

Cllr Matthew Holmes
Cllr Miles Pattison
Cllr Alison Holmes
Mickleover Ward Councillors
C/O Derby City Council
Corporation Street
Derby DE1 2FS

7th May 2026

South Derbyshire District Council

**Re: Regulation 19 Addendum: Proposed Modifications to South Derbyshire Local Plan Part 1 Review
Publication Version (2022 – 2041) Consultation.**

We submit the following:

1. Summary

This representation raises concerns that the Local Plan, as amended through the Regulation 19 Addendum, is not sound and risks procedural non-compliance, specifically in that:

- The Plan has been materially amended at Regulation 19 stage in a way that raises questions about whether it has been properly tested.
- The spatial strategy relies heavily on large, complex strategic sites (including STRA2 and FLG1) whose deliverability is uncertain.
- The Plan depends on cross-boundary coordination and infrastructure provision that is not clearly evidenced or secured.
- The cumulative effect is that the Plan is not justified and not effective within the meaning of paragraph 35 of the NPPF

2. Procedural Position – Regulation 19 Addendum

The Addendum introduces changes that:

- Strengthen infrastructure requirements.
- Introduce clearer delivery mechanisms (e.g. Housing Implementation Strategy).
- Refine strategic policies, including those affecting major allocations.

These changes go beyond editorial clarification and relate directly to:

- Deliverability.
- Infrastructure provision.
- Policy robustness

The key issue in regard to this is - if additional clarification and strengthening is required at this stage to demonstrate soundness, it raises doubt as to whether the Plan was sound at the point of Regulation 19 publication.

Inspectors have consistently emphasised that Regulation 19 is the stage at which a plan should be ready for submission, not still evolving in substantive ways.

There is therefore a risk that:

- The Plan has not been fully or consistently tested in its current form.
- The Addendum may amount to material modification without full reappraisal

3. Spatial Strategy – Over-reliance on Strategic Sites

The Plan's strategy is heavily dependent on a small number of large, complex sites on the Derby urban edge, notably:

- STRA2 – Land South of Mickleover.
- FLG1 – Land South of Mackworth (long-term growth area)

This creates a structural risk as the Plan's success is dependent on the timely and coordinated delivery of a limited number of high-risk sites.

This is a common point of failure at examination where delivery assumptions are optimistic, infrastructure is uncertain and sites are interdependent.

4. STRA2 – Deliverability and Infrastructure

STRA2 is a strategic allocation of significant scale, requiring:

- Major transport interventions.
- New education and community infrastructure.
- Comprehensive master planning.

The Addendum also introduces further clarification on infrastructure expectations and delivery strategy – but the need to strengthen policy wording at this stage suggests that deliverability was not sufficiently robustly evidenced at the point of publication. Doubts still exist.

Inspectors frequently require clear infrastructure phasing, identified funding mechanisms and confidence in delivery within the plan period.

In the absence of this, there is a risk that delivery will be slower than assumed, infrastructure will lag behind development - leading to unacceptable impacts.

5. FLG1 – Cross-Boundary Dependency and Effectiveness

Policy FLG1 is identified as a long-term strategic growth area, explicitly dependent on:

- Alignment with Amber Valley Borough Council.
- Joint master planning and coordinated delivery.

However, the Plan does not clearly demonstrate, agreed governance arrangements, a jointly evidenced delivery strategy and/or aligned phasing across authorities.

In addition, key infrastructure (e.g. A52–A516 linkage) is described in aspirational terms - no clear funding or delivery mechanism is identified.

Therefore, the policy relies on multiple uncertainties outside the control of the authority, without clear mechanisms to ensure delivery.

This conflicts with the requirement that plans are; effective, deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working.

6. Cumulative Impact and Spatial Clarity

While STRA2 and FLG1 are presented as separate policies, they:

- Form part of a single western Derby growth corridor.
- Share infrastructure dependencies.
- Contribute to cumulative impacts on the Mickleover area.

However, the Plan does not clearly articulate the combined scale of development in this location or how infrastructure provision will respond to cumulative demand.

In the case of FLG1, the description as “Land South of Mackworth” – it does not clearly reflect its functional relationship to Mickleover and the Derby urban edge. It also limits transparency in understanding how growth is distributed.

FLG1 would be more accurately described as ‘Land North of Mickleover’ to avoid confusion with the nearby suburb of Mackworth, which FLG1 does not relate to.

Without a clear and transparent presentation of cumulative impacts, it is difficult to conclude that the spatial strategy is justified.

7. Soundness Assessment (NPPF paragraph 35)

a) Effective

The Plan is not clearly effective because:

- It relies on large, complex sites with uncertain delivery trajectories.
- It depends on cross-boundary coordination without clear mechanisms.
- Infrastructure provision is not fully evidenced or secured.

b) Justified

The Plan is not clearly justified because:

- The distribution of growth, particularly on the western edge of Derby, is not transparently presented in cumulative terms.
- It is unclear whether reasonable alternatives have been fully considered or if the chosen strategy is the most appropriate.

c) Consistent with national policy

The Plan risks inconsistency with national policy in that:

- It is not clearly demonstrated to be deliverable.
- Strategic cross-boundary matters are not supported by robust evidence of effective joint working.

8. Relevant Examination Practice

Inspectors have found plans unsound in comparable circumstances, including where:

- Strategic sites lacked clear infrastructure delivery mechanisms.
- Cross-boundary allocations were not supported by firm agreements.
- Plans relied on optimistic delivery assumptions for large sites.

A consistent theme in examination reports is that - uncertainty in delivery of key strategic sites undermines the effectiveness of the plan as a whole.

9. Conclusion

The issues identified are not isolated. Taken together, they demonstrate that the Plan relies on a high-risk spatial strategy, that it has required late-stage strengthening to address weaknesses and that it does not yet provide sufficient certainty on delivery or infrastructure.

Accordingly, it can be strongly argued that the Plan is not clearly justified and not effective, and therefore not sound.

It is requested that the Inspector:

- Scrutinise whether the Regulation 19 Addendum introduces material changes requiring further testing.
- Examine the deliverability of STRA2 in detail, including infrastructure and phasing.
- Assess whether Policy FLG1 demonstrates effective cross-boundary delivery.
- Consider whether the cumulative concentration of growth on the western edge of Derby is justified and supported by evidence.

Cllr Matthew Holmes Cllr Miles Pattison Cllr Alison Holmes
Mickleover Ward, Derby City Council.