

I am a resident of the Pastures community in South Derbyshire and am writing to voice my considerable concerns regarding the proposed planning and development between Mickleover and Burnaston on arable land.

When Pastures was developed it was considered a finite site within the boundaries of the existing hospital grounds. It preserved the identities of the original site, the ancient village of Burnaston and housing in Littleover. It recognised the importance of the farmland between as a vital wildlife sanctuary and corridor. Although there is need for new housing, something I regretfully acknowledge, the level of development is totally unjustified. South Derbyshire has the highest level of new building in the country. This is bizarre considering the dramatically falling National birth rate. Why is South Derbyshire having to take on Derby City's housing shortfall with no beneficial gains for us? With Derby City's well known financial issues this suggests something less than transparent.

My main concern is with changes to the local plan relating to STRA2 and the land south of Mickleover. The original plan had access points to the proposed development on Staker Lane and near the A38 but the new version is to build a new through road linking the A38 and A516. This is totally unjustified for the many, many reasons I will state. This smacks of development via the back door - get the road in place and no one can object to further development on the grounds of poor infrastructure. I am appalled.

The justification for this through road is definitely **not** sound using South Derbyshire's own modelling. Putting a road through will only make improvements of 4-5%. This is according to the planners own records! Definitely no justification for spending millions and the irreversible damage that will follow. There is no sound evidence of how congestion will be eased in Mickleover and Littleover. Any road built here will become a rat run. There is no alternative suggestion. Is this legal?

The plan submitted by SDDC planning is, in **their own words**, 'confusing'. There is no legend on the printed map and boundaries are not clear.

The road would sever a green flag status Country Park. Surely this is against National rules and guidelines? The impact on wildlife, human health and wellbeing is devastating. Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is supposed to leave the development area greener and help bring nature back to the community, not eradicate it. The Derbyshire Wildlife Fund for Nature has identified more than 60 different species of animal and plant in the area, including some red list endangered birds nesting in the tract of land between Mickleover and Burnaston (skylark, lapwing). Deer, badgers and hares, some of our iconic British mammals are regularly seen. SDDC should be finding ways to uphold BNG, not look for morally corrupt loopholes.

Preserving the identities of established settlements is vital. Burnaston is an ancient linear village that deserves to be protected from sprawling development to maintain its character and identity. Likewise, the contained Pastures Community deserves to keep its identity. A 5m horseshoe of greenery to 'protect' Pastures is insulting and laughable.

The impact on residents' wellbeing and health is worrying. Noise levels will increase along with air pollution and light pollution. I initially moved to this area to be near green spaces and open countryside, for my health (redacted) and that of my children. Pastures will be totally boxed off by roads with no (redacted) and poor air quality. The heritage of the area will be affected with open vistas being destroyed and the perception of space and greenery gone forever. The Government is desperately trying to improve the nation's health by prescribing nature as an aid to wellbeing. Why are we proposing to destroy nature for unjustified and unsound financial gain?

The land is currently valuable green belt arable land, with crops rotated annually to get the best out of the soil. It is heavy clay in some areas that struggles to drain when heavy rain occurs. With the changing climate, heavier rainfall and hotter summers, the land is much more likely to flood. Large areas of the fields regularly have sitting water on them now which will only worsen when covered in concrete, thousands of houses and a road. Has this been considered by the planners? There is no accessible evidence that it has.

No reasonable alternative was given by SDDC for the road and no modelling has been done. This is not sound preparation and intelligent planning. It shows a level of incompetence and desperation by the planners to get as much through the back door as possible in the hope no one will notice. Is this legal?

The fact that SDDC refused to disclose evidence until the day before the plans were published suggests incompetence or something to hide.

There are too many sections of Regulation 19 regarding STRA2 that are ringing alarm bells. Is it poorly put together by incompetent planners, unsound reasoning and no justification? Or is it planners thinking far into the future of how to circumnavigate the planning rules by not being transparent and honest so as to bulldoze their way to unlimited building.

Chris Wilson