

View Response

Response #1329753

From K**TJ

[REDACTED]

Date Started: 16 Jun 2026 16:54. Last modified: 16 Jun 2026 16:54

Status Complete

Title Mr

First Name Keith

Last Name Spackman

[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 checked="" 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.

particular, concerns relate to:

- the proposed all traffic A516-A38 link road;
- the location, role and protection of the proposed Country Park and Green Infrastructure land; the protection of the retained separation land in the south-west of the site between Burnaston, the Pastures and the proposed new development area, as indicated by the original Indicative Regulation 19 map published in March 2025;
- ensuring retained open land continues to perform a primarily landscape led and low intensity role and is safeguarded against incremental infrastructure creep or operational intensification over time;
 - ensuring sports and recreation facilities are appropriately scaled, clearly contained and centrally located within the proposed new community;
 - preventing the gradual spread of formal recreation provision into open countryside and retained separation land; and
 - whether the supporting evidence robustly justifies the current proposals.

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.

Planning law requires South Derbyshire District Council to properly assess realistic alternatives before introducing major strategic infrastructure or significant policy changes.

- the Sustainability Appraisal does not appear to have properly assessed alternatives to the proposed all-traffic A516-A38 link road;
- no genuine no through-road option appears to have been tested;
- and insufficient clarity currently exists regarding the scale, extent and containment of proposed sports provision and whether recreation uses may gradually extend into retained countryside and separation land.

The Council's own consultation material states that:

no reasonable alternatives...have been identified.

I am concerned that important alternatives may therefore never have been properly compared or assessed.

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»