

View Response

Response #1329470

From [Lamorna Dianne Prescott](#)

[REDACTED]

Date Started: 15 Jun 2026 11:49. Last modified: 15 Jun 2026 13:48

Status Complete

Title Mrs

First Name Lamorna

Last Name Prescott

Organisation NA

Job Title Retired

[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

I do not believe the housing in South Derbyshire should be extended to meet Derby City unmet need the level of housing development encompassing Mickleover and Hilton and the pace of growth is affecting the quality of life in this area and alternative to meet Derby City unmet need should be considered in less developed areas, such as the eastern border of the city around Elvaston. Particularlry as the high level and increased numbers of housing seems to be impacting the vehicular access requirements.

I object that the initial plan was not to scale and misled me and many of my neighbours on the impact of this development. In addition the original plan was explicit that the access to the site would be from the A38 roundabout. I find it hard to believe that a proper vehicle access assessment was not made at the time, I can therefore only assume the omission of the road proposal was excluded initially to 'mislead' the population responding to the consultation and make it more acceptable. I can not believe an revision took place within one year with a 'link road' requirement suddenly being identified. I think the response to the consultation would have been significantly different had this been included in the initial consultation and therefore do not believe the initial consultation was legal, sound or in good faith..

In the initial plan a 'country park/green wedge' was indicated around the Pastures estate with a 'pedestrian/cycle path running through it. In more recent discussions with local planners and councillors, i now understand this strip to be 25m in width. If the green strip is 25m, I do not think the initial consultation plan was spatially accurate or to scale and was deliberately misleading. I know the distance from the top to the bottom of Sandpiper Lane on the Pastures estate it is significantly more than 25m but on the plan its appears less than the width of the 'country park/green wedge'.

In the latest plan this 'country park/green wedge'. will include within it a road and cycle path. As such I no longer believe it can be described as a 'country park/green wedge' as in the latest consultation. it is a I think the public have a right to be given clear scaled plans with specific distances for a legal and sound consultation. You will also note how indistinct the housing development is compared with the 'country park' shading.

I attended two meetings to try to understand the nature of the road included in the Regulation 19 Addendum, no one was able to define what a link road is. Everything from a link road joining Chellaston to the A516 to a small road to allow egress and exit for the occupants of houses on the estate was mentioned. On this basis i can not ascertain how alternatives were considered. A planning office implied the route was not controlled by the South Derbyshire and would be a southern 'bypass' linking Chellaston and the A516. I believe we already have that it is called the A50. I believe it is not sound or legal to consult on something which has not been defined and would like you to consider how robust a traffic assessment would be undertaken on such plans..

I cannot believe a traffic assessment could change that much in 12 months from the initial consultation so either it was not done for the initial consultation or the outcome that a road was required was 'hidden' to mislead the local community, with a plan to consult on an addendum at a later date.

I could also obtain no information on what alternatives to this 'link' road running through what had been described as 'country park green/wedge' had been considered . Their assessments on the alternatives of undermining this green space for people in the existing and new development have not been shared its therefore impossible to understand why they concluded this change was essential. This land is not only available to the people who live on the pastures estate but also to the people of Mickleover who have already lost so much of their accessible green space developed and will be important to the quality of life of people living in the new development..

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.

There is no explanation why this Southern Derbyshire plan should contribute to Derby City unmet need, therefore there is no justification for some of the additional housing which is impacting the traffic implications of the development, particularly the 150 on the A516 which have been added..

The original consultation was undertaken using a plan which was not to scale and misled the local population on the impact of the plan.

There is no explanation of how a traffic assessment can change so much in 12 months requiring the addition of a link road requirement, was this a failure to undertake a traffic assessment or a decision to 'manage' the consultation to reduce the objections to the plans.

The public are being asked to comment on the addition of a 'link road' an addendum PMM21 for which the purpose, use and type is not defined. I do not feel this makes it a sound and legal consultation.

There is no indication that alternative routes considered or the impact they may have.

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.

A further open and honest consultation with clear plans to scale evidencing the impact of a road on the green space approved in the original plan..

A consultation on the alternatives considered, and the reasons and evidence for dismissing them.

I do not feel this is a sound consultation as the language used, and technical knowledge required to respond is beyond most people expertise and capability, what happened to using plain English and providing the opportunity to feedback in a way which is accessible to all.

I am sure that technically you can dismiss my concerns. I am sorry that I am unable to complete this response to meet the stringent requirements. I do not understand the legalities of planning applications, but there needs to be an opportunity to feedback on genuine concerns about the style and nature of this consultation and the rigour of the plan for this area.

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»