

Councillor Matthew Eyre

Rep ID 166

Matter 6

HS Acorn Way 6.5

---

### **Erewash Core Strategy Review – Options for Growth Document – Planning Inspector Contributions**

A response from Councillor Matthew Eyre, Councillor Jamie Mulhall and Councillor Freya Trehella, Elected Members of Derby City Council for the Oakwood Ward, followed by responses from residents within Oakwood Ward who wished for their comments to be included.

We strongly object to the housing allocations proposed by Erewash Borough Council in their Core Strategy Document, at both Oakwood (SGA1) and Spondon (SGA26).

Our comments below address the site allocation at Acorn Way, SGA 1.

#### **Introduction**

The allocation of housing within an authority is, purely and simply, a numbers game. How many are needed and where best in the borough can they be located to meet the perceived housing needs. Every council has to tackle these issues and balance each allocated site with the constraints of the allocation, constraints of nearby amenities and facilities/services, and wider administration issues. We cannot work in isolation and each council has to look beyond its boundaries to see the effects and impacts, whether positive or negative, of such allocations, on neighbouring existing conurbations, whether those are located within one's own borough or not.

It is surely common sense that sites allocated on the edge of an existing settlement that is located within another local authority, and which are constructed long distances away from conurbations, facilities, amenities and services in one's own borough, will meet the growth needs of that existing settlement AND use the existing services and facilities of THAT existing settlement under the other local authority.

The two sites allocated immediately to the north of Spondon and east of Oakwood, in our 'to be stated' view, fulfill the above, not what is claimed by Erewash Borough Council.

The two sites meet the numbers game that Local Authorities must play, BUT residents who would occupy the housing units constructed will use the infrastructure, facilities and services of the EXISTING adjoining settlements – to the detriment of those settlements and the residents within them; this is the definition of taking without giving anything in return.

### **Inter-Authority Co-operation**

It is incredibly disappointing that next to no discussions have taken place with us, as Ward Councillors, nor with previous Ward Councillors Mick Barker (2010 – 2023) and Robin Wood (2007 – 2023) in developing the revised growth options for consultation. Neither were there discussions with residents within the Oakwood Ward, who would be drastically affected by these proposals, should they go ahead.

Residents inform us that the only notification they received, excluding the notification sent to those who had already submitted comments at an earlier stage, came from us as Oakwood Ward Councillors or rumours from neighbours.

While we acknowledge that such discussions and notification are not a specific legal requirement, as authorities who share an authority boundary, such discussions would have been in the spirit of authority-to-authority cooperation. We are neighbours after all, and we should not be left finding out about things from social media, or per chance emails. We firmly believe that authorities should be working together to tackle issues relating to the housing crisis, not retreating into bubbles, and acting like anything outside of our boundaries does not really exist.

Similarly, it appears Erewash Borough Council, and its political and officer leadership prior to the change of political control in May 2023, were intent on only minimal discussions occurring with our Officers at the City Council on this incredibly important Core Strategy. Concerns around lack of communication surrounding the initial consultation document in January 2020 have long been raised, including in a joint letter from Cllr Matthew Holmes (Derby City Council), Cllr Tony Harper (Amber Valley Borough Council), Cllr Tony King (Derbyshire County Council) and Cllr Stephen Taylor (South Derbyshire District Council) dated 28<sup>th</sup> July 2021. A further letter, including a

request for a correction of statements made by Erewash BC in the Core Strategy, was sent by Cllr Steve Hassall (Derby City Council) on 9<sup>th</sup> May 2022, but it would appear that the concerns raised have not been actioned or addressed.

These letters outlined concerns regarding transport, education, housing need and lack of evidence of a proper Green Belt assessment, all of which will be explained in detail in this objection.

It appears things have not changed, and it appears Erewash Borough Council had no intention of them changing and made no attempts to ensure or seek said change. This has occurred despite the change in political leadership and despite objections raised in 2022.

The letter dated 2021 also referenced that Derby City Council believed “you need to make available more explicit justification of the choice of your sites and the exceptional circumstances for the release of the specific green belt sites.” Do such justifications now exist? What are they based on? When were they done? Who were they done by?

We as local councillors do not feel in possession of such justification; nor do our residents. We have been unable to locate proper assessments of the site(s) in question of anything more than a list of numbers and are still uncertain as to why they have been chosen.

We do however feel in possession of a potential understanding of what could be a motivation which would lead to the pursuit of a development ‘bolt-on’ to an existing community of an adjoining neighbouring authority, a good distance away from conurbations, amenities and facilities within Erewash’s own borough.

Minimal conversation and positive cooperation with the City Council and an apparently convenient dumping of housing growth of hundreds of homes, seemingly ‘suitable’ for the growth of Erewash, yet adjoining the city boundary where, as Erewash Borough Council are well aware and are promoting and encouraging, new residents will use Derby’s roads and Derby’s services, without contribution to their upkeep, maintenance and renewal, seems to be Erewash clear intent and goal, sometimes regardless of what authority has a duty to provide services.

We are incredibly disappointed that it has come to this. What we have before us is the “claimed” growth of Erewash, that is in effect the growth of Derby – yet it is growth we didn’t ask for, growth we didn’t properly and effectively discuss, growth of which we

have long-term documented severe concerns, and growth which does nothing for Derby and its residents, or indeed residents of Erewash who are in need of new housing close to their existing settlements at Borrowash, Ockbrook, Little Eaton, Ilkeston, Sandiacre, Long Eaton and more.

Indeed, at a meeting of Erewash Borough Council on 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2022, Councillor Michael Powell, then Lead Member for Regeneration and Planning at Erewash Borough Council, stated that discussions had taken place with “13 Parish Councils in Erewash, 18 (Adjacent) Parish and Town Councils... 9 Local and Adjoining County and Borough Councils and 15 specific consultation bodies (Historic England, Nature Reserves, NHS etc).” Derby City Council was not mentioned in the list of authorities cited as having been engaging with.

In various documentation, including the responses to questions from the Planning Inspector, we are told of how strong the co-operation has been with councils in Nottingham and Nottinghamshire... what about Derby City? We are barely mentioned as having been co-operated with, if at all.

Had ‘real and timely’ engagement taken place with the City Council, and with ourselves as City Councillors, or with our formerly serving City Councillors pre-May 2023, we would have been able to provide information to support and elaborate on the vast array of concerns that we, and our residents, have in respect of any potential building on land off Morley Road / Acorn Way.

These concerns include:

### **The Purpose of Acorn Way:**

Acorn Way functions as a link road between Oakwood and Spondon, providing traffic from Oakwood and neighbouring areas with quick access to the A52 and facilities in neighbouring wards, without adding all this additional traffic, created due to the construction of the Oakwood Estate and other nearby expansions, on to Nottingham Road, which would overbear infrastructure in Chaddesden, or onto Locko Road, which would overbear infrastructure in Spondon.

Such easy access for Oakwood residents to nearby facilities, including Spondon’s ‘Big Asda,’ is perhaps what motivated designers and developers not to put any such similar facilities in Oakwood. We have no large-premises chain supermarket, instead we are provided with two small precincts and one medium sized one. These are served by a few takeouts, a single restaurant and single café, two Co-Operative shops, and a few

other non-food shops or services. One may already be questioning whether this provision is enough for such a large estate, we would argue it is not.

Acorn Way itself, a national speed limit road, is often congested, with tailbacks sometimes over 0.75 miles long at either end, especially at peak traffic times; it experiences significant pressures should traffic disruption elsewhere increase traffic flow on the road itself, which is not an uncommon occurrence. Any incident on Acorn Way itself creates traffic chaos on nearby roads. Repeated instances of road works on the stretch of Nottingham Road that goes through Chaddesden has exacerbated pressure on Acorn Way.

Similarly, when the road is closed for greenery maintenance or litter picking, which happens at least twice per year, it must be closed outside of peak times, such is the nature of this road and the chaos that would be caused if the road were closed during peak times. If it is closed in peak time, due to an incident or accident, gridlock for hours on all nearby main roads would not be unexpected.

Acorn Way has no pathways, no bus stops, no cycle lanes and minimal street lighting. It was never designed to require these, it was designed to be, and it is, a rural linking road. Significant infrastructure upgrades, at a significant cost, would be required for any type of pedestrianisation of this road – it would not be pedestrian-safe without it.

Without said pedestrianisation, any conurbation constructed around Acorn Way would have severely restricted ability to access nearby facilities by sustainable transport methods (walking or cycling), and public transport, as we will discuss, is incredibly poor; this will create a car-dependent and unsustainable city-extending development. We will address public transport limitations, which further this argument, in subsequent paragraphs.

Should construction occur on and around Acorn Way, including, but even without, access/egress from any new development directly onto Acorn Way, we do not see how the road could continue to exist for the purpose for which it was intended and currently serves. We also do not know where funding for the required upgrades would be expected to come from, with Derby City Council, Derbyshire County Council and Erewash Borough Council in difficult financial situations at present, and nothing listed in any documents we have read regarding S106 contributions for highways upgrades.

We believe the long-term consequence of this land being released from Green Belt and housing being permitted is that this road would require significant works to improve pedestrian infrastructure to something more suitable for a road with

access/egress onto it, or houses backing on to it, which would come at a significant cost, as the road is neither short nor the land immediately favourable.

Similarly, this would no doubt require the reduction of the speed limit on Acorn Way, from national speed limit (as would be the norm for such a linking road) to 40mph or even 30mph, depending on the specifics of the development. This would drastically amend, and for all intents destroy, the intended use of Acorn Way, which itself would become even more congested from the additional traffic stemming from the new houses. Should 600 houses be permitted, and access/egress onto Acorn Way only be granted, an assumption of an additional 1,000 vehicles using Acorn Way would, we believe, be a fair prediction, given poor connectivity by public transport or walking/cycling. This would overburden Acorn Way and is unsustainable.

There would no longer be the quick cut-through that was intended, and which works well for existing residents, despite the congestion already face. Instead, it would be merely another slow moving, over-burdened and regularly congested road. Such actions would then push additional traffic onto Locko Road (itself lacking any real pedestrian infrastructure) and the already congested Nottingham Road in Chaddesden.

The additional pollution from the vehicles should also be considered, especially at a time of Climate Crisis, which has just been declared by Erewash Borough Council, and was declared by Derby City Council some years ago.

### **Traffic on Morley Road**

Morley Road, which we expect would be burdened with a minimum of one access/egress junction on to a newly created development, perhaps many more, is already a road under significant strain.

At peak times, existing congested traffic at the northern Morley Road / Lime Lane Junction can stretch back all the way to Smalley Drive and even Ryegrass Road access/egress junctions. This is a distance of over 0.5 miles and means a car can be sat in traffic for around 15 – 20 minutes between the start of the queue and leaving the junction, all the while with it's engine on and polluting fumes being emitted.

This issue is compounded when there is traffic disruption elsewhere in the local area and would be significantly compounded should changes be made to Acorn Way or hundreds of additional vehicles be added to the equation and added to the queues.

The extent of the existing congestion, and the issues it causes on existing access/egress junctions, including those at Ryegrass Road, Smalley Drive and Sovereign Way, has led to this stretch of road, and the Lime Lane and Sovereign Way junctions, being included in our 2022/23 and 2023/24 Local Transport Priorities, as we are extremely concerned about the situation that is being created. Derby City Council is co-operating with Derbyshire County Council regarding the Lime Lane Junction and re-working it due to the significant pressure already faced.

Derby City Council have had to install a "KEEP CLEAR" Marking at the Sovereign Way/Morley Road junction to prevent queueing traffic from blocking residents on Sovereign Way and its side streets from leaving via their only access/egress point and to provide visibility around the queueing traffic, following a number of accidents and near misses reported to us, including multiple vehicles ending up in the adjoining ditch.

Documents for the now withdrawn housing proposal at "Land North of Chaddesden Wood" in the Oakwood Ward stated that the Lime Lane / Morley Road junction, and junctions surrounding it, were all already, or were all set to be, over-capacity, with Lime Lane / Morley Road expected to be at 128% capacity by 2028. That figure is not including a single additional vehicle from development of an SGA 1 Site, much less the sheer number of vehicles that a development of this size would place on these roads.

Had anyone sought discussions with ourselves about the highways and infrastructure surrounding the proposed SGA 1 site, we could have made Erewash Borough Council aware of these existing issues and the severity of the impact SGA 1 Development would have. We have had no such opportunity to do this, except from the letters provided and submissions made at various stages of this process.

The addition of 600 houses and the hundreds of cars they would bring to this area at peak times, will exacerbate and compound this issue further and potentially cause more problems, including 'close' and 'actual' vehicle collisions, for residents in this area, which neither our existing residents, nor potential new residents in the Erewash Borough, would appreciate or find acceptable in the long term. We do not believe this has been properly planned for.

Additionally, one side of Morley Road does not have any pathways, indeed the greenery on this side of the road is rarely maintained in the way we would all wish, and there are no cycle lanes existent on Morley Road, nor are there plans to be, for the reasons outlined above and the simple lack of space for them to ever be installed.

This again leads to car dependency and a lack of sustainable transport options.

The 'bottom end / southern portion' of Morley Road, formerly located in the Chaddesden Electoral Ward but relocated into the Oakwood Electoral Ward for and from the May 2023 Local Elections, to which the proposed new development would adjoin, is also the location of Lees Brook Academy, meaning this lower portion of the road suffers from twice-daily, for significant portions of time, from severe school parking issues. It can be horrendous to navigate by car, and almost impossible to navigate by bus. Side streets are clogged, residents trapped on their own driveways and Public Protection Officer are regularly in attendance to ask vehicles to move so passing traffic can get through.

Morley Road is also narrower than many other roads in the immediate vicinity and struggles to provide the space car need when clogged with parked vehicles. From the Acorn Way Roundabout to Lees Brook Academy, there is a pavement on only one side, such is the narrowness and poor pedestrianisation.

Morley Road, Acorn Way, Lime Lane and other routes in the area are also, by their very nature, the unfortunate victims of 'rat run' journeys, as people trying to quickly navigate the outer edges of the City and avoid the A52, A38, City Centre and Nottingham Road, are met with commuters returning along Acorn Way from Pride Park and Raynesway, along Lime Lane from the University of Derby or Ilkeston, along Mansfield Road and Morley Road from the City Centre and A52, and through Oakwood on shorter journeys, journeys out of Oakwood, or school pick-ups.

600 houses worth of additional traffic is not needed, not sufficiently budgeted for, not even slightly planned for and not easily and safely accommodatable on the existing roads. We don't even believe it is sufficiently understood by Erewash Borough Council that these issues are occurring, and information on the issues has never been sought from us as Ward Councillors.

We have all the stated issues already and the addition of so many extra houses would make the problems a lot worse – and that's without mentioning in detail the impacts on air quality for residents in the houses in the area.

We remain deeply concerned that, should the development at SGA 1 go ahead, we have seen no financial contributions to mitigate any of the aforementioned affects.

### **Insufficient Public Transport Capabilities**

Similarly to all the above, we are deeply concerned that existing bus services are limited in terms of frequency and route/destination choice. The SGA1 site has only one service per hour, which runs only a few times a day. One service, which passes through rather than transporting around the local vicinity, for the 600 new houses and thousands of residents Erewash propose to be located here.

This existing service, the Trent Barton Black Cat, would not take new Erewash residents to existing shops, medical centres, schools or amenities in the immediate vicinity, it would not take them into the Oakwood estate to our Community Centre or Gym, it would not take them to Long Eaton, Sandiacre, Borrowash, Ockbrook or most other places in Erewash Borough, or even to neighbouring Spondon in Derby City. The route goes Derby – Ilkeston – Heanor – Mansfield.

If new residents are not taking that journey, then they are not getting on the bus service closest to them, pure and simple. Any other bus service is a significant walk away from the SGA 1 Development Site.

This is in antithesis to the heart of the Oakwood estate, a considerable walk away, which has two services transporting residents across Oakwood and into Derby City Centre via Chaddesden, allowing access to immediate facilities without the need for a car.

We have seen no plans that Erewash Borough have to fund a new bus service for new Erewash residents or plans to fund the number of different services and routes this new development would likely require to make it more attractive than private vehicle use, or even private hire vehicle use, again noting all the cycling and walking difficulties already outlined.

Even if the viability of these sites allows improvements to existing bus services, as the draft policy suggests, these bus services are not likely to be sufficiently attractive to encourage people away from unsustainable car trips, and thus would do nothing to mitigate the issues laid out above but may add a few buses to the traffic congestion outlined above. There are equally no public transport buses that go along Acorn Way due to the nature of the road.

We note that at 4.25 of the “Erewash Borough Council Core Strategy Review Viability Assessment 2023 – Final Report” dated September 2023, £100,000 is to be provided to increase the frequency of services along Morley Road.

It is our view that this funding, which will quickly run dry, will do nothing to improve the sustainability of the development and nothing to truly improve bus services. Increasing the frequency might make the one journey available slightly more attractive, but will not allow residents to access their nearest shopping precincts, large chain stores, gym, Community Centre or schools by public transport. The car will still be king.

This view was shared by Councillor Steve Hassall, then Derby City Council Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Decarbonisation, Strategic Planning & Transport who stated in his letter in 2022 that *“Even if contributions towards improvement in existing bus services could be secured, as draft politics 1.3 and 1.4 suggest, we remain of the view that these improvements are not likely to make bus services sufficiently attractive to encourage people away from unsustainable car trips, leading to an unsustainable car borne form of development.”*

The nature of this site again causes issues for walking and cycling connectivity. As laid out above, the pathway and cycle lane infrastructure is just not there. There is no spinning it, no hiding it and no dodging the question – it simply is not there and is not planned to be there because there is not the space for it to be there.

Despite former Councillor Powell’s statement at the Erewash Borough Council meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2022 that new developments would be “accessible by modes of transport that do not emit carbon,” with lacking pavements, cycle lanes or any sustainable bus services, we fail to see how, outside of electric vehicles, this would possibly be the case here.

This represent another nail in the coffin for the supposed ‘sustainability’ of these sites whilst residents in Oakwood, and those who would live on the proposed new development, are forced to inhale the results of this not coming to fruition.

### **Lack of suitable facilities required for an expansion of the existing residential area**

We share the concern of Derby City Council’s Chief Planning Officer Paul Clarke, who stated in his letter to Erewash Borough Council on 19<sup>th</sup> May 2021 that *“there are implicit assumptions in the identification of these sites that City infrastructure, in terms of schools, healthcare, transport networks and public transport will be able to accommodate this level of housing growth with no prior discussion with the City Council to understand the local context.”* We take this statement as damning to Erewash Borough Council as it was intended.

This was reaffirmed in Councillor Steve Hassall's 2022 letter, which states "*Despite our comments on the Revised Growth Options document in May 2021, setting out our concerns at the assumption that pupils arising from the Acorn Way and North of Spondon sites would attend schools within the City; we note that the draft policies for both these sites have not sought to remove this assumption.*"

And further states "*We would therefore request that specific reference to pupils from sites 1.3 and 1.4 attending City schools should be removed, both from the policy and supporting text.*"

For this to have been the conclusion reached by Erewash Borough Council on hard evidence after months of discussion and negotiation with Derby City Council would be one thing – but that it was not. This was, in our view, an arrogant, baseless assumption, made with no attempts to understand the local situation, no attempts to gage the pressures on existing local services, and no care for either the pressure it would place on existing facilities used by residents under Derby City, or new residents under Erewash's own Borough. The disdain shown for our officers, for our service providers and for our residents is simply appalling. One could call it BAD planning, or one could call it NO planning – in this scenario, it amounts to the same thing, if it even amounts to 'planning' at all.

And perhaps even worse, we see that this baseless assumption has continued, despite factual errors, especially around schooling, being pointed out on at least two occasions and likely many more.

We are incredibly concerned that site SGA1, being located on the edge of Oakwood and nowhere near existing Erewash conurbations, would have absolutely no relationship at all with existing facilities, including schools, shops, medical centres and similar establishments, within the Erewash Borough Area, and minimal relationships with those within Oakwood, Chaddesden and Spondon. This has clearly been done by design and intention as a consequence of a bolt on to an existing estate. It is plainly not an accident, or it would have been corrected and amended at first opportunity.

The Oakwood Estate has a single school, Parkview Primary School on Springwood Drive. Only in the 2023 Local Elections did three additional schools, Lees Brook Academy (Secondary School), Cavendish Close Junior Academy and Cavendish Close Infant School, join the Oakwood Ward. These schools however were not additional schools, they were not recently constructed to meet the growing needs of the Oakwood and Chaddesden Estates, they were simply moved due to a redrawing of City Council electoral boundary lines.

Parkview Primary School is, and has always been, far too small for the Oakwood Estate. It has been over-subscribed since its first year and fails to meet the needs of the Oakwood estate as it currently exists. The newly built Lime Tree Court Estate, constructed around 2018, and closer to the school than an Acorn Way development would be, does not fall within the catchment area. The vast majority of the Oakwood Estate does not, never has, and never reasonably could, fall within the catchment area. A new development at SGA 1 would not fall within the catchment area, even if it were doubled.

There is little opportunity to extend the school, due to existing buildings in the immediate area, Springwood Drive itself, and an ancient woodland surrounding the school playing field.

Has any consultation taken place with Parkview Primary School to discuss them taking on the additional pupils? Have they even been contacted and notified that this is Erewash Borough Council's intention? Do they even know about the proposed SGA 1 development? Because when we as Councillors visited them to discuss the now withdrawn proposal for 150 houses at 'Land North of Chaddesden Wood', far closer to the school and within Derby City Council and Oakwood Ward boundaries, they were clear that the school could not accommodate children from that estate had it gone ahead; so where is any evidence it could accommodate children for this estate?

All Oakwood residents must send their children outside the Oakwood Neighbourhood for secondary school, often to Chaddesden and Spondon-addressed schools, but sometimes as far as Amber Valley and Darley. This is because the Oakwood Estate does not have a single secondary school contained within it. Many of these schools are consequently also either over-subscribed, or very close to it. Some Oakwood residents even find themselves forced to relocate to other areas of the city, or out of the city altogether, due to a child moving into secondary school and the parents desired school.

Lees Brook Academy, Chaddesden addressed but located in the Oakwood Ward, has little ability to expand, with 18 homes set to be constructed on land formerly accommodating their tennis courts, and is already under pressure from existing demand. Our school parking concerns, and the lack of pathways for walking children, we have already addressed.

Crucially, schooling provision for the 600 new properties, despite any unresearched assumptions by Erewash Borough Council that Derby City would pick up all the provision requirements, would be the responsibility of Derbyshire County Council as

the LEA, not Derby City Council. This is the consequence of the properties being treated as Erewash Housing and being located in the Erewash / Derbyshire area, despite being an attempted bolt-on and expansion of the City area. Discussions with Derby City Council, with us as Ward Councillors, or even simply reading the letters stated above, would have made this clear.

Nearby schooling under the County is some distance away from the proposed site, and, if it is anything like schools in Derby City, is already stretched. It is not easily served by existing bus or cycle routes, as previously discussed; They are certainly not within walking distance. Once again, the car would be used for these journeys, and anyone without the ability to drive children to school would be in an incredibly difficult position. Even those with the ability to drive would be affected by the congestion also stated above.

Has Derbyshire County Council been approached about school provision for SGA1 and SGA26? What was the outcome? Where is their commitment in writing to provide primary and secondary school placements for any and every child who is resident on any future development at SGA1 or SGA26? Where would these places be and how accessible for the new Erewash residents would they be? Or has the assumption just been that Derby City Council, who are not the LEA, would provide the places, and hands washed of any responsibility?

Any assumption that Derby City would take up all the requirements for provision for this development is misguided, has repeatedly been corrected, and should not in any way be the basis for any decision to proceed with this development. Children would be left without nearby viable educational establishment options, and it will not be Derby City's responsibility to provide them.

We note again that at 4.25 of the "Erewash Borough Council Core Strategy Review Viability Assessment 2023 – Final Report" dated September 2023, £3,454,860 is set to be made available for schooling of pupils who would reside on a developed site.

This had the potential to ease pressures and provide for future Erewash residents, but it fails to do so, because it comes with significant and severe caveats.

The first caveat is that it is allocated for "off-site education provision". This makes it clear that despite the struggling local schools which are over-subscribed, despite the huge number of houses being proposed, despite the nature of the housing being family-orientated with two, three, four and five bedroom properties that are, in this economic climate, undoubtedly more attractive to families and less attractive to non-

familial households than a one-bedroom flat would be, and despite no Derbyshire County Council-overseen school in the immediate area, a new school will not be constructed to serve the newly added pupils/residents and, given the estate is being bolted on to Oakwood to extend the city, to take some of the demand from within Oakwood itself.

Instead, the suggestion is that existing schools will just expand to take on the new pupils, with no recognition that Parkview Primary School has no space to expand, nor do the Cavendish Close Schools and nor does Lees Brook Academy. A new school is what is actually required, but this is not being considered or budgeted for because of the assumptions made that additional pressures will just be 'dealt with'.

The second dramatic caveat is that the funding is allocated to increase pupil capacity at schools in Oakwood and Chaddesden, which are under Derby City Council. This demonstrates that, again, Erewash Borough Council has ignored letters from senior councillors and Planning Officers at Derby City Council and chosen to arrogantly assume and state, in writing, that Derby City Council will school the children who would reside at a developed SGA 1, when the duty falls upon Derbyshire County Council as the LEA.

What discussions with Derby City Council have taken place where this has been committed to? What guarantee is there that expanding a nearby Derby City school wouldn't simply result in additional places for children in existing Derby City properties, leaving children at SGA 1 without a nearby school.

For the sake of those pupils and their families who could reside on a future development, Erewash Borough Council must pay the required attention to the letters from Derby City Council and reach an agreement with Derbyshire County Council to provide schooling for any future pupils. As this has not happened yet, we fear it will not happen at all.

Consequently, there would be little, if any, school provision for any new residents in new SGA 1 properties within the immediate vicinity, forcing families to travel unreasonable distances, at peak times, in vehicles as opposed to more sustainable transport methods, to get their children to school. Not only will this be unfavourable to them at the time, at a time of Climate Crisis, it is not the kind of behaviour we should be encouraging. Again, this is 'Bad' or 'No' Planning, if 'planning' at all.

At a time of ever-increasing class sizes, with teacher time at a premium, we as ward councillors would not support increasing the class sizes of our schools by anything like

the extent it would take to accommodate the proposed development and we do not possess the necessary excess budgets to extend current school buildings and facilities to accommodate such a drastic increase in demand. We do not believe the proposed funding would be enough, even if the space was in existence. And, again, it would not be Derby City Council's responsibility.

A very similar situation occurs in relation to Nursery school provision, with Oakwood's limited facilities receiving significant numbers of applications, not all of which they can always meet.

Any working professionals who would inhabit a new Erewash development and require nearby childcare facilities are, put plainly, set to be out of luck. We have seen no evidence that Erewash will seek to provide them at the SGA 1 development site, and we do not have them already in existence to serve the SGA 1 site. Residents on the new development would be amongst all the above who must drive to find facilities elsewhere. 'Bad' Planning or 'No' Planning, the result is again the same.

In a very similar vein, both medical and dental facilities in Oakwood, Chaddesden and Spondon are limited and strained, with pandemic-increased backlogs and often very significant waiting times for appointments, including telephone appointments. We are told that Oakwood Dental Practice has just ceased NHS appointments, so NHS patients wouldn't be able to travel to a local practice.

As Oakwood Ward Councillors, we are having to arrange interventions with at least one, if not both of our medical centres, due to the sheer number of concerns brought to us by residents. And to add to this, the Chair of the Lister House Surgery Patient Participation Group has already contacted us to seek information on which surgeries would serve the residents on any new development, due to the severity of difficulties experienced by patients at this surgery.

Residents moving into any new properties will undoubtedly struggle to join any existing facilities in the area, likely having to register many miles away and, again, travel long distances on routes not provided for by public or sustainable transport. Again, a car will be required due to poor, or no, planning.

We are incredibly disappointed and highly concerned that despite these issues, which again could have been found out through simple discussions, no money is stated to accompany the schools and public transport budgets to assist with alleviating issues at existing medical centres or constructing a new one. We believe this is entirely the wrong decision, as more infrastructure is needed to alleviate this serious issue.

The ease and availability of shopping precincts must also be considered. Oakwood has two small precincts, populated by Co-op, Takeaways, Hairdressers, Barbers and a Café, with another medium-sized precinct accommodating a fish and chip shop, Post Office, Estate and Lettings Agent and medium-sized Co-op.

These facilities were not designed to accommodate the sheer number of visitors they currently receive on a regular basis. The car park at the medium precinct is regularly 'jam-packed' and overflows onto Wayfaring Road (a main road a bus route), and we are currently engaging in discussions with the private owner around implementation of a one-way system, as, at many times during the day, the western entrance can become very hazardous for entering and leaving traffic.

Both smaller precincts' car parks are also regularly completely full of cars, with on-road parking the 'go to' option on Smalley Drive, though not the safest option, and a very similar situation at Vestry Road. These sites, two of which are on the eastern side of the ward, are not in a position to cater for thousands more residents who would be added to the area at SGA 1. They also do not possess the large chain supermarkets or high street retailers which many new Erewash residents would surely wish for and would require – these are small and convenient neighbourhood precincts which serve their immediate residents for 'basic' or 'last minute' needs. To do a 'big food shop' at an Aldi, Lidl, ASDA, Tesco, Morrisons or other supermarket would require a drive to another area; the trip again could not be done via public transport from SGA 1.

We have seen nothing in any documents made available to us, or any that we had to look for and find, that suggests that a new primary school, new secondary school, new medical centre, new dentist, new large shopping precinct, or any similar amenity will be provided at the proposed SGA 1. With it lacking, we believe none are proposed.

Indeed, documents already provided to Erewash Borough Council demonstrated that there are no local amenities. None of those that we have discussed above, except Lees Brook School, are within an easy walking distance (800 metres or 10 minutes).

This has seemingly been disregarded entirely by Erewash Borough Council as they attempt to plough ahead with this development, despite the impact it would have on their future residents if development proceeded.

In our minds, it is clear that the intention is to 'piggy-back' existing facilities until they are broken by the strain and then to say, "well it isn't Erewash's problem, it's yours".

This is simply unacceptable and will be of no benefit to existing residents of Derby City or future residents of Erewash Borough, whose needs these sites are purported to meet. Again, it is 'Bad' planning, or 'No' planning, if 'planning' at all.

## **Removal of land from the Green Belt**

At a time of Climate Crisis, is removal of Green Belt Land, especially Green Belt Land which surrounds large existing conurbations like Derby City, without clear documentary evidence and a justification that it is absolutely necessary and needed, really something we should be considering, never mind actually doing?

Green Belt Land holds protected status for a reason; shouldn't this be protected, unless there is clearly presented evidence to the contrary?

In questions from the Planning Inspector, we note the specific scrutiny regarding Paragraphs 140 and 141 of the NPPF, surrounding the requirements for exceptional circumstances being fully evidenced and justified, and the need to demonstrate an examination of all reasonable options for meeting identified needs for development.

We do not believe that Erewash Borough Council has met these needs.

In addressing the "exceptional circumstances" requirement at Planning Inspector Question 16, Erewash Borough Council appear to respond that their persistent failure to meet housing targets should be treated and considered an "exceptional". We do not agree with this statement. We believe a failure to meet targets is not "exceptional," as Erewash will be neither the first nor the last to do so, nor should it be treated as circumstances which permit building on the Green Belt.

Such an acceptance would surely encourage Council's to forgo meeting housing targets by using brownfield sites if there are circumstances making it any less than as simple as possible, fail to meet housing targets, declare an "exceptional circumstance" and then allow developers to propose Green Belt Land where they wish to build, and that be a permitted development despite former Green Belt Status. This is our concern about SGA 1.

We then turn to the requirement to prove an examination of all reasonable options for meeting identified needs.

In antithesis to what we would have expected, we have seen no recent or even semi-recent comprehensive review of the Green Belt Land under Erewash Borough Council's Boundaries, which would have informed the selection of land to be deleted from the Green Belt in favour of allocation for housing. In addition, the Core Strategy fails to reference any documented and evidenced strategic Green Belt Reviews that have previously been undertaken, covering the whole Erewash Borough. There does not appear to be any such work/evidence on assessing and prioritising such Green Belt sites. How can this possible be the case? Who on earth would make decisions on such important matters in this way?

With regard to SGA1 and SGA26, we agree with our planning team that there is also a woeful absence of evidence, such as employment need, landscape sensitivity or flood risk, OR, as importantly, a comprehensive review of the Green Belt **as a whole** to inform and arrive at the designations now being promoted with such vigor.

Rather than being dumped upon on a whim with no regard for the impact or consequences and absolutely no regard for whether these are the best, or even appropriate, locations for such drastic development and changes in the character of the land, an informed process for site selection is an essential ingredient in planning growth properly, and ensuring you do not cause severe negative impacts, up to and including flooding, to existing areas and their conurbations.

When building 'bolt ons' to existing conurbations, we would have imagined it was the most basic element of forward planning to consider whether removing green fields, which naturally soak up rainwater, and replacing them with concrete and tarmac which do not, could impact on existing properties in the immediate vicinity.

Morley Road is a hill, with low lying properties, including residential dwellings at Lawrence Avenue, Oakridge, Brookfield Avenue and Lees Brook Academy, in a dip towards the bottom. Earlier this year, during Storm Babet, the lower portion of Morley Road was under water, as were nearby Springwood Drive (which lifted from its foundations) and roads adjoining Smalley Drive.

Where is the absolutely confirmation that, by removing green fields and replacing them with tarmac and houses, the lower lying area would not be at risk of increased flooding? We have not seen it? Does it even exist? Has such an investigation even

been considered? And, should this go ahead, who would insurance companies come after if a flood were to occur?

Drains around Oakwood are prone to over-flowing during heavy rain. The drains on Morley Road were having to be worked on as recently as 30<sup>th</sup> October. When once a chance, flood-worthy rainfall has become much more common in recent years. While upper Oakwood itself, being atop the hill, rarely floods at present, central and lower Oakwood is prone to flooding. If you take away a good portion of rainwater-absorbing land, how do we know this will not exacerbate existing, and create new, issues? We do not know, because the studies and examinations have not been presented to us, if they have even been properly done.

'Bad' planning or 'No' planning, if planning at all, the consequences are the same either way.

At this stage we note the "Sustainability Appraisal of the Proposed Core strategy Review, November 2022", which promulgates many figures about the sustainability of the various sites considered as part of the Core Strategy Review. We note here that SGA 1 scored in the minuses, not in the positives.

The document however leaves more questions than answers, what led to each score being the outcome for each site? Why were those numbers the case? Where weren't they higher? Why weren't they lower? Where is the assessment for each site that evidences why each number was what it was? Where is the evidence that this is more than plucking numbers out of thin air?

At the time of writing, the Appendices Table at (<https://www.erewash.gov.uk/local-plan-section/sustainability-appraisal.html#ListA>) which may contain said information, are not selectable or openable.

When taking the numerical obligations of delivering new residential dwellings seriously, surely the allocated sites by the local authority should be guaranteed to meet the needs of the Erewash Borough rather than discarding these numbers, like fly-tipping, on the edge of the neighbouring City, just to inefficiently and improperly 'meet' a numerical solution. It is the numerical needs of Erewash, and the housing demand from within their Borough, that is the purpose of the Core Strategy Review in the first place.

We can find absolutely no hard evidence / an evidence base, to build upon and to make site specific decisions. Decisions appear to be based more on assumptions, whims and guesses than on hard evidence.

In response to questions 16, 17 and 18 from the Planning Inspector about the evidence based used to justify the removal of these sites from the Green Belt, we note that a very long-winded answer is provided by Erewash, which we do not believe answers the question. We would however like to respond to the following section of the answer:

*“Officers undertook an extensive and in-depth technical exercise throughout 2019 assessing the suitability and sustainability of land to accommodate strategic scale housing development. A methodology was devised allowing for a balanced, yet robust assessment of 17 separate Strategic Growth Areas (SGA) to occur, with all but one (Stanton) located within the Green Belt. This enabled the Council to rigorously appraise the relative strengths and weaknesses of each SGA.*

*A key component of the SGA assessments was how the matter of Green Belt was considered in a planning context. Despite the suite of SGA assessments looking at the impact strategic scale development would be expected to have on a range of individual factors (ecology, highways, flood risk, community facilities etc.), assessing whether Green Belt at 16 of the 17 locations might be harmed by way of inappropriateness was a vital component of the wider exercise. In assessing this, each appraisal looked in detail at the five Green Belt purposes as set out at **Paragraph 138** of the NPPF. Accompanying the written commentary that described how potential development may impact each of the five purposes, the assessments also saw the production of mapping to further support the information being provided. Mapping largely related to purposes **A to C**, purposes which involve a spatial dimension, allowing for the publication of material which clearly showed what impact the SGA sites would have on contributing to the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, the possible narrowing of key gaps between neighbouring towns and villages and whether the countryside would see unacceptable levels of encroachment as a result of expanded settlements.”*

We also note that in response to question 10, the following is stated:

*“In bringing together site-based information from all sources, the Council were able to consider all submissions as part of a single, consolidated exercise. Officers devised a comprehensive assessment framework to ensure each site was subjected to rigorous appraisal against a wide-ranging list of planning considerations to determine the level of general suitability to accommodate a strategic scale of housing development. At this point, the Council began to refer to potential allocation sites as Strategic Growth Areas (SGAs) and the exercise in which Officers subsequently went on to appraise SGAs was through a Strategic Growth Area assessment (referred to as SGA assessments). SGA assessments were published at both stages within Regulation 18 (Options for Growth and Revised Options for Growth).”*

Our questions are simple and are essentially akin to the question from the Planning Inspector. Can the Council identify where any assessment of the Green Belt Land in the whole of Erewash took place, in order to determine which land should be released from the Green Belt and used for housing and which land should not be?

In the same vein: Between what dates did this take place? What were the assessment criteria? Who devised said criteria? What determined the criteria was suitable? Who carried out the assessments? When were they carried out? From where were they carried out? How was each portion of Green Belt ranked? How did each portion of Green Belt score? What were the rankings overall? Where was this information stored? Where are the graphs, reports, email exchanges and charts that show that all of this was actually carried out? Where is the rigorous appraisal against the wide-ranging list of planning considerations that was spoken of? What was the comprehensive assessment framework and where are the outcomes of it? Where is the report the Planning Inspector has asked for, that our Planning Officers asked for, and that we as Ward Councillors are asking for?

Instead of being able to view a report, or series of reports, or email exchanges, or even draft reports, as we would like, and as the Planning Inspector requested, we believe we are presented with an answer that basically says “We don’t have any written or documented evidence that we did it, but you should believe that we did as we are saying that our officers did it.”

We do not in any way believe this is acceptable.

Has Erewash Borough Council ranked the sites promoted in the Core Strategy and assessed each in terms of their impact on the Green Belt and meeting Erewash’s own growth needs? How do these sites meet Erewash’s growth needs and how can Erewash evidence this beyond a numerical solution? Which other sites were determined to need to remain in the greenbelt, and why was this conclusion reached? How was a determination reached that sites were not needed at Green Belt Land at Little Eaton, Stanley or Breadsall Village, despite these being existing Erewash conurbations, whilst a huge new settlement was needed adjoining Oakwood and another at Spondon Wood? How was it determined that SGA 1 and SGA 26 would be to house people wanting to live in Erewash and not those wanting to live in Derby?

Many Ministers of State for Housing have been clear that Green Belt Land should only be used for residential dwelling development in exceptional circumstances. Exceptional, in other words “extraordinary” or “anomalous” or “divergent.” What makes SGA1 so ‘abnormally’ beneficial for housing, so ‘extraordinary’ a location for development and so ‘divergent’ from all other Green Belt locations, that Erewash Borough Council seek to plough ahead despite everything we and others have highlighted? We don’t have that answer, and we suspect Erewash don’t either.

At a 2022 meeting attended by then Councillor Mick Barker, he was told that some sites are more preferable in sustainability terms than SGA1 and SGA26, including land at North Draycott and land at North West Hallam. This is evidenced in the sustainability report, but he says these were taken out of consideration as they are 'too big' and Erewash 'do not need the extra numbers these would generate'.

What better way to plan properly for any sites failing, or to over-provide for the growth of Erewash than to include those larger sites, over plan to maintain a 5 years supply, and remove the two sites on the Derby boundary that contribute little if anything to alleviating pressures in Erewash?

In what universe would any authority remove preferable and more sustainable sites simply because they may allow you to provide the amount of housing you need to with a bit of flexibility on top? If the sites would provide 'too much housing,' perhaps Erewash Borough Council could seek developers to include within plans for North Draycott and North West Hallam, some of the facilities discussed above that would not be available to residents at a developed SGA1 site, and place them where the additional housing would have been?

Why would Erewash make this decision? Could it possibly be that they were removed because developments at these sites would not enable Erewash Borough Council to 'piggy-back' on Derby City Council services and amenities while seeking only to collect council tax and empty bins...? Could it be that new schools would be needed, rather than seeking to force at duty on Derby City Council to school pupils at SGA 1?

This is what it reads like to us, and whilst we hope it is not the case, we are unsure what other situation fits the criteria we are presented with.

"Absolutely shocking" fails to sufficiently define our astonishment at any such decision, especially given that such over-provision in these more sustainable and suitable locations would surely be of a flexibility benefit, but given that Erewash seem to be providing houses for the expansion of Derby's population rather than Erewash's Housing Needs, as we will discuss later, we would highly suggest reconsideration of that decision – Erewash residents may one day thank the Council for it, as would ours for not over-loading our services beyond capability.

At the Erewash Borough Council Meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> March, then Lead Member and Councillor Powell referenced that the removal of Green Belt Status of the SGA 1 land off Morley Road / Acorn Way should be supported, because this site was amongst one of the "least damaging locations" for housing to be built.

We think it worthy here to note a statement from page 6 of the “Green Belt Technical Paper – September 2023”, which despite its name has remarkably little to say about the technical details of the Green Belt land proposed to be released, which claims that releasing the Green Belt at Acorn Way would “*not compromise the historic setting of any rural villages.*” We agree that this is true, because this development has been chosen to be located nowhere near existing Erewash village conurbations which would benefit from expansion and allow Erewash residents who grew up in Breadsall Village, Little Eaton, Stanley and others to continue living there. Instead, it has been bolted on to Oakwood, where it will not aid Erewash Housing Needs at all.

But what about the compromise to Oakwood’s setting? To Oakwood’s services? To Oakwood’s amenities? To Oakwood’s highways? Or do we not matter because we are a Derby suburb and not an Erewash village?

This leads us to our response to then Cllr Michael Powell’s comments; We simply ask, least damaging for who? For Erewash residents tens of miles away, we accept it is not very ‘damaging’.

For those Derby residents residing in the immediate vicinity of Acorn Way and Morley Road, and in the wider Oakwood Ward, this development would push already strained services to, and possibly beyond, their capabilities, risk overcrowding local schools which cannot expand, congest and choke local roads and strain and over-demand public transport, while providing nothing in return.

This is VERY damaging indeed.

If these sites have not been evidenced by a proper Green Belt study of Erewash Green Belt Land, and we have seen no evidence that this is the case, just a “trust us” answer, it generates the question as to why these sites are being chosen? Why are they being pursued? Why, when an evidence base is not being provided as evidence in response to questions from a neighbouring Council and a Planning Inspector, are these the sites that are being considered?

Here we reference that in response to Planning Inspector Question 10, it is stated that:

“In parallel to Council Officers processing and reviewing information about possible locations for housing development in Erewash, the Greater Nottingham Planning Partnership (GNPP) (consisting of all Nottingham Core Housing Market Area (HMA) councils) launched a combined

HMA-wide 'call for sites' exercise. This enabled submissions to be made to understand locations across Greater Nottingham where strategic-scale sites were likely to be promoted for development through future Local Plan reviews. This exercise ended in July 2019. It resulted in a small number of submissions being made relating to potential sites within Erewash."

Without a proper, official and substantiated assessment criterion of the Green Belt Land and the accompanying outcome report(s), we are forced to reach the conclusion that this Core Strategy is being developer-led. Has Erewash Borough Council received submissions from developers about where they would like to build, and decided to try and let them do so, through the Core Strategy Review, to save face after repeatedly failing to meet housing needs?

Without a proper Green Belt Assessment and the criteria required, we struggle to reach any other conclusion. Our conclusion seems to be evidenced at the Spondon Woods site, where an application has already been submitted by a developer.

We do not believe that this should be the way things are done, developers should not be allowed to have 'carte blanche' to build anywhere they like and the consequences left for others to deal with. A proper assessment should have been carried out and should be able to be evidenced.

We cannot imagine any other council service making a decision of this magnitude and be entirely unable to provide reports, papers and documentation to satisfy a key and central legal requirement. We do not believe that a statement that boils down to 'we promise our officers did it, we just can't evidence it' should be allowed to stand.

**SGA1 will not meet Erewash Borough Council's Housing Needs and will function as Derby City Overspill; despite this Derby City Council was not 'appropriately involved' in the processes**

The City Council does not have a blanket refusal of additions to existing conurbations, especially where the adjoining land is under another authority. Derby City Council is in almost all cases built either up to, or almost to, its boundaries, and DCC has housing targets to meet. Extending existing conurbations into former green fields has become more common than it used to be.

As you will be aware from a letter sent to Erewash Borough Council by Paul Clarke (Derby City Council Chief Planning Officer) on 19<sup>th</sup> May 2021, "*The City Council has*

*been supportive of extensions to the south and west of the City, outside of the Green Belt, through the current round of HMA local plans.”*

Erewash chose not to be part of the HMA that Derby City is a part of – Derby did not exclude Erewash from it. EBC are part of Derbyshire and Derby’s immediate eastern neighbour. Working with EBC is in Derby’s interest as much as it should be in Erewash’s. We as Ward Councillors would never have refused a meeting to discuss meeting housing needs, and we don’t imagine that the City Council would have either.

It is fascinating that these extensions to Derby are promoted without any clear appraisal of all urban areas within Erewash, or discussions with Derby City Council as a relevant neighbouring authority.

How can it be *‘inevitable’* that locations close to Derby or Nottingham are inherently more sustainable than others, especially when additional facilities are not being provided to support growth? Or that SGA 1’s deletion from the Green Belt would have the least harm on the function of that Green Belt? At a time when open green spaces close to existing city suburbia, with all the natural, environmental, physical and mental health and wellbeing benefits that accompany them, are being promoted and celebrated for their necessity, how can this be the conclusion you have arrived at?

Suburban sprawl, especially without provision of the required facilities or services for the expansion, surely cannot be reasonably considered ‘sustainable’ nor meet the housing needs of Erewash where, in the real world, such housing will meet the housing needs of adjoining settlements. In this case, Derby City expansion. We have already explained how Erewash are not seeking to provide the required services for expansion, merely push existing ones to their limit, and have made token gestures of funding that will either be eaten up immediately or should be going to new facilities and services instead.

This leads us to the pivotal question, whose housing need is this actually going to benefit from development at SGA 1, a development proposed just metres away from Derby City and Oakwood... Erewash Borough, or Derby City? In the absence of a Green Belt study proving it is Erewash, whose nearest conurbation is miles away, we believe the natural answer is the conurbation that is metres away, the one of Oakwood, the one of Derby. Thus, SGA 1 would benefit Derby’s needs, not Erewash’s.

Surely it is inevitable that SGA 1, and the site at Spondon, will be meeting housing needs from within Derby City, and not the housing needs of young families, single parents, divorcees, aspiring young people, recent graduates, ‘downsizers’ and retirees

within the Erewash Borough. To pretend otherwise will do these residents in Erewash Borough a huge disservice in the long-term.

If a family wish to remain in Borrowash or Ockbrook or Ilkeston, how will this development aid them? If a young worker who doesn't drive needs to stay in Stanley, West Hallam or Little Eaton, in what way are they served by this "bolt-on to Oakwood"? If someone living in Long Eaton or Sandiacre wishes to downsize and free up their house to allow someone to move up the chain, but wants to remain close to friends and neighbours, how is this development of use to them? If someone wants nothing more than to live in the Erewash Borough and reside close to Draycott or Kirk Hallam or Breaston, how does this development aid that housing need?

The simple answer is that it doesn't. The people SGA 1 would aid are those wishing to live in Oakwood, Chaddesen or Spondon, or those wishing to reside close to Derbyshire's only city and access employment and educational opportunities within it.

SGA 1 will not assist the housing situation in Erewash, aside from being counted towards their numbers. Erewash numbers will reduce, but their housing demand remain as high. Derby's demand will reduce, but DCC will still be required meet high numbers at the expense of other sites.

The real-world consequences of SGA 1 progressing are that Erewash Borough's housing need will not be sufficiently met by its own Core Strategy, as EBC will be creating Derby Growth for Derby Housing Needs and, in effect, Derby 'Overspill.'

Erewash Borough Council will provide a number of properties that will be of no assistance to those already within Erewash, perhaps currently seeking to reside in Wilsthorpe, Draycott, Risley, Dale Abbey, Sawley, Sandiacre, and other parishes and villages, struggling to purchase housing in the areas around where they live, where their children go to school, where their family are nearby, where they take their dog to the vets, where they shop local, where they work, where they have sustainable public transport and where they do not want to leave, but are not able to stay due to lack of new available housing.

With those Erewash residents understandably not wishing to move long distances from quite villages to city overspill at the Derby border, any new properties at SGA 1 will be taken up by those residing within, or wishing to reside within, Derby, who are moving up or along the property ladder, freeing up other properties within Derby for Derby residents. Indeed, we have already been contacted by a resident in a neighbouring Chaddesden Ward, far from the SGA 1 site but further from an existing

Erewash conurbation, who was less opposed to the site because 'he wanted to move from Chaddesden to Oakwood' and this was how he could do it. Proof, if more proof were needed, that Derby residents will seek to move there, not Erewash residents, because it is seen as an extension of Derby, or even seen as part of Derby itself.

SGA 1 provides no benefit to residents in Erewash; EBC will meet 'numerical' needs but will not meet the actual Housing Needs of Erewash residents and EBC will not be thanked by Erewash residents for this disservice in the long-term.

Again, this leads us to question Erewash Borough Council's decisions around the more sustainable North West Hallam and other sites, which were acknowledged to be more sustainable than SGA1 or SGA26, but we do not have the assessment criteria or Green Belt Study outcomes to show why SGA 1 and SGA 26 were preferred.

SGA1 would not be housing that would support the continued growth of Erewash or meet Erewash's own needs. If it were, these proposed homes would be more closely associated with the towns and settlements IN Erewash, such as Breaston, Draycott, Borrowash, Sandiacre, Sawley, Risley, Dale Abbey, and Ockbrook. They would not be being proposed to be bolted on to existing areas of Derby, away from services provided by Erewash, away from facilities located in Erewash, away from schools located in Erewash, but conveniently close to those provided by Derby City, in the Oakwood, Spondon and Chaddesden Wards.

A 2021 letter from Councillor Matthew Holmes, then Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Planning and Transport, outlined these concerns as it stated "*The Green Belt land adjacent to Oakwood which is of significant concern forms an isolated development with no links to the primary urban fabric of the Borough, which would be at odds with the Spatial Strategy as contained within the Core Strategy.*" We agree with this entirely, there are no links into Erewash from SGA 1, as it is proposed to link into Derby only.

We believe that this statement was included in the 2012 SHLAA of Erewash Borough Council, and fail to see, or to have been told, what has materially changed since then.

The issue of Derby's unmet housing need is likely to be an issue for the Local Plans of all neighbouring authorities, not only those in the Derby Housing Market Area (HMA), given the nature of the tight boundaries surrounding Derby City. This will continue to be an issue until there is an agreement on how housing needs in and around Derby are to be met.

The answer is authorities working together, cooperating, and planning without boundaries, where growth is located where growth IS NEEDED. The answer is not for one local authority to seek only to be partnered with its Eastern neighbour, and its Western neighbour ignored entirely, whether that be the concerns of its residents, letters from its Councillors and Officers or the easily discoverable needs of that community.

Planning without borders means acknowledging all that is around you, not pretending your border is the edge of the world and that nobody living mere metres from the border matters if they are on the wrong side of it.

But the construction of 'bolt ons' to existing communities, with no proposed proper addition of public services, facilities, amenities or highways, is absolutely not the way it should be done. It is 'Bad' Planning or 'No Planning' if it can be classified as 'planning' at all.

If Erewash Borough Council is seeking to provide 'bolt-ons' to assist with Derby City's Housing Needs, there are constructive ways that this could be done, and done in the locations it is needed and the locations it is actually suitable, with mitigations in place, services to meet the demand of new and existing residents, and an honest, open and frank discussion about the issues that already exist. Derby City Council Officers assure us they were and remain open to this, but these have not been the circumstances. Similarly, Erewash Borough Council have expressed no desire to work with us as Ward Councillors on the issues that face our residents, and would face theirs if SGA 1 went ahead.

If Erewash Borough Council is seeking to provide for its own housing needs, then we believe building on Derby City's boundary, rather than within Erewash's own conurbations, will not do anything close to achieving this aim.

We believe that the statement at Page 6 of the "Green Belt Technical Paper – September 2023" relating to Acorn Way, which states that the "Site extends the conurbation of Derby" further emphasizes our point. It would extend Derby, and the extension will be considered part of Derby by those who move there, drive past it and discuss it, regardless of whether it is located in Erewash or not. It will not be akin to Breadsall Village, which is separated from Derby by fields, SGA 1 would be opposite the road from houses that have been a part of Derby for decades.

We have arrived at this critical point, where the potential for the houses to be constructed, with all the negative impacts to Erewash Borough (not that many) and to ours (massive impacts) that it will bring, and the Duty to Cooperate has seemingly been set to one side.

Various comments across various documents make it clear that Erewash BC looks far more towards Nottingham City than Derby City. But be that as it may, it does not change some material facts. DCC and EBC have a shared border, and Erewash is within Derbyshire. Those are materially true statements.

Yet Erewash appear to be looking solely towards Nottingham and have express no interest in engaging, co-operating, and liaising with Derby City Council in the way that we would hope, and that proper planning for growth expects. Erewash will burden our services and burden our residents, regardless of what is actually best for residents in Erewash. A very sad and sorry state of affairs it is.

This inward-looking approach does seem counter to the requirements to talk with your neighbours. The common joint approach to planned and coordinated growth is absent. In fact, it raises serious concerns over whether Erewash Borough Council is fulfilling its legal obligations under the Duty to Co-operate.

Whilst we of course accept that the 'Duty to Cooperate' is not a 'Duty to Agree', the facilitation of discussions about strategic issues, and those common to both authorities, should be an absolute priority, both to the existing neighbouring authority which will be affected by the construction of new properties, but also, surely, to the authority within whose boundaries new properties would be constructed... should SGA 1, on this or any scale go ahead, though functioning as Derby overspill, these will be Erewash Borough Council residents. Derby City Council have sought to co-operate, we believe Erewash have sought, and succeeded, to be evasive.

Cooperation between Erewash and Derby City is surely in Erewash's best interests as it is ours, or are EBC happy for future residents of their Borough to be impacted by all the issues we have laid out above? Future Erewash residents at a constructed SGA 1 site will not be silent about the issues they would be impacted by; that they cannot raise their voices now should not mean that issues are ignored until it is too late and the burden is already occurring.

Whilst we accept that some discussions with officers took place before the Reg 19 Consultation and the impending 'Examination,' DCC officers inform us they believe they were at far too late a stage in this process; indeed, they came at a stage where

many, ourselves as Councillors included, believed that Erewash perceives building on this land to be 'a done deal' and merely half-heartedly engaged with the process as a 'tick box' exercise, with minimal care or concern about the plight our existing residents will, or Erewash Borough's future residents would, face.

Tokenism springs to mind, as does the thought that this is developer-led and not properly evidenced. We will do this to you and no amount of objection will prevent such. Is that really how Erewash would define a 'Duty to Cooperate'?

### **The DISGRACEFUL treatment of concerns of Oakwood and Spondon Residents at earlier stages of this process!**

Turning back to last year, Councillor Matthew Eyre, and then Councillors Mick Barker and Robin Wood, despite being Councillors for the area most affected by the proposed SGA 1, were only made aware of the content of the meeting scheduled for 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2022, at which the Core Strategy was discussed, by chance; an email from a concerned resident on Morley Road who was sending in their own objections to the Core Strategy Review and wanted to inform us of the meeting. Such late notice meant only one of our councillors, Councillor Matthew Eyre, was able to attend and seek to make the feelings of Oakwood Ward residents known.

It was too late for him to submit a question, too late for him to speak or ask to speak, and almost too late for him to be in the public gallery, such was the high turnout of individuals in opposition to the Core Strategy, but we could at least have taken some solace from the fact that the concerns of our residents were going to be taken into account.

How shocked we were then when Councillor Michael Powell dismissively and arrogantly stated that, in respect of hundreds of objections to the sites at Spondon and at Oakwood, "Only a handful of the responses came from Erewash".

We were horrified to hear that objections from our residents in Oakwood, and from residents in Spondon, were seemingly being treated as 'second class' purely because our residents do not reside within the boundaries of Erewash Borough Council and do not vote for its elected representatives or pay into its coffers and budgets.

It is our residents that will feel the pain of this poor planning, our residents who will be burdened with the consequences, not those in the Erewash heartland or villages, who seem to get priority in rising objections.

Not only was such blatant dismissal of objecting residents from Spondon completely and utterly unacceptable and morally reprehensible when considering the damage that would be done to their community and natural environment – they were at least considered as ‘mentionable’ during the meeting.

We believe Councillor Powell’s statement of only ‘one objection from Acorn Way’ gave the game away. A ‘slip of the mask’ that revealed that not only are all the Oakwood residents objecting to SGA1 not being given the courtesy of being properly considered and properly taken into account, but they were also not even judged to be worthy of inclusion in his speaking notes for deliberation in the meeting itself. Councillor Powell never mentioned how many overall objections there were to the SGA1 site if Oakwood residents had been included, perhaps he didn’t know, perhaps he didn’t care, perhaps he and his officers simply didn’t want us to know.

But one thing we should all know it that when you propose the allocation and building of 600 houses as a ‘bolt-on’ to existing locations, which do not adjoin any existing locations within your own borough, then dismiss any concerns from those adjoining locations because they do not come from within your own borough, you do a disservice to your residents, disservice to the adjoining authority’s residents, and disservice to Councils up and down the country. ‘Bad’ Planning, ‘No’ Planning or just a total lack of care for anyone else – we know which one we think that was.

This was why we were delighted to know that the appointed National Government Planning Inspector will, via their hearings, at least do us the courtesy of taking our concerns seriously.

For all the above reasons, we completely, entirely and utterly object to the inclusion of land off Acorn Way / Morley Road (SGA1) and land north of Spondon (SGA26), being included under Erewash Core Strategy Review – Options for Growth Document.

Submissions from Oakwood Ward Residents  
AGAINST the inclusion of Site SGA 1 in the  
Erewash Core Strategy Review – Options for  
Growth Document!

## Objection to Erewash core strategy review-site SGA1.

As residents of Besthorpe close, we are concerned about the proposal to build 600 houses that will be accessed off Morley Road, and are therefore objecting to this development on the following grounds of: -

1. Morley Road is not a wide enough to take the additional traffic from the building of more houses directly accessing or egressing this proposed development. The road already cannot cope with the number of students attending Lees Brook school and quite often you will see them walking in the roads as the pavement cannot cope with the amount attending the school.
2. Heavy rain - currently when there is a deluge of rain, our road Besthorpe close floods, and we have noticed it bubbles up out the main road drains, the surface water drains are not large enough.
3. Morley Road has increased in traffic over the years, and we have already found it hard to travel around from Morley Road junctions to the rest of Oakwood and down Acorn way, they are all over capacity, by building more houses with direct access to Morley Road will increase traffic even more.
4. Morley Road currently has a weight limit on it and had until recently signs indicating no through road to vehicles over 7.5t, these signs appear to have been removed!
5. We understand the new development has no provision for addition infrastructure such as Schools, Doctors, Dentists, etc and therefore that will greatly impact the current Oakwood District infrastructure which can't cope with the number of people living in Oakwood without adding a possible 2000 more residents.
6. The current public transport system on Morley Road has diminished over the last few years to one bus every hour and can't be relied on to commute to town or Mansfield, so unless additional buses are planned it will mean more private cars being used which will have a detrimental impact on the environment and roads around Oakwood.
7. During the School start and finish times the number of cars stopping to drop children off or parked waiting for children increases often to the point of standstill on Morley Road, with the increase in children the risk of accidents will increase dramatically.
8. I am certain once you have completed a full environmental impact assessment you will realise that this area of greenbelt land is not suitable for a development of this size and to add a further 600 houses onto the edge of Oakwood and to expect these people to use Erewash facilities and infrastructure would be ludicrous and without the provision of facilities specifically for this development will mean added unsustainable pressure on the current infrastructure.

Regards

Glynn and Wendy Booker  
1 Besthorpe Close  
Oakwood  
Derby  
DE214RQ

Elizabeth Parker

8 Earls Crescent, Oakwood, Derby DE21 2QB

07941 093426

I would like to submit a very strong disagreement to the proposed new housing scheme along Acorn Way, my reasons are as follows:

1) Flooding Risk: Acorn Way has always had issues with flooding. Whilst this has been better with works done to the road, to remove the natural flood afforded by the fields will cause higher risk. Once all development is complete, the additional concrete will remove any facility for natural drainage.

2) Additional Traffic on Roads Not Fit For Purpose: Roads out of Oakwood are already notoriously difficult, Acorn Way / Morley Road / Bishops Drive are gridlocked at peak times. Morley Road in particular has been problematic at the King's Corner turning, including awful accidents in the past 12 months. To add circa 1200 cars to this would be catastrophic. The site has no public transport and no cycle paths so this pushes the home owners to cars. Acorn Way has little lighting and its curvature means glare from headlights and bends in the road leads to difficult driving conditions in the dark or icy conditions. If building does go ahead, we all know that, despite a weight limit on Morley Road, the heavy lorries and construction vehicles will access the site along Morley Road and Acorn Way. These roads are narrow, poorly lit, full of people and cars at school entry & exit times, and this is not conducive to allowing heavy transport along these routes.

3) Lack of Schools: there will be no absorption of the children in this estate to surrounding schools without forcing the use of transport, adding to traffic issues and creating a perfect storm for serious accidents. Morley Road in particular is not fit for purpose now for students to Lees Brook so adding more aiming towards Cavendish Close would not be practical.

4) Not Assisting in Erewash Housing: Acorn Way, whilst officially in Erewash, is a bolt on to Oakwood & Spondon. No-one wanting to live in Erewash would move to Acorn Way and feel they were part of Erewash community. All negative impact will be to Derby (bin collection, road conditions, etc) with no detriment to Erewash who will reap the reward of additional taxes and a tick in the box for the housing statistics, whilst not affording the home owners any participation in Erewash.

5) Removal of Green Belt: if covid lock down taught us anything, it was the importance of open space for us all. Continual chipping away of the green belt will stop the general public from open exercise which aids mental health and wellbeing. What will happen once there is no further green belt to chip into? What forward planning is in place to help with the housing needs then? Surely now is the time to start practicing looking at alternatives to maintain open space for people's mental and physical health rather than continual building. Empty houses, empty industrial plots, derelict buildings, empty office blocks, empty shops would all provide alternatives. We need to look beyond the decimation of green belt to help wildlife and ourselves.

6) Lack of Supporting Infrastructure: There are already difficulties in Oakwood for GP and dental appointments. Dwellers along Acorn Way will either be forced yet again into their transport to travel distances towards Nottingham for services or will add to the already overburdened practices in Oakwood, Spondon & Borrowash. This is critical for residents and needs to be addressed before any planning consent is given - where are the residents expected to go for medical and dental services?

7) Anti-Social Behaviour: Oakwood is already finding itself a hub for an unruly conduct primarily by young people who literally have little to do in the area. Evidence of drugs and alcohol are in sight in open spaces and local police are already stretched to their limits. How will the area be policed by Erewash when local Derby police are having trouble clearing up incidents already. 600 additional houses will bring more young people accessing an area which already has no facilities for them outside of school hours.

Please accept this as a submission to carry forward as part of the Oakwood Resident's Views.

Regards

Liz Parker

My name is Nikki Farmery and my address is 3 Besthorpe Close, Oakwood, Derby, DE21 4RQ.

I would like to object to the proposed development and wish my views as follows:-

First of all I would like to say I am a nurse and work in A&E at the Royal Derby Hospital. If this development goes ahead with 600 houses and the residents are classed as Erewash but live within Derby city where will these residents go when they need hospital treatment. I can imagine these will attend the Royal Derby but they are classed as Erewash residents paying Erewash council tax. The A&E is under considerable pressure now without the winter pressures not yet hitting, they are having to hold ambulances as no movement in A&E, how is it to cope with another 1500 minimum residents coming under Derby City, these residents won't be going to Nottingham hospitals it will be too far. I know there are no plans to make the Royal Derby Hospital any bigger.

There are two doctors practices in Oakwood and you can never get an appointment there. I have to drive to Borrowash, luckily I drive, but where are these new residents going to go to seek medical attention. There are not enough places in Oakwood for another 1500 minimum residents. There are also no NHS dentists in Oakwood and I personally have to go to London Road in Alvaston, where will these new residents go. They will have to travel, like all other residents of oakwood, causing again more traffic and more pollution.

The road infrastructure in the area is not good enough to take a minimum of 1200 extra cars. Morley Road is already too busy, especially at peak times. Trying to get down Morley Road to pass Lees Brook school is just about impossible when the children are coming out, and the extra vehicles from this housing development would become even more dangerous for the children. Acorn Way, the top of Morley Road, Bishops Drive and the route out of Oakwood through Chaddesden are already too busy, with long queues at certain times. This also adds to pollution.

There is not a sufficient bus service for all of these new houses. The bus service runs from Ilkeston to Derby once an hour, stopping at 7 in the evening and not running on a Sunday. The residents of the new development will be car dependent as there is insufficient public transport.

There are not enough school places for the children of Oakwood already. Most children have to attend school out of the area, so where will all the children from this new development go. They will have to go to school out of the area and again this will cause more traffic and more pollution.

Flooding will also be a problem if this goes ahead. Morley Road and Acorn Way already flood during heavy rainfall, with Morley Road being like a river at such times. Where will the rainwater go if these

houses go ahead. One resident on our street already gets flooded, this will get worse as the fields absorbs so much rainwater and is a huge concern to all the residents.

I can't see how these new residents will be from Erewash area of Ilkeston, Long Eaton, Sandiacre etc. so will actually serve for Derby City residents, so how will this benefit the Erewash housing needs.

Approx 20 years ago there was a proposal for approx 100 homes to be built on this land, this got thrown out as they wanted the entrance and exit on Morley road, it got refused as Morley Rd could not withstand the extra traffic and it was classed as a danger due to the children there and back to school.

The infrastructure for this development does not exist so I cannot see how this can go ahead.

Yours sincerely  
Nicola Farmery

Ref: Objection to Erewash Core Strategy Review Site SGA 1

I wish to voice my objection to the above proposal to build 600 houses on green belt land, the reasons given below.

No.1. Due to the lay of the land, a very sloping sight and the current climate changes, it will increase the risk of more flooding in the area. We have already seen the closure of Locko Road, Morley Road and Acorn Way in recent months.

No.2. There is only housing proposed with no provision for new schools, doctors or dentist surgeries, the existing ones being already full to incapacity in the area, with an added burden to the ambulance, fire and police services that could cause danger to life.

No.3. There will be an increase in traffic on the existing roads that already have a weight limit in force.

There are blind bends in the area where many accidents have occurred over the years.

There was a stipulation at the time of the building of Oakwood that NO access roads should be constructed after Besthorpe Close because of these dangers.

No. 4. The lack of public transport in the area. Only one bus per hour with no service after 7pm and no services at all on a Sunday.

From Mrs. Marilyn A Dunn.

165 Morley Road,

Oakwood,

Derby. DE21 4QY

Comments and objection on the proposed construction of a housing estate off Acorn Way. This estate is opposite where I live off Acorn Way, and will impact my life.

Elizabeth Jackson

7 Wheatsheaf Close

Oakwood

DE21 2TZ

### **Consultation**

I moved into this house in 2019 and none of the searches undertaken at that time flagged the potential build on Acorn Way. I have lived in Oakwood for 15 years so have good familiarity with the area.

I have never been consulted, or made aware that a consultation process was under way. I live ~310m from the new development and under the Town and country Planning Regs 2012, Clause 18, (2), (c) would have expected that I would count as an appropriate resident to invite for consultation. (I previously lived 550m away.)

Having now been made aware of the plans and being told I can't comment at this stage is disappointing. I trust that my comments will be considered as part of the specific body consultation (2, (1) (h) adjoining council).

Please note that at 13/11/23, typing 'Acorn Way' into the Erewash consultation search engine, this plan does not appear, so from my perspective the consultation feels like it has been intentionally hidden.

### **Housing to Support Erewash Borough Housing Growth Plans**

The location of the proposed estate (Acorn Way) is too far away from Long Eaton and Ilkeston to materially affect their housing stock and therefore workforce. It also has poor transport links (there are no direct roads). A bus service is not sufficient to address this. People living in the new estate will likely work in Derby, not Ilkeston or Long Eaton.

This does nothing to address the councils Hybridised criteria to impact on diversity or quality of jobs.

## **Traffic**

In the information available on the website I cannot find any analysis of the impact this estate will have on traffic. The junctions around this area are already at or over capacity (as reported in a separate planning application for an estate adjacent to Chaddesden Woods Nature Reserve).

Traffic already queues back from the Lime Lane-Acorn Way junction, past my road end on a regular basis. If this estate is to support Ilkeston workforce, then much more traffic will head that way.

Our existing bus services are unreliable. No-one but the extremely desperate would rely on it to get to work. Any bus route from this new estate to Long Eaton or Ilkeston is likely to take much longer than by car, therefore be very undesirable and underused (and therefore cancelled after a few years). People in this estate will be car dependent.

Traffic down Morley road is already untenable at school times (gridlocked). The new estate will make this worse, both Morley Road and the surrounding alternative routes to avoid it.

## **Services**

The document pack indicates that some money will be provided to fund new classrooms and a bus service. This falls far short of the full suite of services which will be stretched in Derby borough as a result of this new estate, including broadband, water (pressure) – which are stretched already in Oakwood; GP and dental facilities.

Due to lack of appointment availability at my GPs I already have to travel to my GP's sister facility in town. I am lucky that I am able to travel, so have been able to do this. For situation where I have been really unwell, I have had to have a friend drive me there on 2 occasions over the last 10 years (I don't go to the doctors that often).

I have had to go private for dentist, there was no NHS provision available when I moved here. The practice has subsequently moved to all private. i.e. there is a lack of Dental provision already, without extra houses in the area.

Making a one off payment does not address the ongoing provision of services that the adjacent – Derby borough, will have to provide.

The Infrastructure Delivery Plan EBC06 also makes no provision for additional facilities for the Acorn Way build, neither cycle paths, nor footpaths are mentioned. (For example, Acorn Way is the most direct cycle route to Long Eaton, and it is not cycle friendly.)

With regard to footpaths, there is no provision for 'safe junctions'. A public footpath from Loco Park to Morley road cuts across the bottom of the site, with a crossing on Acorn Way, and Morley Road. The Acorn Way crossing requires extremely high concentration to cross quickly and safely, and the Morley Road Exit – I have walked into the road thinking I was walking onto footpath before now, due to markings in the tarmac. The road has since been resurfaced, but there is no landing zone to exit the path before crossing the road. Higher footfall on this path is likely to lead to a much greater chance of an accident, if the junctions are not amended.

At the right hand side of this footpath, the path ends on the country road towards Loco park. This does not have a footpath and requires one to walk on the road. Having done this once, due to the narrow road and speed of traffic I did not feel safe, and have not done it again. (I am fit and able bodied.)

## **Green Belt**

Stating that additional housing is needed for Ilkeston and Long Eaton (Erewash borough), then placing it far away (by road), does not adequately justify deletion of greenbelt land. There are other locations which would support these towns.

The implication in some of the documentation is that they would not generate sufficient revenue, particularly for social housing to make them desirable to build at these other location. (Erewash BC Viability Study 2023 ~p45). Deletion of greenbelt should be based on more than a financial decision.

Other locations have been rejected on the basis that they encroach on farmland. This proposal is also building on farmland. Only a tiny boarder at the top is shared with other buildings, Oakwood (Morley Road), all other sides of the development boarder farm land. In particular, the land on the opposite side of Acorn Way is Green Wedge farmland.

It also does not meet the councils declared Sustainability Criteria Objective 9 – to use brown field sites.

The argument made is that the site chosen is an appropriate extension of a town into greenbelt land. The town in question is not part of Erewash borough, so it is not appropriate for them to make this argument.

The additional residents, and their cars will increase the local air pollution.

### **Green Space Provision**

With the high housing density planned for the site I expect there is no provision for a park or green space. Green spaces are known to be a necessity for good mental health and good social behaviour.

30 dwellings per hectare is higher than the adjacent Oakwood housing, and will not support community cohesion, with a significantly different feel to the area.

It should be noted that the areas immediately adjacent to this site are not accessible green spaces – they are farmland and a sealed football site. Lack of local green space access will put additional pressure on the existing local parks (particularly pressure for parking and roads to get there).

The farmland does not include extensive footpaths or access (there is much barbwire and large hedges). There is one public footpath at the bottom of the site, which does not offer access into the adjacent fields. My safety concerns regarding its road crossings are noted above.

### **Conclusion**

I object to the construction of a large housing estate on green belt land next to Acorn Way.

There are better options available for Erewash borough to choose to build new housing stock to support its towns and businesses.

## **OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ON LAND AT ACORN WAY**

### **[SGA1]**

Assumption: 600 homes = circa 2000 people & circa 1000 vehicles.

I wish to submit to Erewash Borough Council [EBC] the following objections against its proposed housing development on SGA1.

### **Traffic load & Road Safety on Morley Road and Acorn Way.**

- Irrespective of whether ingress/egress to the proposed 600-house development would be located on Morley Road and/or Acorn Way, the impact would be significant. Neither road would be able to cope with 1000 more vehicles. Both roads are heavily congested at peak periods – southerly during the peak morning times and northerly at cease-of-work times.
- Acorn Way would need **major** expansion, causing significant disruption to traffic flow during the construction period, and peak-period traffic lights would be necessary at the roundabouts at each end to maintain traffic flow.
- Morley Road is already a very busy road, particularly during peak periods and can become virtually impassable in the Lees Brook Academy area during school opening/closing periods. Unlike Acorn Way, which could theoretically be widened [at a very significant cost], Morley Road could not, particularly south of the Acorn Way roundabout: this section of Morley Road is relatively narrow, has several bends, always has a number of cars parked on the road, and has established housing on both sides of the road for most of its length down to the Wilmot Arms pub; increasing the capacity of this section of Morley Road would be impossible.
- Adding circa 1000 vehicles to the existing traffic levels could be remedied on Acorn Way, but at very significant cost; for Morley Road, it would be untenable.
- The ingress/egress points would also exacerbate traffic flow. Given the circa 1000 vehicles, traffic lights would be necessary at new junctions at these points, and perhaps also roundabouts; for sure, there is insufficient width in Morley Road south of the Acorn Way roundabout for new ones.

- Road safety is already a concern on Acorn Way [particularly in the presence of cyclists] and also Morley Road south of the Acorn Way Roundabout, where the many vehicles travel at dangerously-high speeds, despite being in a 30mph zone. Road safety is already an issue: there are always a number of cars parked on the road, but safety is most acute in the area of Lees Brook Academy; it is already at the 'dangerous' level. Adding circa 1000 vehicles to the existing traffic levels could only reduce road safety, most significantly on Morley Road.
- During the building phase of the proposed development, which would last for several years, ingress and egress of HGVs would be a further problem to both Acorn Way and Morley Road; I have heard that the latter may have a weight restriction which might not be compatible with the HGV traffic. Egress, in particular, would deposit a lot of mud onto the highways, further negatively impacting road safety.

### **Flood Risk on Morley Road**

- My concern here is with Morley Road, south of the Acorn Way roundabout. The recent heavy rains, once again highlighted the problem of existing rain run-off, from the field proposed for development, onto Morley Road. The field elevation is up to 2-3m above that of Morley Road and the run-off from the field results in a shallow, fast-running river down the gradient [north to south] of Morley Road that pools further down the road where the gradient becomes level for approx 200m before the gradient continues. One must assume that the run-off from a housing development would be significantly higher than that from a field. The existing drainage is inadequate and, therefore, without a significant upgrade to the current drainage system and specific run-off mitigation constructions on the proposed development, the flood risk WILL increase.

### **Local Infrastructure and Facilities**

- **Infrastructure.** Roads & Drainage: already covered.
- **Public Transport.** No bus route currently runs along Acorn Way. There is currently one bus route running along Morley Road [Service 32], but this is only a 1-bus-per-hour service in each direction. Clearly, the current public transport is inadequate for an additional passenger loading from 600 houses. I am aware from EBC's documentation that one planning assumption is "*To increase frequency of [bus] services along Morley Road*", but a response from the developer is awaited; lack of detail is therefore concerning. The other consideration here is how occupants from the proposed development would walk to Morley Road to catch a bus.
- **Medical & Dental GP Surgery Capacity.** The Park Practice at Chaddesden already has 38,000 patients. Given the current difficulties in talking to/seeing GPs and other staff, an additional circa 2000 patients from the proposed development could not be

accommodated in the Oakwood/Chaddesden Wards. I have not found any coverage of this issue in EBC's documentation.

- **Education.** Education in this context comprises Secondary, Primary and Nursery facilities. Nursery capacity would certainly need increasing, and I have not found this covered in EBC's documentation. There is only 1 Secondary and 1 Primary school for Oakwood children; class sizes are already excessive and there is already no spare capacity. EBC's documentation states "*Toward provision of additional pupil capacity at schools in Oakwood and Chaddesden*", with an estimated cost of £3.45m. I wonder if this assumption of "additional pupil capacity" has been agreed by the affected parties – I suspect not; in any case, given that the children from the proposed development would reside in EBC's area of responsibility, surely they would not be added to the catchment area for the Oakwood and Chaddesden schools. The only tenable solution would be new schools, at EBC's cost, in which case the estimated cost assumption of £3.45m would be woefully inadequate.
- **Sports facilities.** I suspect that there is little chance of new occupants from the proposed development joining Springwood Leisure Centre in Oakwood, as it is already heavily utilized.

### Green Belt Land

- The proposed development is on Green Belt land. EBC has already received a question on this from the appointed Planning Inspector in his/her "Initial Questions Response – Feb 2023" document, which states, *inter alia*, "**Paragraph 140 of the NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified through the preparation or updating of plans..... Can the Council identify where this has been done and where the exceptional circumstances are set out?**". The EBC's response was "*The Council is of the view that it has fully evidenced and justified the alteration of Green Belt boundaries through the Core Strategy Review (CSR) process in response to Paragraphs 140 and 141 of the NPPF.*"
- The EBC document "Green Belt Technical Paper, Erewash Borough Council, September 2023, states as rationale for using Green Belt land at SGA1 "*Site extends the conurbation of Derby. Release of this area of Green Belt forms a logical extension to Oakwood and would not compromise the historic setting of any rural villages*". Paragraph 140 of the NPPF states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where **EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES ARE FULLY EVIDENCED AND JUSTIFIED.....** . It would appear from the evidence that the only rationale offered by EBC for using this Green Belt land for housing is to tick off 600 of its new-housing target: hardly "exceptional circumstances!"

### General

EBC's proposed development at SGA1 is flawed in many areas. To add salt to the wound for Oakwood and Chaddesden residents, indeed for all Derby City Council [DCC] council tax payers, EBC appears to assume that the cost of expanding infrastructure and local facilities to accommodate a 2000 increase in population would be borne by DCC and, in turn, its

residents by dint of increased Council Tax. Furthermore, the new 2000 residents would wholly utilize DCC facilities, yet EBC would receive the Council Tax from the 600 properties.

The arguments presented by EBC are weak, particularly in terms of under-estimating the costs of infrastructure and facilities upgrades, ignoring the increased flood risk to Morley Road and, most importantly, the crude attempt to misuse the Green Belt.

The case appears to start with the answer that EBC wants and then attempts to find supportive arguments: to illustrate this, the Erewash Core Strategy Review, Revised Options for Growth, March 2021 states "**consultation did not identify any substantive issues with this site**"! I beg to differ. This proposal must be rejected.

David Rees

David Rees  
Meadowlands House  
131A Morley Road  
Oakwood  
Derby DE21 4QY

14 Nov 23

Mr Adrian Ball

131c Morley Road

Oakwood

Derby

DE21 4QY

14/11/2023

Reference SGA1 : Proposed erection of 600 residential dwellings to be built on the land between Acorn Way and Morley Road Oakwood.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to object to the above planning application for the following reasons:

1. Location. The proposed site is just an extension to Oakwood and Chaddesden and therefore will not benefit anyone who desires to live in the suburbs of Erewash. This will not help the need for housing in Erewash.

2. Flood Risks. Morley Road already tends to flood when the weather is bad. The proposed building land is higher than Morley Road so therefore when it rains all the water running off it will head towards Morley Road causing even more problems for the local residents.

3. Green Belt land. I see no justification for the removal of more green belt land from around Oakwood. In these times of climate changes does it not make more sense to use all the available brownfield sites and disused retail and office blocks before destroying animal habitats and the health of our ecosystem.

Yours sincerely

Adrian Ball

Dear Sir/Madam

I wish to object to the proposed buildings regarding SGA 1 Land at Acorn Way.

The proposed 600 homes on this green belt land regarding Erewash Borough Council, whose needs are to be met, as my understanding of this is Derby City picks up the cost for any necessary upgrades to the infrastructure. Who will the council tax payments go to EBC or DC who will pay for bin collections etc.

Proposed a new road layouts possibly made off Acorn Way, Bestthorpe Close and/or Bridle path on Morley Road which would create far more congestion on Morley Road. Already particularly mornings and evenings with school and work traffic. School traffic parking alone is even worse this particular this year with parking reaching up to 141 Morley Road. I very often see queuing traffic morning in particular outside of my property as far up from the school to 151 Morley Road. Parking takes place on both sides of the road with drivers having great difficulty in getting through. For the bus it is even worse with many drivers having to mount the pavement to get by which is dangerous particularly when pupils/pedestrians walking.

The proposed outlet mini islands on Morley Road being at Besthorpe Close and the Bridle path would cause more congestion on a road that has substantial traffic already. Both being on a bend in the road that is not appropriate for a clear view approaching an island. The proposed outlet road off Acorn Way would bring extra traffic in both directions turning right towards Derby, Spondon, Long Eaton etc turning left towards Chaddesden, Oakwood, Breadsall. The island on Morley Road, roads off too Acorn Way, and Oakwood Drive is already a rat run for heavy traffic and queuing up to the junction of Lime Lane through traffic to Breadsall, Morley, Smalley, Stanley and Ilkeston.

There also appears no provision for any shops, GP surgeries, dentists or schools. All GP surgeries, dentist and school cannot provide a service as they are currently full capacity and not taking any new patients/ pupils on.

I do understand more homes are needed but the area is populated enough. As stated previously Morley Road already gets congested enough particularly mornings and early evening with work and the school traffic.

The bus route Ilkeston - Derby also only runs up Morley Road Mon. - Sat. 8 - 7pm once an hour with No bus on Sunday already not adequate.

I urge you to find adequate land available in a more suitable area.

Elaine Downing  
151 Morley Road  
Oakwood  
Derby  
DE21 4QY  
Contact No 07855447034  
Email- [gurtdowning@hotmail.com](mailto:gurtdowning@hotmail.com)

Joyce Yeomans,  
133 Morley Road,  
Oakwood,  
Derby.  
DE214QY

Re. Erewash Borough Council's proposed 600 new houses to be built between Acorn Way and Morley Road.

I am writing to object to this proposal.

I attended a meeting a couple of years ago at Kirk Hallam school when this proposal was first aired and submitted my objections then.

Obviously the objections have been ignored but the situation remains.

This land is not suitable for building these houses for the following reasons.

1 ] Morley Road is not suitable for all the extra traffic that would be generated.

At school times in particular it is near chaos with cars parked from some distance north of Lees Brook Academy right down to the

Puffing Billy Pub. Cars are parked on both sides of this narrow road. Any other traffic, including the bus service having extreme difficulty in getting through. Children streaming out of school on narrow pavements , running across the road, bicycles ridden erratically, a serious accident , fatality is waiting to happen and the potential for such incidents would be increased.

How can more traffic with its noise and pollution be acceptable?

2] Access to this new housing from Morley Road would be so unsafe and highly unacceptable to local residents .

Access from Acorn way would present safety concerns as this is a fast highway.

3] New schools , health centres , GP surgeries and facilities would be needed to meet new demands and who would be expected to foot the bill?It would not be fair or justified in expecting Derby City Council to pay for facilities on E.B.C. land.

Education and health needs do need to be met . For a project this size current establishments would not suffice.

4] Public transport in the area would be inadequate thus more car journeys would have to be utilised impacting the whole of Morley Road, Acorn Way, Lime Lane etc.

5] Loss of Green Belt land is to be deplored. These fields are a much needed resource for wild life, i.e.squirrels,foxes,birds ,wild flowers and is much used for rambling,dog walking and their owners exercise.

6] During periods of heavy rain, Morley Road becomes like a river with water running down the road . Drains are unable to cope and thus a potential hazard for car users and pedestrians. Less traffic needed not more.

7] Acorn Way was originally built to take traffic from Oakwood Estate away from Morley Road , now it is to be expected to absorb more traffic.

Please think again and accept these proposals are not in keeping with the needs , safety and views of residents in this area.

Dear Sir/Madam

With regards to the above subject I oppose this because of no

No schools for all age groups                      Full to capacity

No doctors or medical centres                      “

No dentists    “

No regular bus routes                                      Hourly, None on Sunday

What responsible Local Government organisations would think of building 600 new homes on this proposed land.

That equates to 1500 people and a 1000 cars to this area. Acorn Way is 50mph Road Providing access to and from the development.

Morley Road is only a minor Road and potentially far too dangerous for any access, already suffers from traffic hold ups throughout the day on a regular basis.

This development should be thrown out of any plans to turn green belt land into brown for a housing estate.

Dave Downing  
151 Morley Road  
Oakwood  
Derby  
DE21 4QY  
Contact No 07970847894

On behalf of  
Christopher Pierrepont  
16 Brookfield Ave  
Chaddesden  
DE214RE

My objections to the planning consent relating to GG1 Acorn Way are :

The Green Belt land on which the application refers to is essential for an already far too built up area. The effects of building on the proposed site would seriously effect the well being of Derby residents (and not people of the Erewash area which is where the decision is being made)

Any suggestion to add any more traffic to an already over used route Morley Rd which has become a 'rat run is ridiculously irresponsible.

Air quality in the area due to vehicle fumes is already such to impact on the health of pedestrians most of which are mothers and children on school runs

Safety is already a major concern at several times of the day due to the high number of vehicles and pedestrians where Morley Road is narrow, inadequate pavements and with dangerous bends.

Health facilities in the area are already well overstretched as I know when trying for example to get a doctor's appointment.

Insufficient school places for infant and junior age groups have been an issue since Oakwood housing estate was built.

In conclusion, there are far too many seriously negative factors connected to this planning application. It must NOT go ahead.

Submission of objections re planning application of GG1 Acorn Way

On behalf of:

Mrs. Gwyneth Pierrepont

16 Brookfield Avenue

Chaddesden

DE21 4RE

My husband and I have grave concerns of this housing application.

We want to begin this objection firstly by explaining our horror at the suggestion that the parcel of land involved is to be removed from the existing green belt.

Secondly we want to refer to the parts of the 'Strategic Environmental Assessment' which includes, amongst other issues, the need to address 'human health', 'air' and 'environment'.

We want to point out that the suggested proposal would at a stroke negatively affect all 3 of these by the removal of the greenbelt status of the land and by introducing an indeterminate number of extra vehicles onto the local roads.

The greenbelt has been an ESSENTIAL buffer to Derby City residents of Chaddesden since the completion of the large Oakwood housing estate and on top of the already existing large Chaddesden council housing estate.

To add the proposed number (600) houses to that is frighteningly alarming in terms of the possibility of increased traffic in the vicinity and in particular on Morley Rd which the land butts up to.

It would have serious impacts on the residents who live on or near to Morley Rd which was never intended or developed for the amount of traffic ALREADY using it now. With very narrow pavements in parts and paving on only one side in others in addition to tricky bends and passing areas it has already become a daily DANGER zone with schoolchildren needing to walk it with traffic at a high

and congested volume. We and many others witnessing 'near misses' on a daily basis, anticipate a SERIOUS ACCIDENT waiting to happen !!!

That is without the existence of the traffic this proposal would obviously create.

Extreme traffic obviously also impacts on air quality and pollution and we experience that when needing to walk on Morley Rd. We certainly choose our times whenever possible to protect ourselves.

Some other folk aren't able to choose and that includes the many schoolchildren who walk to and from school on a daily basis. That includes 3 of our grandchildren who are all aware even at their age, of the danger to their long term health of breathing in traffic fumes.

We therefore must appeal to the sense and decency of individuals involved in the decision making to NOT ALLOW this proposal to be passed.

We strongly object to the 600 housing development on land adjacent to Morley Road Oakwood. We are very certain that this development will impact on the country road which is what Morley Road is, the traffic at the moment is under strain due to the school at one end of Morley Road and work time traffic at the Kings Corner cross road.

Then there is also the impact on the Doctors it very difficult to get appointments as it is so it is certain that having extra residents will make it worse. The schools are already full so that will be difficult, and the bus services on Morley Road are one an hour and none on Sunday so that means more cars will be using an already busy road. There is also an added problem with flooding which happens regular when it rains.

Taking all of those reason and more which is the wildlife in this area we feel this area is not suitable for this housing development which is proposed.

Mr Anthony and Mrs Dianne Scaife

16 Besthorpe Close

Oakwood

Derby

### **Land Off Acorn Way**

(I confirm I have not previously commented on this planning application).

1. My main objection to this housing development is the loss of green space. This green space has two major benefits.

Firstly, it has amenity value for local residents on the south side of Oakwood and Chaddesden, affording an opportunity to walk into open countryside right on the edge of a built up area without having to cross Acorn Way, a dangerous move at the best of times.

Secondly, I believe the land forms part of a corridor of open countryside for wildlife, one that is being increasingly squeezed out of existence by development.

2. I consider putting up to 600 houses on this site to be an over development of the land. By way of comparison, 250 houses were erected on the north side of Oakwood, off Mansfield Road. Now built, the high density of this development is apparent to all. The contrast between this development and the older parts of Oakwood estate is stark.

3. A dense development of 600 houses on land sloping down towards Acorn Way and Morley Lane is surely going to lead to greatly increased surface water run-off. Recent flooding on Morley Road and other parts of the area (October 2023) was a graphic illustration of the results of increasing surface run off from housing and roads and the inability of the existing surface water drain system to cope with it.

4. Road traffic on Acorn Way and Morley Road is already high. There is a general lack of visibility on Acorn Way due to the road being largely in a cutting combined with frequent level changes. Putting a new junction onto this road would surely increase the likelihood of accidents and create increased congestion.

5. The existing doctors' services at Oakwood and Chaddesden medical centres are already over-subscribed. A development of 600 houses will only add to that problem.

6. Places at local primary and secondary schools in the area are already limited. This proposal will increase demand for school places or, more likely, lead to children being taken by car to other schools beyond, thereby contributing to local traffic congestion.

7. Oakwood and the upper parts of Chaddesden are poorly served by public transport. This puts pressure on residents to use their own vehicles (further traffic congestion) or isolates those who have to rely on the limited bus services.

Kind regards,

Charles Glenn,

8, Ryegrass Road,

Oakwood,

Derby,

DE21 2TX

[charlieglenn1961@gmail.com](mailto:charlieglenn1961@gmail.com)

Reference SGA1 : Proposed erection of 600 residential dwellings to be built on the land between Acorn Way and Morley Road Oakwood.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to object to the above planning application for the following reasons:

1. Location. The proposed site is just an extension to Oakwood and Chaddesden and therefore will not benefit anyone who desires to live in the suburbs of Erewash. This will not help the need for housing in Erewash. It will also create a problem for children finding schools as Lees Brook would not be able to house them all.

2. Green Belt land. I see no justification for the removal of more green belt land from around Oakwood. In these times of climate changes does it not make more sense to use all the available brownfield sites and disused retail and office blocks before destroying animal habitats and the health of our ecosystem.

3. The area is currently untouched and a great site for avid dog walkers and nature enthusiasts. The building of so many properties would create an eyesore for those living in the area.

Yours sincerely

Olivia Dunne & Jonathan Ball

131 Morley Road Oakwood

Resident :  
Louise Pipes  
141 Morley Road  
Oakwood, Derby  
DE21 4QY

With reference to the development plans for Acorn Way and over 600 houses by Erewash Council. I wish to share my objections for many reasons as listed below.

I have lived on Morley Road for over 35 years , initially with parents at 151 and then 143 with my own family , prior to 141 from 2014. The road has always remained as a sought after area to live due to the individual houses, often of larger proportions and indeed the beautiful fields that we have opposite . This is certainly a reason why many of the homes were initially bought as the homes retain their charm and value .

I would be concerned how these proposed homes would over populate the area and devalue the properties . If they too are to be deemed as affordable housing , this in turn can attract a clientele that would not befit the area and would devalue the current properties on the road. Residents here work hard and enjoy the neighbourhood and have very little issue regarding crime or anti social behaviour .

The development would exacerbate the already busy road with additional traffic and people. Leesbrook School already brings extensive issues of car parking whereby the cars are moving further up the road and causing obstructions for other cars and the buses and of course residents .

Moving onto schools , doctors and local services , it would be a concern where all these residents would be accommodated . The local schools would need extensions or a new school to support the extra children. There would need to be additional doctors surgeries to be able to accommodate more residents as they are all ready full to capacity .

The fields are a lovely area of green belt land that benefits , farm animals, walkers , dog walkers and connects over to Locko Park . This is a lovely quality of the area , not to mention the nature that is within this land that will be dramatically affected.

I fully oppose the plan for the housing development for the above reasons and for the continued safety concerns of the residents and protection of the areas reputation.

Kind regards

Louise Pipes

***Erewash Borough Council via Local Derby City Councillors***

**Objection to Erewash Core Strategy Review – Site SGA 1**

Planning Policy/ Local Plans Team

In respect of the plans for SGA1, Land at Acorn Way I - a local resident of Oakwood - wish to object to this proposal in the strongest terms. Regretfully, Erewash Borough Council have refused to accept my direct objection so this is being presented via my local councillor.

Outline plans have been put in place for 600 dwellings (probably 2000 or more people and circa 1200 cars) with, as far I can tell from perusing the extensive range of Core Strategy Review documents available online, very little consideration of the impact on the people of the City of Derby closely associated with the geographical location of the site.

The infrastructure needs, schools, doctors, dentists, public transport, of so many people are not well considered. The location of the site means that it is inevitable that the population will use already overstretched faculties currently used by Derby City residents. This will place an intolerable burden on these services to the detriment of the current users and also at a financial cost to Derby City finances. There are few alleviation measures in the plans and on these grounds alone the proposal should be rejected.

Further, the increase in traffic that is bound to result from the development will add to the already very bad traffic congestion on Nottingham Road, Morley Road and on Acorn Way itself. The additional pollution in Oakwood and Chaddesden is a further serious objection. In addition, the

removal of an area of Green Belt land, which is designated as such to control urban growth and provide opportunities for access to open countryside, will have a negative effect both mentally and physically on the people who use it for recreational purposes. The health of people in these locations will be put at risk by this development.

Flooding has been much to the fore in the awareness of the people of Derby recently and building houses on this land can only increase the risk to those living around it. Water is currently running down Morley Road off this land. Residents of Besthorpe Close must drive through this flooding currently. The development will make it worse.

I trust that logic and common sense will prevail and that this development will not proceed.

Mrs Patricia Bowen  
23 Besthorpe Close,  
Oakwood  
DE21 4RQ

## **Objection to Erewash Core Strategy Review - Site SGA 1**

Jonathan Wareham  
7 Shrewsbury Close  
Oakwood  
Derby  
DE21 2RW

I am writing to object to the proposed development of 600 houses on land at Acorn Way, known as SGA 1. I have set out my reasons for the objection below :

**Lack Of Health Services/GPs** - I moved to Oakwood 6 months ago from the centre of Derby, and yet I am still with the same GP surgery because I haven't been able to register with a GP in Oakwood due to lack of capacity. There are simply not enough GPs and medical facilities to serve the existing residents of Oakwood/Chaddesden meaning obtaining appointments is extremely difficult. If the existing residents are not able to be served, how are the residents of 600 new homes going to access medical services?

**Road Congestion** - The roads in the area including Acorn Way, Morley Road, Lime Lane and Nottingham Road are already often congested at peak times. Morley Road in particular is a narrow road not designed for the current traffic load. Acorn Way was built specifically to link traffic between the A52/ring road at Spondon, to Oakwood. It is a 60mph speed limit road with no pavements and totally unsuitable for access onto a new 600 home estate. Congested roads cause noise and air pollution, and road accidents. In the last 2 months alone, there have been two serious crashes at the junction with Lime Lane, one of them fatal.

Flooding/Drainage - I'm concerned at the potential problems with flooding that adding another 600 homes to the local area might bring. Several properties have already faced flooding following storms in 2023, and just around the corner from my house, on Springwood Drive, the road has only just been repaired after the road surface was cracked and lifted by storm water.

Lack Of Bus Services - No buses run on Acorn Way, and the only bus on Morley Road has a minimal service between Derby and Ilkeston. This can only mean that the new residents would have to use their cars to get around, adding to the already congested roads.

School Places - Similar to health services, schools in Oakwood are already over-subscribed. Where would all the children from the new estate go?

Erewash vs Derby City - I don't really understand how this development is deemed to be for people looking to live in Erewash, when it would clearly just be additional housing for Oakwood. New houses would be marketed as Oakwood, not as any Erewash suburb. This means the pressure on public services, roads and infrastructure is borne by Derby City, with council tax going to Erewash - how is that fair?

Paul Crossley  
17 Besthorpe Close  
Oakwood  
Derby  
DE21 4RQ

Erewash borough council

Re proposed development land at Acorn way

Arguments against the above development

#### 1 Flooding

As seen in recent weeks heavy rainfall water flowing of the proposed site and flowing down Morley road. The proposed development would speed up this waterflow and so the risk of more flooding along Morley road.

#### 2 Public Transport

Currently there are only 2 buses running near to the proposed development with limited service.

So as a result more cars meaning more congestion especially at school times around Morley road and the surrounding area.

#### 3 Schools

I'm guessing some of the residents will have children and require schooling. There are currently few schools in the area so will lead to stress on these.

#### 4 Environment

The proposed development will rob us of green fields.

## 5 Medical services

The proposed developments residents will need doctors we in the area currently struggle to get appointments so is our health expected to deteriorate by the proposed development

Yoursfaithfully

P R Crossley

Lorraine Miller  
17 Besthorpe Close  
Oakwood  
Derby  
DE21 4RQ

Erewash borough council

Re proposed development land at Acorn way

Arguments against the above development

### 1 Flooding

As seen in recent weeks heavy rainfall water flowing of the proposed site and flowing down Morley road. The proposed development would speed up this waterflow and so the risk of more flooding along Morley road.

### 2 Public Transport

Currently there are only 2 buses running near to the proposed development with limited service.

So as a result more cars meaning more congestion especially at school times around Morley road and the surrounding area.

### 3 Schools

I'm guessing some of the residents will have children and require schooling. There are currently few schools in the area so will lead to stress on these.

### 4 Enviroment

The proposed development will rob us of green fields.

5 Medical services

The proposed developments residents will need doctors we in the area currently struggle to get appointments so is our health expected to deteriorate by the proposed development

Yoursfaithfully

L Miller

Natalja Lescuka  
147 Morley Road  
DE21 4QY  
Derby

I hope this letter finds you well. I am writing to express my deep concern and objection to the proposed housing development in our area, specifically on the green fields that have long been cherished by our community. While my family and I recently moved here and were unable to provide objections in Spring 2022, we have already begun to witness the potential impact of these changes on our environment and overall well-being.

**Environmental Impact and Climate Emergency:**

The proposed development comes at a time when we are facing a climate emergency. The green fields provide crucial ecosystem services and contribute to the overall health of our environment. Their loss would not only exacerbate pollution but also deprive the community of valuable green spaces that aid in mitigating the effects of climate change. It is imperative that we prioritize environmental conservation and sustainability, especially in the face of such global challenges.

**Increased Traffic and Air Pollution:**

We have noticed a rapid increase in traffic since our recent move, and the proposed housing development is only expected to worsen this issue. The

subsequent rise in air pollution poses a direct threat to the well-being of the residents, affecting not only our physical health but also the quality of the air we breathe. Considering the importance of air quality in the current global health climate, it is crucial to avoid decisions that would further compromise our environment.

**Loss of Walkways and Recreational Spaces:**

The green fields serve as essential walkways and recreational spaces for our community. Losing these areas would not only diminish our quality of life but also limit opportunities for outdoor activities. Preserving these green spaces is vital for the mental and physical well-being of residents, and their loss would be felt by both current and future generations.

**Impact on Education and Healthcare:**

The influx of new residents, especially families with children, raises concerns about the potential impact on our son's education. Increased class sizes could hinder the effectiveness of teaching, and the strain on local healthcare services, as evidenced by the difficulty in securing a GP appointment, is likely to worsen. It is essential to consider the existing infrastructure's capacity to accommodate the needs of a growing population.

I appreciate your attention to this matter and trust that you will consider the long-term consequences of the proposed development on both the environment and the well-being of our community.

Sincerely,

Natalja Lescuka

My name is Jane Pittwood of 39 Woodsorrel Drive, Oakwood, DE21 2UF and these are the points I wish to raise/make:

### **General points and effect on the green areas around Oakwood**

It is not sustainable for Oakwood to suffer more loss of its surrounding green areas and, in this instance, Green Belt, to Oakwood as a whole. Two substantial green areas have been lost in the past 6+ years with two sizable areas of building which are already having an impact on Oakwood in a number of areas. To return to this particular area of Green Belt, when permission was granted for the Football Academy it was granted on the understanding, or so I thought, that this was a 'one-off' development as the number of actual buildings were to be minimal and of low impact to the area. A number of parts of Oakwood already suffer with water retention/flooding due, in part to the underlying clay substructure, but also because of the amount of building that has already taken place. Taking away the natural drainage of this undeveloped land can only make matters worse. Acorn Way itself is particularly prone to flooding and this will not be helped by further development of the surrounding land. We are continuously being made aware of our increasing 'carbon footprint', but this can be alleviated by increasing the amount of natural habitation. Developing this area will only make carbon emissions worse for this area. During Covid, it also

became apparent that areas of open countryside are beneficial to our health and wellbeing for a multitude of reasons.

It is suggested that Erewash are needing to increase their housing stock for current and potential new residents. I cannot see how this area can be beneficial to those people living or wishing to live and probably work in the Sandiacre, Long Eaton or Ilkeston areas. There are no public transport services linking these areas to the proposed Acorn Way development. Indeed, the area is more closely associated with Derby City and is, if anything, more likely to be of benefit to Derby City residents.

### **Education**

Unless provisions for schools for all ages are to be included within this development, there will be a severe difficulty in providing schooling for any children moving into the area. The nearest local schools, incidentally currently funded by Derby City Council and therefore Oakwood and other city suburbs residents, are already oversubscribed with many children not being offered places in their first choice establishments or even their nearest. None of the schools close to this area come under the jurisdiction of Erewash. Local children are already having to travel to schools further than is ideal, thus increasing traffic movement in the area, and the development of more family housing can only make this worse.

### **Health**

All the local doctors' practices are already unable to cope with their current patients judging by how difficult it is to see a doctor. The two latest housing developments have already been absorbed by the current practices. Therefore if this amount of proposed housing development is to exist, more provision will have to be made (and this cannot be by just another branch surgery to one of the existing practices as these are already branch surgeries to other practices).

Whilst considering health issues, there is an issue for many with accessing dental help. The current Oakwood practice is already losing NHS places as more of its dentists opt to treat only private patients. Many of their current NHS patients are being asked to either 'go private' or move elsewhere.

### **Traffic**

The lack of access to public transport currently in the proposed area will mean an inevitable increase in the use of private vehicles, not only for the usual work commute (which could be for longer distances if people are having to return to various parts of Erewash for work), but also to facilitate access to schools and health practices. This will be on roads which are already busier than they were built for and can only further increase the number of accidents that are already occurring. Indeed, within the last month alone Acorn Way has been closed twice due to accidents. Extra vehicles travelling on these roads will also increase wear and tear, resulting in more temporary road closures and more difficulties in getting about. In addition, who will be responsible for these repairs? The majority of roads in question are the remit of Derby City Council, therefore Derby City residents will be having to pay for this through increases to council taxes.

### **Conclusion**

With the above points it is easy to see why this area is so attractive to Erewash – they fulfil their obligation to provide their quotient of new housing with little or no cost to themselves and their residents, but they can still collect Council Tax revenue from the new residents!

Kind regards

Jane Pittwood

I strongly object to the proposed plan to build 600 homes on green belt land adjacent to Acorn Way. My main concern regarding the proposed build of 600 homes on what is now green belt land is the impact on local resources not administered or funded by Erewash Borough Council.

1. Building on green belt land will have a devastating impact on drainage and wildlife routes through the fields. Our roads have been impacted by severe flooding that is likely to get worse as the climate changes. More hard surfaces will push rainwater onto roads that cannot cope now. Including a small pond in the plan will not be enough as demonstrated by other local developments such as the Persimmon development on Mansfield Road where the pond quickly overflowed causing more problems. This proposal will have a severe flood impact in the Morley Road area but at a cost to Derby City and not Erewash!

2. The loss of green belt land is very detrimental to local wildlife when we have lost so much already. I feel sure there are many brownfield sites within the Erewash wards that would be more suitable to meet the needs of Erewash Borough Council.

3. I am concerned about the vastly increased road usage on already congested routes. The current road system is already congested at various times of the day and there have been many accidents at pivotal points such as Kings Corner. Acorn Way has no footpath for pedestrians and is currently too busy and too narrow to add footpaths. No provision seems to be made to improve public transport to the new homes leading to an expectation that at least 600 vehicles (possibly 1200) will be added to our local roads.

4. No additional education or medical facilities are proposed within this development. Our schools, GPs and Dentists are already over subscribed. What will be done to mitigate the added demand for these services?

5. New homes added to this site will be seen as an extension of Oakwood and Chaddesden rather than Erewash. This will not encourage people to use the facilities of Erewash areas such as Ilkeston and Sandiacre etc as the travel distance is less convenient than going into Derby, Chaddesden or Oakwood although Erewash will benefit economically from the Council Tax on these properties.

Kind regards

Mrs Pauline Garner

16 Earls Crescent

Oakwood DE21 2QB

Mrs Suzanne Small

14 Beechley Drive, Oakwood, Derby DE212LP

24th November 2023

Following on from the meeting held regarding the proposed Acorn Way development, I wish to oppose the application with the below points to raise.

# Green Space - the impact of the loss of green space in these times of climate emergency and loss of footpaths because of the development will have a huge impact on local residents. As a walker in the area I have sighted owls, foxes, deer and badgers and the loss of their environment would have catastrophic effects on their existence.

# Schooling - There are no provisions for new families in the area in terms of education. Local schools are already at capacity, I have personal knowledge of this, my own children were not provided with a local school place and had to travel to a village school out of the area, once again an environmental and economic effect on the community.

# GP Facilities - locally practices are at capacity, so where does this leave any new home owners? Getting an appointment at over crowded medical centres is a near on impossibility now, let alone with a further 600 households. Ultimately this puts pressure on an overworked NHS and could affect critical care, if minor ailments cannot be dealt with at the onset.

# Public Transport - local bus services have already been cut for routes on Morley Road, with only an hourly service and nothing on a Sunday, how can this be conducive in the first instance in reducing congestion when any new homes will have to rely on personal transport.

# Traffic - My family and I have lived in Oakwood for 40 years, during this time there has been no improvement to the road network. On a weekly basis there are road traffic collisions at the Kings Corner cross roads, Lime Lane, Locko Road, Sovereign Way and Smalley Drive. It is by pure luck there has not been a fatal collision. Speed bumps on Morley Road just seem to be a challenge for those who swerve them and race around them will little consideration for local residents. This would increase ten fold with additional residencies.

# Flood Risks - Acorn Way and certain areas of Morley Road already flood, with the drains unable to cope with any sudden down pours. The run off from another potential 20 hectares of development will leave the drainage system in dire straits and overwhelmed.

# Erewash Housing Stock - This development will be a tick box for Erewash Borough Council in meetings it's housing requirements, however, the burden will be on Derby City Council for road maintenance, health and well being facilities and education. Both councils cannot maintain grass verges for example on Acorn Way now, so how will the addition of 600 homes ever be conducive the their co-working. Why is this housing stock not being thought of for areas in the middle of Erewash, such at Stanton, Borrowash or West Hallam.

I hope my points are well received and I once again confirm my objection to the proposal

Yours Sincerely

Mrs Suzanne Small, Mr Joseph Small and Miss Olivia Small

Response to Erewash Council planning application at site SGA1 Land at Acorn Way.

Submitted by Heather Bryant, 9, Applegate Close, Oakwood, Derby DE21 2SL.

I OBJECT to the above planning application for the following reasons:

1. The proposed site is Green Belt land. Guidance in the NPPF for Local Planning Authorities sets out a presumption against development in the Green Belt unless there are exceptional circumstances, and that planning policies must protect and enhance the Green Belt in line with NPPF guidance.

Erewash Council seem to claim that their failure to meet housing targets over the past years is a good enough reason to justify this level of destruction of Green Belt land. That is not an 'exceptional circumstance'.

The Green Belt here separates Spondon, Chaddesden and Oakwood helping to retain their individuality as separate communities. It offers space with public footpaths across it – rights of way for walkers, and an important rural space where local people can access nature.

As farmland it helps improve National food security.

Wildlife habitats will be destroyed, hedges and trees ripped out and the character of the area would be permanently altered. We need more, not less natural habitats. The areas of open space around Oakwood connect important Ancient habitats at Chaddesden Wood and Breadsall Cutting SSSI and form corridors, or green fingers, joining Derby City with the surrounding countryside. This Green Belt site should be retained and protected as it is part of a wider connecting habitat, and these environmentally important areas enhance and sustain one another. Can the Planning Authority demonstrate that it has fully considered these interactions between habitats?

2. Flood Risk. Increasingly heavy rainfall, such as that experienced recently, requires more areas of open fields and flood plains to absorb it. Hard surfaces increase run off and flooding. Where is the water currently absorbed into this Green Belt land going when it is paved over? What will be the effect on Lees Brook which flows at this site? The brook will gather more run-off from an estate and create flood risks for Chaddesden downstream along its course. Balancing ponds can overflow, as the pond at Lime Court estate on Oakwood did recently and that contributed to the flooding in Breadsall village in the recent storm 20<sup>th</sup>, 21<sup>st</sup> October. Similar conditions could lead to Chaddesden experiencing similar down-stream flooding issues.

Acorn Way is regularly flooded. There is a Flood warning sign which is almost permanently in place. This road is dangerous in wet conditions. There was a fatal accident in wet weather

here. Conditions have not improved and would in fact be made worse by rain run-off from new roads and hard surfaces on the Green Belt at this site.

3. Traffic. Congestion at peak times on Morley Road and Acorn Way is really bad. Local residents are already angry about long queues forming every day as traffic tails back from the Kings Corner junction. Currently at peak morning travel times it can take me 20 minutes to drive down Acorn Way from Oakwood. Congestion is already a daily problem for local residents. 600 new houses at this location would hugely impact this already over-burdened road network and create further delays.

As there are no spaces for more pupils at the local schools, doctors and dentists serving Chaddesden and Oakwood, the residents of a new estate would be completely car dependant and have to drive potentially long distances to access schools which would add more pressure on the roads. Bus services are limited.

Acorn Way would be a lethal entrance/exit for traffic due to regular flooding, lack of street lighting, national speed limit and high traffic density. Morley Road would also be unsuitable and dangerous for hundreds of additional cars to access every day. There is a secondary school, Lees Brook, on this road where hundreds of children have to cross twice a day. There is no pedestrian crossing. The road is narrow and buses can struggle to get through. School children will be in greater danger from this already busy road if it is also used by construction vehicles accessing the site and increased cars.

4. Cost to Derby City Council This is an Erewash planning application which is, to all practical purposes, an extension to Chaddesden and Oakwood. It is a very long way from Erewash's main towns. Are they going to service this estate with required facilities and services or will Derby City residents have to pay for these?

To whom it may concern

As a resident of Oakwood and in particular Morley Road I feel best placed to share with you my reasons to objecting to the proposed development.

My daughter currently attends Leesbrook school, every morning I witness the absolute chaos that takes place during school drop off and pick up times.

The volume of traffic on Morley road is extremely busy, mix this with children trying to dodge the traffic to cross the road or walk along the pavement towards school can make for uncomfortable viewing.

There has been some near misses involving the children that have also been reported.

I am very happy to provide video evidence to support this statement regarding the traffic if required.

As I understand it the main access points to the development will be on Morley road, only adding to the problem.

The green belt land is used by so many and is an integral part of what makes Oakwood and Chaddesden what it is.

The access to green space has a huge impact on mental health and especially to communities who have been impacted over the last few years including Covid, the climate crisis and cost of living.

To have access to green spaces is fundamental to mental well-being.

With regards to the climate crisis, green space should be protected in all cases, as with the impact on wildlife suffering. Adding on to what is already one of the largest housing areas in Derby should be considered as a mistake.

With regards to the housing, why is it necessary for Erewash to build right up to its boundary line that encroaches on Derby city boundaries, surely those who live within Erewash would want more local housing for families and future generations?

The building of 600 houses would without doubt impact the traffic even further with the addition of at least one car per household and stretch what is already a skeleton service with bus links.

This again adding to the impact of climate change.

Finally, the public services available in Oakwood are already full to capacity.

With local Dr's being impossible to see due to the volume of patients, local Dentists becoming private, again, due to the number of NHS patients and local schools being over subscribed.

Lees Brook school is striving hard to improve and after years of trying are finally seeing some more positive progress, this, I feel would be comprised if class sizes were to increase and the school were forced to over subscribe.

The information regarding the proposal has been very limited, whilst it is available on the Erewash website, most people would fail to read this.

The area is impacting Derby city council residents, with Erewash council residents benefitting from the build.

Above are just some of the reasons I would like to firmly object to the proposal and ask that our opinion is considered.

Regards

Mr & Mrs Johnson.

John Berresford,  
36 Seagrave Close,  
Oakwood.  
Derby.  
DE21.

**Objections to the proposed removal of land adjacent to Acorn Way/Morely Road from the green belt and its subsequent development for housing.**

As this land is higher than Morely Road, it tends to drain onto this thoroughfare. The proposed construction of housing would inevitably mean more water runoff onto Morely Road and therefore the possibility of a considerable amount of standing water on the carriageway if not the flooding of it.

The proposed development is more likely to attract people wishing to live in the Derby City Council catchment area than those wishing to reside in Erewash. It would therefore affect those already living in the former to a much greater degree than those in the latter.

It is proposed to route traffic to and from the development along either Acorn Way or Morely Road but both these routes are already busy, especially at peak times, and the safety of both would be adversely affected to a considerable degree. Traffic on Morely road is already considerable and indeed, heavy at school attendance and leaving times. I drive a 6.5 metre long motorhome and it is already impossible for me to drive it along Morely Road at these times; a situation which would be made considerably worse by the extra traffic this development would inevitably create.

The development would undoubtedly place even greater demands on local infrastructure such as shops, doctor's surgeries, public transport and schools. I know long term Oakwood residents who wished for their children to attend either Park View Primary or Lees Brook school but could not obtain places as both were already oversubscribed. And regarding doctors, I have had to wait six weeks for a simple medication review appointment, one of which I must have on a regular basis. The frequency of local bus services has been reduced recently and some routes were withdrawn completely in the past.

I see nothing in the proposal to address or improve any of these issues.

The reduction of green belt land is highly undesirable given the present state of climate change and the ecology in general. It would make much more sense and be much more acceptable if local authorities would concentrate on developing brown field sites instead.

For these reasons I object most strongly to Erewash Borough Council's proposed development.

I strongly object to the proposed plan to build 600 homes on green belt land adjacent to Acorn Way.  
My main concerns:

The loss of green belt land is very detrimental to local wildlife when we have lost so much already. I feel sure there are many brownfield sites within the Erewash wards that would be more suitable to meet the needs of Erewash Borough Council.

Building on green belt land will have a devastating impact on drainage and wildlife routes through the fields. Our roads have been impacted by severe flooding that is likely to get worse as the climate changes. Including a small pond in the plan will not be enough as demonstrated by other local developments. This proposal will have a severe flood impact in the Morley Road area but at a cost to Derby City and not Erewash!

I am concerned about the vastly increased road usage on already congested routes. The current road system is already congested at various times of the day and there have been many accidents at pivotal points such as Kings Corner. Acorn Way has no footpath for pedestrians and is currently too busy and too narrow to add footpaths.

There is no additional education or medical facilities proposed within this development.

New homes added to this site will be seen as an extension of Oakwood and Chaddesden rather than Erewash. Erewash will benefit economically from the Council Tax on these properties but Derby will be picking up the bill.

Regards,

Paul Garner

16 Earls Crescent

Objection to proposed housing development on Land at Acorn Way.

Natalie Peake. 49 Morley Road, Oakwood, Derby, DE21 4QU.

To whom it may concern,

I wish to add my objection to the proposed housing development being brought by Erewash County Council on the land at Acorn Way. Living next to this proposed development, and having lived in the area all my life, I wish to object in the strongest way possible, and list my reasons below;

- This development would have a negative impact on traffic on local roads, including Acorn Way, Morley Road, the Lime Lane Junction, lower Morley Road at peak school times, Nottingham Road and others. Morley Road, which I live on, is already heavily congested, particularly at school drop off and pick up times. The area outside Lees Brook Secondary Academy is particularly congested, with parents parking on both sides of the road, this causes a lot of issues particularly where the road narrows and the speed bumps along the road add to difficulty navigating along this road. All along Morley Road we suffer with congestion, traffic pollution and noise, this will only increase significantly with the addition of 600 homes with multi-car families. In addition, we have just 1 bus which runs along Morley Road, so we do not have the public transport infrastructure to alleviate an increase in cars travelling along the road. The bus already has difficulty travelling along the road, and this is made worse when the local College bus and the Refuse lorries are also on the road. To add more traffic and congested to this area is sheer madness.
- The proposed development has no plans to include the building of new doctors or dentist facilities, resulting in hundreds of new residents registering at the already over-subscribed local surgeries. I have been unable to get my 4 year old daughter a doctor's appointment at my local Chaddesden surgery every time I have rang up for an appointment, and have to travel into Derby City Centre to get her seen at the

Walk-in centre instead. We do not have the infrastructure in this area to accommodate even more families.

- There are just two Primary schools in the Oakwood/Chaddesden area, one of which, Parkview Primary, has been oversubscribed since its first year. My daughter attends the other school, and the extra children who could arrive with the proposed housing estate, would lead to increased class sizes and demand for places, resulting in even more difficulties securing first preference schools. I am fortunate that I can walk to school with my daughter, but people living on a new estate further along Morley Road would drive to drop off children, which will add even more congestion and dangerous parking to the Wood Road and Deborah Drive areas. We have had a near miss ourselves, with a parent driving along the pavement and almost knocking our daughter down.
- The proposed land is actually from the Green Belt and as a family we regularly enjoy walks over the fields, spending time in nature and looking at the sheep and horses on the surrounding fields. When the whole world is seeing the impact of climate change, how anyone can justify building on Green Belt is unbelievable. We would lose walkways used by local residents, dog walkers and families. In addition, this land regularly floods. During the recent storms, Morley Road was so flooded outside my home, up to 2.5ft in places, I had to travel all the way through the Oakwood estate just to travel to my workplace. Building on this land will make the issues so much worse, as there will be no land to soak up the rain water, and we have seen for ourselves the failings of so called 'overflow reservoirs' on the newly built Breadsall Hilltop Estate.

Kind Regards

Natalie Peake

To whom it may concern,

I wish to add my objection to the proposed housing development being brought by Erewash County Council on the land at Acorn Way. Living next to this proposed development, and having lived in the area all my life, I wish to object in the strongest way possible, and list my reasons below;

- This development would have a negative impact on traffic on local roads, including Acorn Way, Morley Road, the Lime Lane Junction, lower Morley Road at peak school times, Nottingham Road and others. Morley Road, which I live on, is already heavily congested, particularly at school drop off and pick up times. The area outside Lees Brook Secondary Academy is particularly congested, with parents parking on both sides of the road, this causes a lot of issues particularly where the road narrows and the speed bumps along the road add to difficulty navigating along this road. All along Morley Road we suffer with congestion, traffic pollution and noise, this will only increase significantly with the addition of 600 homes with multi-car families. In addition, we have just 1 bus which runs along Morley Road, so we do not have the public transport infrastructure to alleviate an increase in cars travelling along the road. The bus already has difficulty travelling along the road, and this is made worse when the local College bus and the Refuse lorries are also on the road. To add more traffic and congested to this area is sheer madness.
- The proposed development has no plans to include the building of new doctors or dentist facilities, resulting in hundreds of new residents registering at the already over-subscribed local surgeries. I have been unable to get my 4 year old daughter a doctor's appointment at my local Chaddesden surgery every time I have rang up for an appointment, and have to travel into Derby City Centre to get her seen at the Walk-in centre instead. We do not have the infrastructure in this area to accommodate even more families.

- There are just two Primary schools in the Oakwood/Chaddesden area, one of which, Parkview Primary, has been oversubscribed since its first year. My daughter attends the other school, and the extra children who could arrive with the proposed housing estate, would lead to increased class sizes and demand for places, resulting in even more difficulties securing first preference schools. I am fortunate that I can walk to school with my daughter, but people living on a new estate further along Morley Road would drive to drop off children, which will add even more congestion and dangerous parking to the Wood Road and Deborah Drive areas. We have had a near miss ourselves, with a parent driving along the pavement and almost knocking our daughter down.
- The proposed land is actually from the Green Belt and as a family we regularly enjoy walks over the fields, spending time in nature and looking at the sheep and horses on the surrounding fields. When the whole world is seeing the impact of climate change, how anyone can justify building on Green Belt is unbelievable. We would lose walkways used by local residents, dog walkers and families. In addition, this land regularly floods. During the recent storms, Morley Road was so flooded outside my home, up to 2.5ft in places, I had to travel all the way through the Oakwood estate just to travel to my workplace. Building on this land will make the issues so much worse, as there will be no land to soak up the rain water, and we have seen for ourselves the failings of so called 'overflow reservoirs' on the newly built Breadsall Hilltop Estate.

Kind Regards

Charles Woodward

07531595573

[ceawoodward@gmail.com](mailto:ceawoodward@gmail.com)

27 November 2023

To whom it may concern,

As a resident of Morley Road, I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed housing development on Acorn Way/Morley Road for the following reasons:

My understanding is that the access points on and off the new development will be from Morley Road, which will mean a huge increase in traffic throughout the day. Oakwood is already an extremely large housing estate as it is, and the build up of traffic at peak times leads to long delays in making journeys and an increase in pollution. An additional 600 homes will greatly exacerbate these issues.

There is already significant traffic bottlenecks further down Morley Road around Lees Brook Academy at school drop off and collection times, and additional traffic on this road will significantly increase the risk to the many children who walk to school and have to navigate dangerously parked cars, and traffic trying to manoeuvre around these cars, with many needing to cross this road when, at times, visibility is very poor due to cars obstructing their view. This leaves me concerned for the safety of those that attend this school.

I am also concerned about the increase in flood risk to properties on Morley Road. We frequently witness a stream of water running down Morley Road when it rains, and rainwater will quite often pool in areas along Morley Road. At times of significant rainfall, we have also witnessed water cascading off the field on to Morley Road and surface water flooding in our back garden, which is already classed as being in flood risk category 3.

As our home is opposite the field where these houses will be built, and we are further down Morley Road where the level of the field is much higher than the road level, I am concerned about the impact of this development on our privacy. If homes are built at a much higher land level than ours, then these will look down onto our house and garden. I am also concerned that this will make our home feel much darker if we lose natural light due to this development.

Another concern is the lack of additional infrastructure and the reliance on the public services provided by Derby City Council. We already have to battle to make a doctor's appointment if we need one, and I am aware that many residents on Oakwood have difficulties finding a local NHS dentist. Again, another 600 homes will only exacerbate this.

At a time when so many people are struggling with their mental health, the increase in houses, traffic and population, and the removal of greenbelt land which so many enjoy, will only damage our community. We hope the EBC reconsider this proposal and look again at the brownfield sites which have been dismissed.

Yours sincerely,

Julie & Rob Fowler

145 Morley Road, Oakwood.

## Objection to plans to build on Land at Acorn Way - SGA 1

*Submitted by:*

Nick Charles,

159 Morley Road, Oakwood, Derby, DE21 4QY

I wish to object to the proposed plans to build 600 houses on the land designated as **SGA1** or **Land of Acorn Way**.

My main objections are as follows:

### Green Belt Removal

In a time of potential food insecurity, it seems a very short-sighted decision to take productive farmland out of use. This year the fields where you are proposing to build have been used to raise over 400 lambs and have also produced three cuts of silage for winter feeding. Grassland is also a very efficient absorber of CO<sup>2</sup>, even better than just trees alone.

### Flood Risk

The proposed area of 26.0 hectares is mainly grass, with surrounding trees, so that most of the rain that falls on the land is currently absorbed. It is also basically a ridge, with the land falling away on three sides to Morley Road, Acorn Way and Lees Brook Community School.

In October this year the amount of rain that fell here in Oakwood was **202 mm**, approx. one third of the expected annual rainfall for Derby and nearly four times as much as the expected October total. This equates to **5,263,180 litres** on the site (1 mm of rain on 1 square metre, produces 1 litre) equivalent to just over **2 Olympic sized swimming pools**.

However, when the land has been built on, only about **30%** of rainfall will be absorbed and the rest will have to be drained and this would have been approx. **3,684,226.00 litres**, or nearly **1.5 Olympic sized swimming pools**. And with climate change, this sort of severe weather is going to happen many more times in the future.

Even a little rain causes water rushes down Morley Road, and I greatly fear that whatever mitigation you put in place, it will not be enough to avert severe flooding to the local surrounding area. The drains we have can only just cope with the current rainfall, but I have seen no indication that you propose to upgrade them.

#### Medical and GP Facilities

I am greatly concerned that no provision has been made in your documents for additional doctors' surgeries, dentists or medical facilities. At present it is extremely difficult to obtain an appointment at our local Medical Practice and with the addition of an extra 1,500 - 2,000 residents, things will become even more difficult.

#### Bus and Transport links

There is only one bus per hour that runs along Morley Road, between Derby city centre and Ilkeston and it does not run in the evening or on Sundays. The government is encouraging new housing estates to be built where there is plenty of public transport, so as not to make them car dependant, however this will not be the case here.

The traffic will be greatly increased on Morley Road, which was not built for this volume of traffic and Acorn Way, which at peak times is already slow moving, particularly at its junction with Morley Road.

Please pass my objection on to Erewash.

I object on the grounds of increased traffic, impact on the environment and noise.

Also, the doctors, dentists and schools around here are already oversubscribed,

Yours Sincerely,

Chris Plant

177 Morley Road

Oakwood

*Rachel Kozłowska-Best, 3 Barleycorn Close, Oakwood, Derby DE21 2TY*

*Living just off Morley road, I am concerned about the proposal to build*

*housing on land abutting it and Acorn Way. The traffic over recent years has increased dramatically along Morley road and Acorn way, with no upgrade in the infrastructure on either, this is causing issues both for residents and road users. Adding the traffic from 600 further houses would potentially bring this area to a standstill during peak times. I note that in your proposal you state that you would seek to fund a new or upgrade of the already inadequate public transport offer to this part of Oakwood. This will be inadequate as it will not connect people with local services.*

*I am aware that you propose this development to be an addition to the housing offer for Erewash residents, however I doubt that those who live in these houses will use services such as Doctors in Schools in Erewash, with the nearest Erewash options for either of these being 2.3 miles (Morley School, already oversubscribed) and 4.3 miles for a Doctors in Borrowash. This will mean they will need to use services in Oakwood, Chaddesden and Spondon. None of which have capacity to take on a large number of new service users. We already have issues with both Doctors surgeries in Oakwood being able to take on new patients and existing patients being seen. This will not be a fair offer for either existing or new residents.*

*The removal of the land from Green Belt would be detrimental not just for current residents of Oakwood but also people in general. It will remove much needed and appreciated green space. Although Oakwood is generally fortunate as regards flooding, in Storm Babette in early October, Morley road around the Wilmot Garage area was closed due to flooding and the upper parts of the road frequently become water runways with nowhere to run off to. I am concerned that with development of the ridge of land between Acorn Way and Morley road, rain water will have even less routes to be absorbed and run off to, increasing the risk of flooding when we are already seeing an increase in extreme weather events.*

*Although I am not completely opposed to house building in the Oakwood area, I feel this plan is not viable for the reasons listed above. Housing that supports a population with infrastructure and adequate services funded properly over the long term and works in conjunction with the environment as far as possible. are most welcome. However I do not believe the current proposal is or can be made to fit this criteria.*

*Rachel Kozłowska-Best*

**Liz Best, 3 Barleycorn Close, Oakwood, Derby DE21 2TY**

**My family lives on the edge of Oakwood and we are very worried about the proposed development on this land between Acorn Way and Morley Road.**

**1) We are aware it is Green Belt Land and are concerned this further development will deteriorate further countryside on the edge of the city. We worry about this because it makes it harder for Oakwood people to access such countryside by foot and takes yet more natural habitat from local wildlife. There is much research these days pointing out the health benefits (physical and wellbeing) for people accessing countryside. The mention of improved path access just doesn't cut it!**

**2) As climate change is so clearly happening NOW we worry that additional houses and all the hard surfaces which accompany them, will add to the higher temperatures experienced during the summer of 2022 to Oakwood residents; the open countryside helps lower such temperatures.**

**3) Conversely this additional residential area will be a significant flood risk for Morley Rd and the parts of Oakwood adjacent to this area of Morley Rd (the stretch opposite the day nursery running downhill) as rainwater will run off and any flood pools are likely to be unable to absorb the additional water. Drainage and sewage infrastructure will, no doubt, connect to existing drains and pipes - again likely to be overwhelmed when the increasingly frequent heavy rains occur.**

**4) Schools - the envisaged amount to be paid by EBC as a one off capital fund is unlikely to help. Where is the spare land for extra classrooms or an additional primary school in Oakwood? There is none, and both Leesbrook Secondary and Parkview Primary are fully, if not over, subscribed.**

**5) Health - local GPs are overstretched. There are many examples of people unable to access any local appointments, let alone timely ones.**

**6) Extra traffic - current plans seem to indicate access onto Morley Rd - really??! Already Morley Rd is extraordinarily busy at key times and especially outside Leesbrook and leading up to the Acorn Way roundabout and the Lime Lane crossroads. Even if access was onto Acorn Way this road, currently 60mph, no footpaths, no bus routes this would be a major difficulty for people**

wanting to join or leave the proposed development. Acorn Way would probably need to become 40mph and this would just add to traffic build up and travel times.

**So, for all these reasons, we strongly oppose this proposed development.**

Liz Best

Barleycorn Close

Oakwood

I hereby submit my objection to the proposed development of land bordering Morley road and Acorn way.

To consider this a viable site by latching it onto Oakwood with no gain in income to DCC is no more than petty theft.

My family and I have lived on Morley road for almost 40yrs. In that time the overall amenities within the Oakwood boundaries have failed to meet the needs of the community.

Our small primary school serves no more than a handful of roads within its catchment.

Put that together with its poor medical cover by doctor's surgery overrun with patients from growing families. Added to an aging community and the pressure that puts on the medical services.

As we understand it seems your desire is to have direct access onto Morley rd from the new development. This is a road that twice a day is a no go zone due to high levels of school traffic. The poor bus service that we now get is at a standstill during these periods. That on top of the traffic you are proposing would be an absolute disaster.

My next issue is with water runoff, during wet periods Morley rd becomes a steady stream of water.

This becomes extreme during heavy rain, to the extent that we can get water ingress into our garage. This added to the removal of soak away land by building foundations and tarmac roads and driveways will only increase this.

Yours sincerely

Paul Burge  
181 Morley road  
Oakwood  
Derby