

# View Response

Response #1329400

**From** HAT

[REDACTED]

**Date** Started: 14 Jun 2026 15:59. Last modified: 14 Jun 2026 17:44

**Status** Complete

**Title** Mr

**First Name** Harold

**Last Name** Thornton

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

**Visibility** Unknown.

1.

To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

Please provide the reference of the policy, paragraph, policies map, evidence etc that your comment relates to. Please fill out a separate questionnaire form for each element of the plan (i.e. policy, paragraph, site, document) that you wish to comment on.

If comments do not provide a reference, or are submitted on a single form and relate to multiple elements of the Plan, then the Council will assign and/or

separate these points out as it considers most appropriate for submission to the Planning Inspectorate.

You must provide an answer to this question.

PM16

If 'other' please explain

«No response»

2.

**Do you consider the Local Plan is:**

Please check one.

Select the most applicable option in each row.

|                   | Yes                   | No                               |
|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Legally Compliant | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>            |
| Sound             | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |

3.

**If you checked 'No' to Sound at question 2 above, please confirm below which of the 'tests' the Local Plan fails to meet.**

Please check the relevant box.

- Positively Prepared
- Justified
- Effective
- Consistent with National Policy

4.

**Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate.**

Please be as precise as possible (e.g., if objecting on the basis of legal compliance, please quote the specific law that the Local Plan does not comply with). If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

There has been identified the need to have a bus route into the site from the north /A516 and is encompassed in the proposal to have a link road through the site to the A38. Also additional housing has been included in this part of the site.

The evidence contained in the HMA transport modelling report does not support the inclusion of a link road or the provision of a new access off the A516.

Alternative locations for the additional housing on this side of the site do not appear to have been examined as a reasonable alternative.

5.

**Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 5 above.**

(Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why each modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

The inclusion of the link road is based on unproven information and the need for it should be re-examined in isolation to establish how it would benefit the road network locally before the amendments to the local plan should be included or adopted. Reasonable alternatives have not been examined and

should be examined first. Is a partial road scheme without the full link through more appropriate?

Its route over open landscape containing important open land vistas as identified in SSDC Heretitage impact document , would detract from the objective to maintain open views and further contribute to the urban merging of Mickleover and Burnaston boundaries.

6.

**If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?**

Please check the relevant box

- No, I do not wish to participate in hearing sessions.
- Yes, I wish to participate in hearing sessions.

7.

**If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.**

Please write your answer in the box below.

«No response»

# View Response

Response #1329404

**From** [HAT](#)

[REDACTED]

**Date** Started: 14 Jun 2026 16:49. Last modified: 14 Jun 2026 16:49

**Status** Complete

**Title** Mr

**First Name** Harold

**Last Name** Thornton

[REDACTED]

A

**Visibility** Unknown.

1.

To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

Please provide the reference of the policy, paragraph, policies map, evidence etc that your comment relates to. Please fill out a separate questionnaire form for each element of the plan (i.e. policy, paragraph, site, document) that you wish to comment on.

If comments do not provide a reference, or are submitted on a single form and relate to multiple elements of the Plan, then the Council will assign and/or

separate these points out as it considers most appropriate for submission to the Planning Inspectorate.

You must provide an answer to this question.

PM22

If 'other' please explain

«No response»

2.

**Do you consider the Local Plan is:**

Please check one.

Select the most applicable option in each row.

|                   | Yes                   | No                               |
|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Legally Compliant | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>            |
| Sound             | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |

3.

**If you checked 'No' to Sound at question 2 above, please confirm below which of the 'tests' the Local Plan fails to meet.**

Please check the relevant box.

- Positively Prepared
- Justified
- Effective
- Consistent with National Policy

4.

**Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate.**

Please be as precise as possible (e.g., if objecting on the basis of legal compliance, please quote the specific law that the Local Plan does not comply with). If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

The indicative plan is difficult to interpret as the proposals are really quite vague and not helped by colour clashes and errors in the legend/key. The country park /green infrastructure / sporting provision, lacks detail over what its boundaries are, how it will look and how it will contribute to preventing settlement coalescence.

The inclusion of additional housing adjacent to the A516 already demonstrates mission creep. How confident can the consultees in this process be that their comments are valid in the face of such a poor presentation?

5.

**Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 5 above.**

(Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why each modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Modifications to the plan should be made to make it clearer over the following aspects:

Defined areas of housing shops and other infrastructure, Location of size and role of green infrastructure, Measures to prevent coalescence of Mickleover and Burnaston, sports facilities on a scale for this development only,

mitigation of impact by appropriately sized buffer zones of tree planting and other wildlife areas.

It all lacks accurate detail so how can anyone realistically comment upon it?

6.

**If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?**

Please check the relevant box

- No, I do not wish to participate in hearing sessions.
- Yes, I wish to participate in hearing sessions.

7.

**If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.**

Please write your answer in the box below.

«No response»

# View Response

Response #1329408

**From** [HAT](#)

[REDACTED]

**Date** Started: 14 Jun 2026 17:55. Last modified: 14 Jun 2026 18:09

**Status** Complete

**Title** Mr

**First Name** Harold

**Last Name** Thornton

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

**Visibility** Unknown.

1.

To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

Please provide the reference of the policy, paragraph, policies map, evidence etc that your comment relates to. Please fill out a separate questionnaire form for each element of the plan (i.e. policy, paragraph, site, document) that you wish to comment on.

If comments do not provide a reference, or are submitted on a single form and relate to multiple elements of the Plan, then the Council will assign and/or

separate these points out as it considers most appropriate for submission to the Planning Inspectorate.

You must provide an answer to this question.

PM21

If 'other' please explain

«No response»

2.

**Do you consider the Local Plan is:**

Please check one.

Select the most applicable option in each row.

|                   | Yes                   | No                               |
|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Legally Compliant | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>            |
| Sound             | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |

3.

**If you checked 'No' to Sound at question 2 above, please confirm below which of the 'tests' the Local Plan fails to meet.**

Please check the relevant box.

- Positively Prepared
- Justified
- Effective
- Consistent with National Policy

4.

**Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate.**

Please be as precise as possible (e.g., if objecting on the basis of legal compliance, please quote the specific law that the Local Plan does not comply with). If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

The proposed modifications are in response to the published HMA Transport Modeling report. The HMA model has looked at a wide area encompassing many schemes in South Derbyshire, Amber Valley and Derby City and comes to the conclusion that as a result of proposed local plans traffic congestion will increase by around 111%. Existing and proposed improvement schemes will deliver in terms of peak morning times, 53% mitigation and with the road scheme included will only serve to mitigate by 59%. This latter figure also includes a number of other highway improvements elsewhere and so the improvement of 6% is not entirely attributable to this one road and therefore the benefits are in fact unknown.

I do not consider that the Model adequately demonstrates that the link road is vital to the plan especially in the absence of having looked at reasonable alternatives.

5.

**Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 5 above.**

(Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why each modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

The link road should be excluded or further work is conducted to look to see if there are any benefits including public transport provision in having this extra road bearing in mind the potential detriment to the landscape it would have. The inclusion of the link road is based on unproven information and the need for it should be reexamined in isolation to establish how it would benefit the road network locally before the amendments to the local plan should be included or adopted. Reasonable alternatives have not been examined and should be examined first. Is a partial road scheme without the full link through more appropriate? Its route over open landscape containing important open land vistas as identified in SSDC Heritage impact document, would detract from the objective to maintain open views and further contribute to the urban merging of Mickleover and Burnaston boundaries.

6.

**If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?**

Please check the relevant box

- No, I do not wish to participate in hearing sessions.
- Yes, I wish to participate in hearing sessions.

7.

**If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.**

Please write your answer in the box below.

«No response»