by Derbyshire County Council.

The normal maximum parking standards for Offices and Residential Developments are set out within Appendix 2 of the Adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan (December 2017). The normal maximum parking standards for Hotels and Conference facilities are provided in Appendix 3 of the Amber Valley Local Plan.

### 4.3.3 Residential Car Parking Standards

Appendix 2 of the Adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan states that for residential developments over five dwellings, developers should refer to the Department for Communities and Local Government DCLG's 'Residential Car Parking Research Report' published in May 2007, which sets out a method for calculating car parking demand. However, this relies on data collected before 2007, and calculates parking demand based on the number of spaces allocated to each dwelling rather than setting out the number of spaces that should be allocated to each dwelling. Therefore, the Derbyshire County Council standards as referenced within the Amber Valley Local Plan have been used instead.

The Derbyshire County Council parking standards, as referenced within the Amber Valley Local Plan, for residential developments are set out in Table 4.4 below.

Table 4.4: Derbyshire County Council Residential Parking Standards (as referenced within the Amber Valley Local Plan)

| Number of <br> bedrooms per <br> dwelling | Maximum <br> Parking <br> Standard |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 1 space per unit plus <br> 1 space per 2 units <br> for visitors |
| $2 / 3$ | 2 spaces per unit |
| $4+$ | 3 spaces per unit, of <br> which no more than <br> 2 shall be in line |

The parking standards set out above have been applied to each residential section of the proposed development in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Residential Parking Standards

| Residential <br> Area | No. of 1 <br> Bedroom <br> Dwellings | No. of 2 <br> Bedroom <br> Dwellings | No. of 3 <br> Bedroom <br> Dwellings | No. of 4 <br> Bedroom <br> Dwellings | Total <br> Parking <br> Spaces | Parking <br> Spaces per <br> Dwelling |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Residential <br> North | 11 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 55 | 1.82 |
| Audit Block <br> Residential | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 2.00 |
| Southern Car <br> Park <br> Residential | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 52 | 2.00 |
| Total |  | 13 | 34 | 0 | 111 | 1.91 |

This shows that according to the Derbyshire County Council maximum parking standards, the maximum number of spaces to be provided for the residential element of the proposed development is 111.

Car ownership within Derbyshire Dales is 1.49 cars per household. Therefore, it is recommended that 1.5 car parking spaces are provided for each dwelling, which falls within the Derbyshire County Council maximum parking standards.

### 4.3.4 Office/Hotel Parking Standards

The parking standards set out within the policy documents set out above have been applied to the office and hotel sections of proposed development in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Office/Hotel Parking Standards

| Land Use | Parking Standard | Source | Total Parking Spaces | Disabled Parking Standard | Disabled Parking Space | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New Build Office | Rural town centre or edge of centre; One space for every 40 sqm | Adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan | 169 | $5 \%$ of total parking | 8 | Over the 2,500sqm threshold for applying the standard |
| Hotel | One space per bedroom (visitors) plus one space per 10 bedrooms (staff) | Derbyshire County Council | 94 | 6\% of total parking | 6 | Where bar and restaurant facilities are also provided, the additional parking provision for these must meet half of the appropriate food and drink standards (see row below) |
| Hotel Restaurant | One space per 4 sqm of dining area | Derbyshire County Council | 48 | 6\% of total parking | 3 | Sqm of restaurant used as Breakfast room and restaurant will be in use at different times |
| Banqueting/ Conference Centre | One space for every five seats | Adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan | 50 | 6 bays plus 2\% of total parking | 7 | "Business centre" sqm on Ground floor plan used |

The forecast parking accumulation for the New Build Office in Section 4.2 are higher than the maximum standards set out in the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan.

The forecast parking accumulation of 153 spaces for the hotel and banqueting/conference centre are within the maximum parking standards set out above.

### 4.3.5 Sustainable Parking Standards

### 4.3.5.1 Electric Vehicle Charging

The Derbyshire Dales Climate Change Supplementary Planning Document sets out a number of potential measures to help developers to maximise climate change mitigation and adaptation. These measures set out guidance on electric vehicle (EV) provision at new developments:

- Residential - EV charging points should be provided for $20 \%$ of all parking spaces and there should be passive provision for the remaining spaces.
- Non-residential - EV charging points of at least 22 kw and a universal socket should be provided for $10 \%$ of all parking spaces and there should be passive provision for the remaining spaces at key destinations and in communal parking areas.


### 4.3.5.2 Cycle Parking

Appendix B of the Derbyshire Dales Climate Change Supplementary Planning Document provides indicative cycle parking standards for each type of land use. These standards have been applied to the proposed development in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7: Cycle Parking Standards

| Land Use | Short Stay <br> Cycle Parking <br> Standard | Short Stay <br> Cycle Parking <br> Spaces | Long Stay Cycle <br> Parking <br> Standard | Long Stay Cycle <br> Parking Spaces |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| Residential | - | 0 | 1 per bedroom | 174 |
| New Build Office | 1 per 1000 sqm | 6 | 1 per 200 sqm | 28 |
| Hotel (inc. restaurant) | - | - | - | - |
| Banqueting/Conference <br> Centre | - | - | - | - |

Cycle parking standards are not provided for Hotels or Banqueting/Conference Facilities. However, it is recommended that a similar level cycle parking provision to the office provision should be provided for these land uses.

### 4.4 Parking Summary

Based on the calculated parking demand in Section 4.2 and parking standards in Section 4.3, a summary of the recommended parking provision has been set out in Table 4.8.

A $20 \%$ sensitivity buffer has been added to the forecast parking demand for new build office land use in order to calculate the recommended parking provision. A 10\% sensitivity buffer has been added to the forecast parking demand for the hotel land use. This has only been added where the recommended provision is within the maximum parking standards.

Table 4.8: Summary of Parking Recommendations

| Land Use | Background Information | Forecast Parking Demand | Time of Maximum Demand | Maximum Parking Standard | Parking standard | Recommended Parking Provision | Disabled Spaces | EV Spaces |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New Build Office | $6750 \text { sqm }$ <br> 600 Workstations | 238 | 11:00-12:00 | 169 | Adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan | 285 (Forecast demand $+20 \%)$ | 14 | 29 |
| Hotel | 85 Bedrooms | 101 | 21:00-22:00 | 142 | Amber Valley Local Plan (Derbyshire County Council Standards) | $\begin{array}{r} 112 \\ (\text { Forecast demand } \\ +10 \%) \end{array}$ | 7 | 11 |
| Banqueting/Conf erence Centre | 688 sqm 250 seat capacity | 56 | 19:00-20:00 | 50 | Adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan | $\begin{array}{r} 50 \\ \text { (Maximum parking } \\ \text { standard) } \end{array}$ | 3 | 5 |
| Residential North | 30 units. <br> 111 bed, 152 bed, 63 bed | 45 | Overnight | 55 | Amber Valley Local Plan (Derbyshire County Council Standards) | $45$ <br> (1.5 cars per household) | 0 | 9 |
| Audit Block | 2 units. <br> All 3 bed. | 3 | Overnight | 4 | Amber Valley Local Plan (Derbyshire County Council Standards) | $3$ <br> (1.5 cars per household) | 0 | 1 |
| Southern Car Park | 26 units. <br> All $2 / 3$ bed | 39 | Overnight | 52 | Amber Valley Local Plan (Derbyshire County Council Standards) | 39 <br> (1.5 cars per household) | 0 | 8 |

The recommended parking provision for each land use is shown in Table 4.8 above. This shows that for the non-residential element of the site the total recommended parking provision is for 447 spaces. This is recommended if the parking for each land use is segregated.

It is recommended that 1.5 spaces per household are provided for residential dwellings, which is within the maximum parking standards.

The benefit to securing off-site parking provision for a proportion of office demand has been identified. This would moderate the overall level of parking required on site and maintain amenity value. One potential opportunity site has been identified for this: the former Derbyshire County Council car park off Cavendish Road. This site is a 10 -minute walk from the Matlock County Hall site, via Wellington Street and Rutland Street.

## 5 Car Park Design Review

### 5.1 Overview

A design review of the car parking facilities has been carried out on the current masterplan. The primary aim of this review was to determine any key issues with the proposed layout and identify any opportunities for improvement.

### 5.2 Design Principles

### 5.2.1 Guidance

The following guidance has been used in reviewing the car park design:

- Manual for Streets, Department for Transport, 2007
- Parking Know How Bay Size, British Parking Association 2016


### 5.2.2 Vehicle Tracking

Figure 5.1 shows the vehicle dimensions used to assess the vehicle tracking in the car parks.
Figure 5.1: Vehicle Dimensions Used for Vehicle Tracking of Cars


Source: Autodesk

### 5.2.3 Visibility

Manual for Streets principles of visibility have been reviewed.
At this stage, no major issues with visibility are apparent, however, this will need to be reviewed as the project progresses to ensure that items such as street furniture and landscaping do not obscure visibility.

No information about the proposed speed limit around the site is provided, but it is assumed that the site will operate with traffic speeds of 15 mph or less, as is typical in similar environments. Due to the anticipated low speeds on the site, the required visibility will be lower than required on public highways.

### 5.2.4 Gradients

Gradients through the site are generally an issue given the topography of the surrounding area. Walking routes should be carefully considered through the site, as gradients over $5 \%$ will exclude most users from usings footways.

### 5.3 Central Car Park

### 5.3.1 Overview and Principle of Design

The central car park is currently accessed via Bank Road, and the proposed masterplan maintains access from this location. Figure 5.2 below shows the location of the central car park.

Figure 5.2: Overview of the Site and Car Park Locations for Reference


Source: HLM Architects (12-1564-01-HLM-00-B1-DR-A-00019 PROPOSED SITE PLAN BASEMENT LEVEL)

### 5.3.2 Opportunities

Vehicle tracking has been carried out for the vehicle in Figure 5.1, into a sample of 10 of the car parking spaces. No issues were identified with this design layout, assuming that vehicles utilise reverse parking.

No specific opportunities have been identified at this stage.

### 5.3.3 Risks and Potential Issues

Accessibility from the car park to the rest of the development should be considered further, in particular the provision of disabled parking. Consideration should be given to providing disabled
parking adjacent to the building entrance, as it is noted that the car park and the building are at significantly different levels.

### 5.4 Western Car Park

### 5.4.1 Overview and Principle of Design

Figure 5.2 above shows the location of the western car park. At present, the proposed layout has retained the existing car park layout.

Access to this car park is currently provided through the central car park, however the proposed layout is currently showing an access from the north as well.

### 5.4.2 Opportunities

Vehicle tracking has been carried out for the vehicle in Figure 5.1, into a sample of 5 of the car parking spaces. The parking spaces at the ends of the parking area were difficult to access, so there is an opportunity here to reconfigure the car park to provide better access for cars.

The access road from the north of the western car park is currently shown in the design as approximately $19 \%$ in terms of longfall gradient. It appears that from the adjacent space available, it would be feasible to redesign this road to be more circuitous, to increase the length and thereby reduce the gradient. This would make it more viable as a route for cars.

### 5.4.3 Risks and Potential Issues

With reference to the potential additional access road, a road which is over $10 \%$ gradient, will typically exclude a significant number of users from utilising this. Therefore, consideration needs to be given to whether an adjacent footway would be included. If a footway isn't included, then an alternative route for pedestrians should be provided.

Further discussion regarding this new road is outlined in Section 6.6, in reference to the service and access strategy.

### 5.5 Residential Parking

Figure 5.2 above displays the location of the proposed residential car parking. It is the intention that the upper-level residences (the residences situated nearer to the western car park) will park their cars in the driveway spaces provided, and that the lower-level residences will park their cars in enclosed garages.

### 5.5.1 Opportunities

Vehicle tracking has been carried out for the vehicle in Figure 5.1, into a sample of 5 of the car parking spaces. No issues were identified with this design layout, assuming that vehicles utilise reverse parking.

For the residences on the upper level (the residences situated nearer to the western car park), it may be beneficial to include a secure cycle parking facility in the location indicated in Figure 5.3 below.

Figure 5.3: Potential Location for a Secure Cycle Parking Facility


Source: HLM Architects (12-1564-01-HLM-00-B1-DR-A-00019 PROPOSED SITE PLAN BASEMENT LEVEL)

### 5.5.2 Risks and potential issues

No specific risks or potential issues have been identified at this stage.

### 5.6 Other considerations

The footpath that links to the south of the site from Edge Road shown in Figure 5.4, could be widened out and benches or resting points could be provided along it, to assist with access for users with mobility issues. This will not provide suitable access for all, but it would improve this route.

Figure 5.4: Footpath Which Could be Improved


Source: HLM Architects (12-1564-01-HLM-00-B1-DR-A-00019 PROPOSED SITE PLAN BASEMENT LEVEL)
The road between the central car park area, and the residential and western car park areas, is too narrow for two vehicles to comfortably pass each other. Either this route should be made one-way only, or it should be widened to accommodate two-way traffic.


### 5.6.1 Car Park Management

There is an opportunity to introduce a payment system into the parking on site to generate revenue.

## 6 Service and Access Review

### 6.1 Overview

A design review of the service and access routes has been carried out on the current masterplan. The primary aim of this review was to determine any key issues with the proposed layout and identify any opportunities for improvement.

### 6.2 Design Principles

### 6.2.1 Vehicle Tracking

Figure 6.1 shows the vehicle dimensions used for vehicle tracking of fire service vehicles.
Figure 6.1: Vehicle Dimensions Used for Vehicle Tracking of Fire Service Vehicles


Source: Autodesk
Figure 6.2 below shows the vehicle dimensions used for vehicle tracking of refuse vehicles.

Figure 6.2: Vehicle Dimensions Used for Vehicle Tracking of Refuse Vehicles


Source: Autodesk

### 6.2.2 Principle of Design for Assessment of Access Routes

Figure 6.3 below displays the access routes assessed.
For the assessment of the fire service access, it has been assumed that the fire service currently access the site via Smedley Street. Therefore, the northern access route has been assessed.

In addition, the southern access route has been assessed, as it would be beneficial for the fire service to be able to access the residential area without having to drive through the rest of the site.

For the assessment of the refuse vehicle access, it has been assumed that refuse vehicles would be required to use both the northern and southern access routes, to collect refuse from both the residential area, as well as the main building area.

Figure 6.3: Access Routes Assessed


Source: HLM Architects (230831 Masterplan Strategy Drawings)

### 6.3 Northern Access Route

### 6.3.1 Opportunities

It has been assumed that the fire service must use this northern access route at present, to access the southern side of the existing building. However, given that there is currently no through route or turning circle provided, it has been assumed that the fire service must currently plan to reverse out of the site for a longer distance than would typically be desirable.

Through discussions with the fire service there is an opportunity here to improve accessibility for their vehicles, by providing some facility to turn vehicles round more easily, albeit it is acknowledged that this may require a large area to facilitate their manoeuvres.

### 6.3.2 Risks and Potential Issues

The initial section of the northern access route is difficult for both types of vehicles assessed to access. This is because it appears that, at present, the site is accessed by vehicles travelling westbound and then turning left into the site. If this movement is not retained, it does not appear possible for vehicles to make a right turn manoeuvre into the site.

It has been identified that the garages on Smedley Street could potentially be removed to provide a larger area for vehicles to turn right into the site. This may make the manoeuvre possible, however it should be noted that there is a significant level difference in this area, and further work to assess the feasibility of a route would be required.


### 6.4.2 Risks and Potential Issues

Fire service vehicles appear to struggle according to the vehicle tracking, so some widening at the entrance to the residential area would be required, if these vehicles need to use this route.

### 6.5 Eastern Access Route

### 6.5.1 Opportunities

Depending on the access routes provided, there may be the opportunity to have some form of access control on this eastern access route, to limit the times that the central car park can be accessed. As outlined in Section 5.6, this may be operationally advantageous in managing the car park, and should be discussed further.

### 6.5.2 Risks and Potential Issues

The car park decking height should be high enough to accommodate fire service and refuse vehicles, should this be deemed a suitable access route for them.

### 6.6 New Connection Route between Residential and Main Building Area

A new internal connecting road has been introduced on the masterplan between the southern access route and the northern access route. The viability of this road in relation to use by cars is outlined in Section 5.3.2.

Vehicle tracking for fire service vehicles and refuse vehicles has been carried out. It has been determined that in order to accommodate fire service and refuse vehicles, the design will require widening.

With respect to the steep gradient, although there are no specific design standards which outline an absolute maximum gradient permitted, the recommendation would be that this would need to be discussed and agreed with Derbyshire County Council and the local Fire Service, if this road is to form part of the emergency vehicle access route. As stated in Section 5.3.2, the road could be made more circuitous to decrease the gradient, but this would then require the road to be significantly wider, to accommodate these vehicle's swept paths.

### 6.7 Other Considerations

As mentioned in Section 5.6, the southern access route should be explored further, as this may provide an alternative access for refuse vehicles and emergency vehicles.

Access to the refuse store shown in Figure 6.4 should also be considered further, as it appears at present that this would need to be carried out via Smedley Street.

Figure 6.4: Refuse Store Location


Source: HLM Architects (12-1564-01-HLM-00-00-DR-A-00013 PROPOSED SITE PLAN GROUND FLOOR LEVEL)

## 7 Smedley Street

### 7.1 Existing Bus Services

The existing bus services along Smedley Street are set out in Table 7.1 and Figure 7.1.
Table 7.1: Existing Bus Services along Smedley Street
$\left.\begin{array}{llllllll}\text { Service } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Direction along } \\ \text { Smedley Street }\end{array} & \text { Origin } & \text { Destination } & \text { Frequency } & \begin{array}{l}\text { First } \\ \text { Departure }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Last } \\ \text { Departure }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Operator }\end{array} \\ \hline 63 & \text { WB } & \text { Matlock } & \text { Chesterfield } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Roughly one service } \\ \text { every two hours } \\ \text { Four services per day }\end{array} & 08: 15 & 15: 55 & \begin{array}{l}\text { Hulleys of } \\ \text { Baslow }\end{array} \\ \hline 63 & \text { EB } & & \text { Chesterfield } & \text { Matlock } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Roughly one service } \\ \text { every two hours } \\ \text { Five services per day }\end{array} & 08: 15 & 15: 55\end{array} \begin{array}{l}\text { Hulleys of } \\ \text { Baslow }\end{array}\right\}$

Figure 7.1: Existing Bus Provision Along Smedley Street


[^0]This indicates a total of 28 services (16 westbound services and 12 eastbound services) along Smedley Street between the hours of 08:00 and 18:00 Monday to Friday.

### 7.2 Bus Service Diversions

Hopewell Road is currently deemed unsuitable for a bus service diversion due to the vehicle weight restriction of 7.5 T , narrow highway width, on-street parking along the length restricting two-way traffic movements, multiple residential properties and a sharp left-turn from Wellington Street.

It is unlikely that public transport operators would consider Hopewell Road as an acceptable alternative bus route.

As a result, bus diversion routes have been considered avoiding the use of Hopewell Road. The potential diversion routes are set out in Figure 7.2.

Figure 7.2: Proposed Diversion Route Avoiding Hopewell Road


Source: Mott MacDonald
The opportunities associated with this diversion route are as follows:

- Route avoids Hopewell Road.
- Existing infrastructure could be considered for bus provision i.e. parking layby.
- This diversion would not change the overall origin/destination of the services.
- Minor journey length changes for the public transport operators.

The challenges associated with this diversion route are as follows:

- Steep gradients on Rutland Street.
- A 7.5T vehicle weight restriction is also in place along Rutland Street/Bank Road between Imperial Road/Lime Grove Walk and Wellington Street, however, there is already evidence of bus services along the route (service 471 Darley Dale-Highfields School).
- Implications for users of the bus stops along Wellington Street as well as users of the bus stops along Smedley Street. Walking distances to bus stops may increase for a number of users.
- A new bus stop near to the Smedley Street junction would need to be considered.
- The complex junction arrangement at the Wellington Street/Rutland Street junction.
- An route would be subject to discussions with public transport operators.

Figure 7.3 displays the diversion routes should Hopewell Road be used as the diversion.
Figure 7.3: Proposed Diversion Route Utilising Hopewell Road


Source: Mott MacDonald
Consideration should be given to the following should this be taken forward:

- Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) to be considered along Hopewell Road and any potential implications of this i.e., consultation with residents regarding any loss of parking.
- Review of Public Service Vehicle (PSV) access via the Hopewell Road/Wellington Street junction.
- Review of the public footway along the western carriageway along Hopewell Road for boarding/alighting westbound services (it is currently extremely narrow).
- Review of the 7.5T vehicle weight restriction along Hopewell Road.
- The views of public transport operators.


### 7.3 Pedestrian Priority Options and Associated Challenges/Opportunities

A number of pedestrian priority options for Smedley Street have been considered:

- Option 1: Closure
- Option 1a: Full closure to vehicles along the length (service and access only).
- Option 1b: Closure to vehicles at the Wellington Street junction between Wellington Street and the northern Matlock County Hall site access.
- Option 1c: Closure to vehicles at the Bank Road junction.
- Option 2: Active travel improvement works.
- Option 3: One-way.
- 3a: One-way only eastbound (EB).
- 3b: One-way only westbound (WB).
- Option 4: Time restrictions (no vehicle access during the day time - excluding AM and PM peak hours
- Option 5: Public transport/servicing/access only (no through route).
- Option 6: Day restrictions (e.g., closure to vehicles on specific days only).
- Option 7: Shared-use space

The following sub-sections provide detail of each option including the associated opportunities and constraints.

The options were discussed with the Traffic and Road Safety Service at Derbyshire County Council on Tuesday $5^{\text {th }}$ September 2023 and the relevant feedback has been included within the following sub-sections.

### 7.3.1 Option 1: Closures

Option 1a entails a full closure of Smedley Street for vehicles between the northern Matlock County Hall site access and Rutland Street/Bank Road.

Option 1b entails a closure to vehicles at the Smedley Street/Wellington Street junction. The closure would be in place between Wellington Street and the Matlock County Hall northern access, with turning head implemented at the Matlock County Hall northern access for WB traffic along Smedley Street.

Option 1c entails a closure to vehicles of Smedley Street at the Bank Road junction.
The key challenges and opportunities associated with the Option 1 sub-options are set out in Table 7.2.

Table 7.2: Option 1: Closures - Challenges and Opportunities

| Potential Challenge <br> / Opportunity | Relevant <br> Option | Detail |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 1a, 1b, 1c | Reassignment of traffic in the local area may have local traffic <br> implications due to no through-traffic. Smedley Street is a well- <br> utilised east to west route. |
| 1a, 1b, 1c | Diversion of three existing bus services would be required which <br> could have impacts on routing, journey length, servicing and distance <br> to bus stops for local residents. |  |
|  | 1a, 1b, 1c | Likely to require highway changes on Hopewell Road for instance <br> reassignment. Any significant highway changes face a risk of <br> objection from the public. |
| 1a, 1b, 1c | Reduction of passing trade along Smedley Street. |  |
|  | Potential relocation of a number of disabled parking bays and time- <br> limited parking bays that are currently present on Smedley Street |  |
| 1a, 1b, 1c | Difficulties with fire and access/servicing from Smedley Street |  |
| 1b | Loss of Smedley Street historic garages |  |
| 1a | Servicing would be difficult for the retail units on Smedley Street due <br> to the lack of alternative (rear) access. |  |
| 1a | Full severance could have a detrimental on the operation of the re- <br> developed County Hall Site. |  |
| 1a, 1b, 1c | Enhanced pedestrian amenity along Smedley Street due to no <br> through traffic |  |
| 1a | Improved active travel facilities due to re-allocation of road space. |  |

### 7.3.2 Option 2: Active Travel Improvement Works

Option 2 entails no changes to vehicular traffic but includes an investment in and enhancement of active travel infrastructure along Smedley Street.

The key challenges and opportunities associated with Option 2 are set out in Table 7.3.
Table 7.3: Active Travel Improvement Works - Challenges and Opportunities
Potential Challenge Detail
/ Opportunity

| Challenge | Limited room for active travel improvements if bi-directional traffic is maintained, and <br> therefore the extent of change is limited. |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
| Potential loss of Smedley Street historic garages. |  |
| Opportunity | This would still allow for passing trade for local businesses along Smedley Street. The <br> existing disabled parking bays and short-stay parking bays could be retained. |
| Likely to have a reduced amount of local objections compared to full closure/partial <br> closure options. |  |
| If the historic garages are removed, there is an opportunity to implement a continuous <br> footway along the southern side of the carriageway. |  |
| Potential opportunity to implement a priority give-way system on Smedley Street <br> (subject to a review of carriageway widths along the length). The layout of the existing <br> time-limited waiting bays could be reviewed and a potential vehicle width restriction <br> could be implemented (in addition to the existing weight limit restriction of 7.5 S ). |  |

### 7.3.3 Option 3: One-Way

Option 3a entails converting Smedley Street to one-way EB only for vehicles between Wellington Street and Bank Road.

Option 3b entails converting Smedley Street to one-way WB only for vehicles between Wellington Street and Bank Road.

The key challenges and opportunities associated with the Option 3 sub options are set out in Table 7.4

Table 7.4: Option 3: One-way - Challenges and Opportunities

| Potential Challenge <br> / Opportunity | Relevant Option | Detail |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Challenge | 3a, 3b | Existing bus services will be affected, as services are currently bidirectional along Smedley Street. |
|  | 3a, 3b | One-way through traffic would still be able to utilise this route, which would mean limited benefits for the active travel conditions. |
|  | 3a, 3b | Reassignment of traffic in the local area may have local traffic implications due to no through-traffic depending on the direction of routing. |
|  | 3a, 3b | Likely to require highway changes on Hopewell Road (for instance Traffic Regulation Orders TROs)) due to the envisaged reassignment. Any significant highway changes face a risk of objection from the public. |
|  | 3a, 3b | One-way traffic could result in a potentially negative impact on traffic speed along Smedley Street due to the removal of potential conflict (increasing speed). This could therefore raise safety concerns. |
| Opportunity | 3a, 3b | By only having one-way of traffic there would be additional road space available for reallocation to active mode infrastructure (although widths are fairly constrained). This could potentially include the construction/widening of footways on both sides of the Smedley Street carriageway. |
|  | 3a, 3b | This would still allow for passing trade for local businesses along Smedley Street. |
|  | 3a, 3b | Although this would still result in reassignment, it is likely that this would be reduced compared to a full closure. |

### 7.3.4 Option 4: Time Restrictions (No Vehicle Access During the Day Time Excluding AM and PM Peak Hours

Option 4 entails no physical barriers to vehicles implemented along Smedley Street but proposes timed vehicle restrictions to allow for an active-travel friendly environment during day time hours.

The key challenges and opportunities associated with Option 4 are set out in Table 7.5.

Table 7.5: Option 4: Time Restrictions (No Vehicle Access During the Day Time Excluding AM and PM Peak Hours)
Potential Challenge Detail
/ Opportunity

|  | The benefits of this option are limited to day time users only. <br> This would be difficult to enforce, it would rely on users adhering to signage restrictions. <br> It would be difficult to implement in the absence of physical barriers. Rising bollards <br> could be considered. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bus services along Smedley Street typically operate in the day time hours only and <br> therefore services would be restricted. |  |
| The restriction could cause confusion for users, which could have further detrimental <br> impacts such as increased number of collisions. |  |
| $\qquad$Reassignment of traffic in the local area may have local traffic implications due to no <br> through-traffic during the 'no vehicle access' hours. Likely to require highway changes <br> on Hopewell Road (for instance Traffic Regulation Orders TROs)) due to the envisaged <br> reassignment. Any significant highway changes face a risk of objection from the public. |  |
| The operation of a hotel on Smedley Street may be difficult as arrivals are expected <br> throughout the day. |  |
| Opportunity | Environment improved for active travel users during the daytime without the need for a <br> full road closure. |
| The option could include the allowance of through-traffic in peak hours (subject to a <br> review of development uses), which would lessen the impacts on through-traffic. |  |

### 7.3.5 Option 5: Public Transport/Servicing/Access Only (No Through Route)

Option 5 entails a closure of Smedley Street to through traffic, but allowing public transport, servicing and access vehicles to utilise this.

The key challenges and opportunities associated with Option 5 are set out in Table 7.6.
Table 7.6: Option 5: Public Transport/Servicing/Access Only (No Through Route)
Potential Challenge Detail
/ Opportunity

|  | As highway infrastructure is still required for public transport, servicing and access, this <br> limits the available space for active travel infrastructure upgrades. |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Majority of vehicles utilising the street are likely to be service vehicles or buses, which <br> will still create an unpleasant environment for active travel users. |
| Reassignment of traffic in the local area may have local traffic implications due to no <br> through-traffic. Likely to require highway changes on Hopewell Road (for instance <br> Traffic Regulation Orders TROs)) due to the envisaged reassignment. Any significant <br> highway changes face a risk of objection from the public. |  |
| This would be difficult to enforce, it would rely on users adhering to signage <br> restrictions. It would be difficult to implement in the absence of physical barriers. |  |
| Opportunity | Reduced number of vehicles will improve the environment for active travel users. |
| This would avoid the need to relocate the existing disabled parking bays on Smedley <br> Street. |  |

### 7.3.6 Option 6: Day Restrictions (E.g., Closure to Vehicles on Specific Days Only)

Option 6 entails closure to vehicles on certain says of the month, for instance, the first Saturday/Sunday of every month during summer.

The key challenges and opportunities associated with Option 6 are set out in Table 7.7.
Table 7.7: Option 6: Day Restrictions (E.g., Closure to Vehicles on Specific Days Only)
Potential Challenge Detail
/ Opportunity

|  | As highway infrastructure is still require, this limits the available space for active travel <br> infrastructure upgrades. |
| :--- | :--- |
| This initiative would be reliant on good communication, otherwise the day restrictions <br> could be confusing and potentially result in accidents. |  |
| The benefits would only be realised on limited occasions. |  |
| Reassignment of traffic in the local area may have local traffic implications due to no <br> through-traffic. Likely to require highway changes on Hopewell Road (for instance <br> Traffic Regulation Orders TROs)) due to the envisaged reassignment. Any significant <br> highway changes face a risk of objection from the public. |  |
| Opportunities for activities/events on the vehicle free days e.g. outdoor markets which <br> would generate an interest in the area. |  |

### 7.3.7 Option 7: Shared-Use Space

Option 7 entails a shared-use space along Smedley Street which would improve pedestrian experience by reducing the dominance of motor vehicles by enabling users to share the space. Shared-use space schemes have become increasingly popular with councils wanting to regenerate local high streets.

The key challenges and opportunities associated with Option 7 are set out in Table 7.8.

Table 7.8: Option 7: Shared-Use Space
Potential Challenge Detail
/ Opportunity

| Challenge | The DfT Inclusive Transport Strategy (2020) ${ }^{1}$ recommends that Local Authorities pause the development of shared space schemes which incorporate a level surface. Disabled people may experience challenges, for instance, visually impaired people utilising the shared space. Simply placing people and vehicles in the same space, without appropriate traffic restraint and speed-reducing measures, can increase danger and exclude vulnerable groups (SUSTRANS, 2018) ${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Whilst the scheme may improve the pedestrian environment, it may not necessarily result in reduction of traffic volumes. |
|  | Potential safety implications associated with the shared use space. |
|  | Allow pedestrians, cyclists and vehicle users to have equal ownership of the street and therefore reduce the vehicle dominance. |
| Opportunity | Reducing separation can make vehicle traffic slower and reduce traffic volume, consequently reducing the frequency and severity of collisions. Slower vehicle speeds make people feel safer, making a place more pleasant to be in and to walk and cycle, and can lead to local economic benefits. Improved streetscape. |

The passing trade and on-street parking bays will still be retained.

[^1]
## 8 Sustainable Transport Links to Matlock Town Centre

### 8.1 Existing Challenges

The existing active travel route to/from Matlock Town Centre to/from the Matlock County Hall site is likely to utilise Rutland Street/Bank Road. The route is extremely steep, there are no formal cycle lanes and there are limited crossing facilities in place at the A615 Snitterton Road/Bank Road roundabout.

The existing bus services that connect the Matlock County Hall site to Matlock Town Centre are set out in Table 7.1. There is existing provision for the route, however, the service frequency is low with most services operating at one service per hour or less.

### 8.2 Potential Options

In order to facilitate linkages to/from Matlock Town Centre by sustainable modes (i.e., not single occupancy private vehicles) a number of potential options are proposed.

The following sub-sections detail the potential options that could be considered in order to provide sustainable access to Matlock Town Centre.

### 8.2.1 New E-Shuttle Bus to/from, Matlock Town Centre and Matlock Railway Station

The development could implement a new shuttle bus between the site and Matlock Town Centre/Matlock Railway Station. For sustainability purposes, the buses could be powered via more sustainable means i.e., e-powered.

An example of this is in place at Surrey Research Park, where a free shuttle service is provided from Guildford Train Station to the Park running through peak journey times: Facilities - Surrey Research Park (surrey-research-park.com) and SRP-E-Shuttle-Service-A4-Poster-v4.pdf (surrey-research-park.com)

Operation of this service could be funded through a joint venture, for instance, between the Derbyshire County Council, the hotel operator, Derbyshire Dales District Council and key businesses in the town expected to benefit from trade/footfall arising from the new and extended economic activity on site.

### 8.2.2 Demand Responsive Transport

Demand responsive transport (DRT) is a flexible service that provides shared transport to users who specify their desired location and time of pick-up and drop-off. DRT can complement fixed route public transport services and improve mobility in low-density areas and at low-demand times of day. The 2022 Department for Transport (DfT) guidance 'Demand responsive transport: local authority toolkit' sets out how DRT schemes can have a range of services:

- Addressing suppressed travel demand to fill the gap where journeys cannot be walked or cycled.
- Transferring existing bus users to a DRT service to provide a flexible service in place of a conventional fixed service.
- Acting as a feeder service to existing bus/rail service (for instance Matlock Railway Station).
- Consolidating existing bus service to enable one service to meet multiple needs.
- Providing an alternative to private journeys to promote a hop on, hop off service.

Examples of on-demand bus services include:

- Callconnect in Lincolnshire: Callconnect On Demand Bus Service (lincsbus.info)
- MK Connect in Milton Keynes: MK Connect | Milton Keynes City Council (miltonkeynes.gov.uk)

Similar DRT services are already in place across Derbyshire County Council i.e., Derbyshire Connect which provided door-to-door shopping bus service for those unable to use conventional buses due to mobility issues or because they live in aeras with limited bus services.

### 8.2.3 Shared Micro-Mobility - Pool Electrically Assisted Pedal Cycles (EAPCs)

Shared micro-mobility relates to short term access to a wider range of small, shared, lightweight vehicles including bikes, e-bikes, e-scooters and cargo bikes.

Electrically Assisted Pedal Cycles (EAPCs) could work well at the Matlock County Hall site, as the EAPCs assist with cycling along routes with steep gradients/hilly terrain. Panniers and stowage trays enable riders to carry equipment and supplies.

By having pool EAPCs available, this would encourage usage without individual financial burden, by removing cost as a barrier to uptake. This option could be supplemented with e-cycle training sessions for those working/living on site.

### 8.2.4 Consideration of a Mobility Hub on Site

Collaborative Mobility UK (CoMoUK) is a national charity dedicated to the social, economic and environmental benefits of shared transport. CoMoUK define mobility hubs as highly visible, safe and accessible spaces that bring together of shared transport with public transport and active travel in spaces designed to improve the public realm for all. The redesign and reallocation of space from the private car, is intended to enhance the experience of travellers as well as benefiting local residents and businesses.

The site could consider implementing a Mobility Hub on site that includes the following:

- High quality pedestrian infrastructure;
- Cycle hire;
- Cycle parking;
- Cycle repair;
- Network maps;
- Journey planning tools;
- Bus stop/services;
- Car club/bays;
- Car share; and
- EV charging and parking payments etc.

It is noted that Derbyshire County Council commissioned SYSTRA to undertake the Derbyshire Mobility Hub Study in January 2022 which investigates the potential for a network of Mobility Hubs across Derbyshire. The study identified that a mobility hub located in Matlock (either at Matlock Rail Station of the Bus Station) would be beneficial, as one of the main towns in Derbyshire. Therefore, the Matlock County Hall development could make use of this facility should it ever be constructed.

### 8.2.5 Enhanced Frequency of Existing Bus Services

The baseline review revealed a number of existing bus services currently connect the site with Matlock Town Centre. However, these are not high-frequency services. Discussions could be undertaken with local public transport operators to explore the possibility of enhancing the frequency of existing service provision. The site could look to further encourage the use of existing bus services with incentives such as travel card discounts.

## 9 Summary and Next Steps

### 9.1 Summary

The trip generation and parking accumulation assessment has indicated the following recommended parking provision for the non-residential elements of the site is:

- 447 spaces - If parking for each land use is not segregated
- 285 spaces for New Build Office
- 162 spaces for the Hotel and Banqueting/Conference Centre.

The parking accumulation for the residential development has not been provided, as it is understood that 1.5 spaces per dwelling have been provided in line with local parking guidelines and local car ownership figures.

A sample of the car parking areas have been assessed for vehicle tracking and in general no issues have been identified, with the exception of in the western car park area where some of the end parking spaces were shown to be difficult to access.

The site service and access arrangements have been assessed for refuse vehicles and fire service vehicles. A number of issues associated with vehicle tracking have been identified across the site.

A potential new connection route between the residential and main building areas has been assessed. The key issue with this being used as a new road is the level difference, which would result (as currently designed) in a road with approximately $19 \%$ gradient. There is an opportunity to reduce this gradient by making the route more circuitous, although this will require more space to accommodate.

### 9.2 Next Steps

The following next steps are recommended:

- Review of the masterplan to take account of the points raised throughout this technical assessment.
- Review the need for traffic surveys to understand existing vehicle movements to/from the site.
- Review the need for pedestrian surveys to/from the site and along Smedley Street to understand the existing active travel access habits to/from and around the site.
- Review the need for parking beat surveys to understand how the existing car park operates.
- Further development of the car parking areas, in particular the western car park which requires some reconfiguration.
- There is a need to review the service and access strategy with Derbyshire County Council and the local fire service.
- Further consideration should be given to the benefit that would be provided by the potential new connection route between residential and main building area. If this is deemed to be beneficial then the road needs to be designed to ensure that it is usable by the intended vehicles.
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\cdots \rightarrow A \rightarrow A A_{\text {d }}$ |  |  | － |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \％．8．8\％\％\％ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 言罰 } \\ & \text { 部言 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | \％ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 亳言 |  | A |  |  |  |  | 喜咅 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \％ |  |  | 言贌 |  | \％ | －0． |  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 言䍜蘦 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  | 10000悩00000000 | 옴융 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 咢？ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \％ 00000 \％${ }^{\circ}$ |  |  | ¿ |  | 言䇾咅 |  | \％ |  | 言离言 |  |  |
|  |  | 00000\％00000000\％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


$\begin{array}{lc}\substack{\text { ARRIVALS } \\ \text { Trip } \\ \text { Rate }} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Estimated } \\ \text { Trip Rate }\end{array}\end{array}$
No.
Days $\underset{\substack{\text { Ave } \\ \text { Beorms }}}{ }$
No.
Days $\underset{\substack{\text { Ave. } \\ \text { BEERMS }}}{\text { D. }}$

Days $\quad$| Ave. |
| :---: |
| BEDRMS |

$\underset{\substack{\text { OtraAtures } \\ \text { Trip } \\ \text { Rate }}}{ }$
$\underset{\substack{\text { Estimated } \\ \text { Trip Rate }}}{\text { Red }}$
No.
Days
$\underbrace{\substack{\text { Ave } \\ \text { BEDMS }}}_{\text {V. }}$
$\underset{\substack{\text { Totals } \\ \text { Trip } \\ \text { Rate }}}{ }$
96
96
96
96
96
96
96
96 $\qquad$ 0.444
0
0.222
0
0
0
0
0




| 0.005 | 0.444 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0.003 | 0.222 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |

0.444
0
0.222
0
0
0
0
0
0
4
4
4
4
4
4
4
4




| 96 | 0.065 | 5.548 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 96 | 0.104 | 8.877 |
| 96 | 0.157 | 13.316 |
| 96 | 0.076 | 6.436 |
| ${ }_{96}$ | 0.057 | 4.883 |
| 96 | 0.055 | 4.661 |
| 96 | 0.073 | 6.214 |
| 96 | 0.185 | 15.757 |
| 96 | 0.131 | 11.097 |
| 96 | 0.17 | 14.426 |
| 96 | 0.248 | 21.084 |
| 96 | 0.18 | 15.313 |
| 96 | 0.151 | 12.872 |
| 96 | 0.097 | 8.211 |
| 96 | 0.094 | 7.99 |




O6. Hotel
Catculation factor:
BERMS
Estimated Trip rate
value per 85 BERPMS
shown in stimated
column




| TRIP RATE for land Use | FOoo \& DRINK/ |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| bedrms |  |
| Estimated TRIP Patevalue eer 88 BEDRMS |  |
|  |  |
| shown in Estimated |  |
| column |  |
| Count Type: motor |  |
|  |  |


23:00-24:00
Daly Trip Rates:

57-138 (units:)
$57-138$ (units:)
$01 / 1 / 1 / 15 \cdot 12 / 11 / 21$


the number of survey
days that have been
manually removed from
$=$ seleted weekdays
selend days in the
sere show. sot of surve
and the selected set outside
of the standard filterien



```
Mopuation within 1 mile
M
l
lol
MTravelPan:
T
Mmber of surveys within and the number of
```



```
MPTAL Ratig:
Nop PaL Present the 1 dayS
\
\begin{subarray}{c}{\mathrm{ LST OE SITES relvant to m}}\\{\mathrm{ selecton parameters}}\end{subarray}
```



```
                \begin{subarray}{c}{\mathrm{ SHEFFILD}}\\{\mathrm{ Edge of Town}}\end{subarray}
                \ Edge of Town
```



```
This section provdes alis
\_l
l
```



```
l
```



```
l
CHOTEL_
```



```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & & ARRVals & & & & \({ }^{\text {departures }}\) & & & & Totals & \\
\hline & No. & Ave. & Trip & mated & No. & Ave. & \({ }^{\text {Trip }}\) & nated & No. & Ave. & Trip & dimated \\
\hline Time Range & Days & GFA & Rate & Trip Rate & Days & GFA & Rate & Trip Rate & Days & GFA & Rate & Trip Rate \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```





[^0]:    Sources: Hulleys of Baslow website, TM Travel website, Stagecoach website (accessed online $16^{\text {th }}$ August 2023)

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ The Inclusive Transport Strategy: achieving equal access for disabled people - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)
    ${ }^{2}$ Our position on shared space and people-prioritised streets and places - Sustrans.org.uk

